

Graduate Student SYMPOSIUM

Selected Papers*
Vol. 13 2018-2019

**The Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Duncan
McArthur Hall: 50 Years of Scholarship at Queen's University
Faculty of Education**

Jackson Pind

Queen's University

(pp. 45-61)

Queen's University
Faculty of Education



Jen McConnel and Clarissa de Leon
Co-Editors

Dr. Christopher DeLuca
Managing Editor

*From the 2018 Rosa Bruno-Jofré Symposium in Education (RBJSE)
Please scroll down to view the document.

The Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Duncan McArthur Hall: 50 Years of Scholarship at Queen's University Faculty of Education

Jackson Pind
Queen's University

Abstract: *In 1968, the Queen's University Faculty of Education at Duncan McArthur Hall began to educate professional teachers in an effort to solve the crisis caused by the dramatic increase in Canada's population during the baby boom era (Gidney, 1999). Built at the same time as the influential Hall-Dennis Report, and named after one of Ontario's most progressive Ministers of Education, the Faculty adopted new methods of teaching and learning to help inspire the next generation of teachers who were now required to complete a specialized one-year program to earn the professional ranking of Bachelor of Education (B. Ed.) (Gidney, 1999). To mark the 50th anniversary of the Faculty, this paper is a reflection on the origins of the program and how it may have changed over time. Relying on the Queen's University archives, a vivid understanding of the education program's inception and growth can be explored. By using a historical analysis of this era along with my own personal perspective of education at Duncan McArthur today, I uncover the intentions, growth, and criticisms of the Queen's teacher education program in Ontario's historical context. In this paper I will explain the progressive foundation of the B. Ed. program and how the early courses and ethical concerns were mediated. Once the historical foundation of the school is outlined, I make suggestions for where the B. Ed. program should head for the next fifty years.*

Keywords: history of education, ethical education, progressive education

Introduction

The history of Queen's Faculty of Education can be traced to an early provincial attempt to establish teachers' colleges within the university system to alleviate the growing need for instructors in Ontario schools during the first decade of the 20th century (Bruno-Jofré, & Cole, 2014). In 1920, "the Department of Education reorganized teacher education in the province and centralized study at the Ontario College of Education in Toronto. The Faculty in Kingston was closed for nearly half a century" (Christou & Sears, 2011, p. 42). The closure of the teachers' program at Queen's University was due to a number of political and economic struggles. Moreover, once the Faculty opened again in 1968, Duncan

McDowall, the official historian of Queen's University, (2016) remarked on the need for a space to house the program, noting that "the first forty students finally arrived that September and found themselves shoehorned into an old house off the main campus with lectures in borrowed halls" (p. 130). These authors have displayed various parts of the Queen's University Faculty of Education's history and development by highlighting the roots of the institution, its early structure, and key changes that were made to accommodate diversity, Indigeneity, and varied research goals.

This paper expands on the work of earlier scholars by bringing the perspective of an educational history doctoral student on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the faculty to provide more context and analysis of the development of the Faculty, a perspective that has long been absent. As Christou and Sears (2011), found, "our students' experiences in school provide rich opportunities to illustrate recent trends in the history of education, and we argue that it is essential to begin instruction of historical subjects by asking students to tell their own stories" (p. 50). By integrating my own student perspective, I show how understandings of the Queen's Faculty of Education have been informed by various historians who revealed different dimensions its educational foundations (Bruno-Jofré & Cole, 2014; Christou & Sears, 2011 & McDowall, 2016). Particularly, this study focuses on the archival record generated at Queen's University Archives and a handful of key program developments which continue to impact education students in 2018. These include the personal correspondence of Dean Vernon Ready, program reports, and senate files considering the Faculty of Education.

Literature Review

One work that features the Queen's Faculty of Education and the political, social and economic contexts surrounding education in the early and mid 20th century is Bruno-Jofré's and Cole's (2014) study "To Serve and Yet Be Free: Historical Configurations and the Insertions of Faculties of Education in Ontario." Bruno-Jofré and Cole argue that the 1968 founding of the Queen's Faculty of Education needs to be understood as part of a "complex reorganization of the educational system, itself a reaction of reformulated postwar socioeconomic aims (p. 88)." They further explain that socioeconomics of the 1960s were a period of massive economic expansion that doubled the number of schools in Ontario (Bruno-Jofré & Cole, 2014). Subsequently, this led to a large demand for newly trained teachers and, according to the Macleod report of 1964, a desire to "modernize teacher education after the second world war...[as] they asserted that teacher preparation in Ontario was out of step with larger social, cultural and economic changes (Bruno-Jofré & Cole, 2014, p. 86). This change placed all teachers' education within the university

system and provided academic content towards the subject that aspiring teachers would eventually teach (Bruno-Jofré & Cole, 2014).

Another article which looks at the original founding of the Queen's Faculty of Education and its redevelopment in 1968, is Christou's and Sears' (2011) article "From Neglect to Nexus: Examining the Place of Educational History in Teacher Education" which utilizes a case study approach to examine the history courses of Queen's University to make conclusions about the decline of history as a foundational course in teacher education programs. Christou and Sears argue that neglecting history as a foundational course in the Queen's Faculty of Education was a slow and unintentional process, but one that has gradually occurred in teacher education programs, leading to a crisis in foundations of education. They contend that the humanities, particularly history, were marginalized as a result of focusing too closely on the social and technological realities of the contemporary society during the first progressive wave of teacher education. Christou and Sears argue that the historical foundation course should be re-envisioned to help teachers understand how their own beliefs fit into professional knowledge that is constantly recycled thereby acting as a "nexus" for their own development. This work will also serve as my historical framework as I attempt to understand my personal nexus of historical development that has been recycled through the Queen's Faculty of Education over the last fifty years.

The third work informing my research is Duncan McDowall's (2016) official history of the university entitled "Queen's University, Volume III, 1961-2004, Testing Tradition." McDowall demonstrates the challenges of establishing the Queen's Faculty of Education and provides further insights into the administration's role to help round out my exploration of the Queen's Faculty of Education's historical developments. Testing Tradition is also a fitting name for what occurred in this era, particularly as it concerned education and the teaching of teachers in the late 1960s. McDowall provides ample context to understanding the early direction of the Faculty and states that "the \$6.5 million education college was to be named Duncan McArthur, a Queen's history professor who had left Kingston in the 1930s to become a highly regarded deputy-minister of education in the provincial government" (McDowall, 2016, p. 143). The Faculty would open for some classes early summer classes in 1967 but officially offered the new Bachelor of Education (B. Ed.) program in the fall of 1968 (McDowall, 2016). This program would provide more room for the field to professionalize as the Ontario government pushed to educate the new wave of baby boomers to obtain an undergraduate degree before becoming a teacher (Gidney, 1999).

The Influence of the Hall-Dennis Report and Historical Contexts of the 1960s

The 1960s brought unheralded economic expansion for the province of Ontario which was translated into a significant increase in educational spending. Between 1950 to 1971 the number of teachers hired by the ministry of education increased from 25,000 to 93,000, primarily fueled by the demand of education for the baby boom (Paikin, 2016). Furthering this economic prosperity was a stable provincial government that was interested in expanding the primary, secondary, and temporary educational systems in Ontario. The Progressive Conservatives enjoyed a massive amount of success in the years between of 1943 and 1985, earning the nickname of “The Great Blue Machine” (Paikin, 2016; Gidney 1999). John Robarts was elected in 1963 earning the Progressive Conservatives their seventh straight majority government. He appointed William Davis as Minister of Education who would later take over in the provincial leadership role in 1971 until 1985 (Paikin, 2016; Gidney, 1999). Moreover, Davis’s favourable views towards education led to the incorporation of the “Living and Learning” document by the Provincial Committee of Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario or its commonly referred to moniker, the Hall-Dennis Report, which recommended significant changes to the education system.

The Hall-Dennis Report outlined that teachers would no longer be seen as experts in front of a captive audience but rather as facilitators of a modern learning process that would be flexible and student-centered. Paikin (2016), explains that “the Hall-Dennis Report was unlike anything that had preceded it... this was a report that eschewed typical bureaucratic language and attempted to make the case that the child should be at the centre of the educational experience. So rote, regimented learning was out, and the child’s individual needs and interests were in” (p. 55). TVO’s vice-president, principal and school superintendent, Dr. Karen Grose explained to Paikin (2016) that the report’s,

impact can be seen directly in the foundations of education today... we see a broader range of practise that reflects a more student-centered approach to learning, as well as practices that nurture health, well-being and the emotional needs of children in learning. We see the impact strong, positive relationships between home and school can have on student success. (p. 55)

The Queen’s Faculty of Education’s history is intimately tied with the origins of the Hall-Dennis Report which was published in the same year and recommended radical changes to Ontario’s education system. The report had also recommended serious changes to the mission of schools,

The underlying aim of education is to further man's unending search for truth. Once he possesses the means to truth, all else is within his grasp. Wisdom and

understanding, sensitivity, compassion, and responsibility, as well as intellectual honesty and personal integrity, will be his guides in adolescence and his companions in maturity. This is the message that must find its way into the minds and hearts of all Ontario's children. (Provincial Committee of Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, 1968, p. 5)

The Faculty of Education at Queen's enshrined these beliefs into their philosophy as they began educating teachers in 1968. The guiding principles of the Queen's Faculty of Education included the "supreme obligation to foster the intellectual outlook and to pursue with steadfastness and humility the search for goodness, beauty and truth" (Basic Principles for the College Programme, Faculty of Education, 1965, p. 3). Moreover, the first Dean, Vernon Ready demonstrated these student-centered principles when he wrote,

We feel that what is learned in a school or college may often be derived less from formal instruction than from the experience of living and working in the institutional environment. In addition, we are convinced that there is not one single curricular programme, which is equally suitable for all candidates, their backgrounds, their needs and their aspirations are so varied that to prescribe an identical course of study for all seems highly questionable. (Preliminary Announcement, First Regular Session, 1968, p. 2-3)

The Faculty was grounded in student-centered and individualized education that let scholars find their own truths about the world and their understanding of it, which was directly related to the themes of the Hall-Dennis Report. Thus, the report played a guiding role in the Faculty's early philosophy and yields perspectives onto the decisions of the early administration.

An analysis of the student publication, the *Queen's Journal*, also reveals the close connection between the Hall-Dennis Report and the early philosophy of Duncan McArthur Hall. Dean Vernon Ready provided an interview to the student run publication upon the opening of the Queen's Faculty of Education in 1968 in which he detailed the unique programs of Duncan McArthur Hall. First, Ready compared the school to the other faculties of education that were opened during this time including Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and Althouse College (Western University) stating that they were "much more prescriptive...[whereas] at McArthur, in almost every category there is a choice" (*Queen's Journal*, 1968, p. 6).

Moreover, he explained in an interview with the *Queen's Journal* that the only required course entitled "professional issues in contemporary education" would be partially led by "Lloyd A. Dennis, co-chairman of the commission which [produced the] Hall-Dennis Report on Ontario's education. The Report's philosophy is largely also that of

the college, Ready said" (*Queen's Journal*, 1968, p. 6). The first Dean of McArthur College adopted the progressive views of the Hall-Dennis Report and entrenched these principals as a requirement directly into the first curriculum for education students.

Ready further explained the progressive views that would be incorporated into teacher education during this period and, more importantly, into the educational, philosophical, and pedagogical direction that the Queen's Faculty of Education would embrace throughout its history. Ready was particularly adamant about recommendations for grading and assessing individual students. In the *Queen's Journal* (1968) interview, Ready said,

he strongly favours the "learning continuum which would abolish grades and stream in the schools. I really think we must group and regroup children. I don't think you can create homogenous classes. Certainly, the ungraded school is going to contribute to this kind of regrouping." (p.6)

Ready's focus on educational experience over assessments and grades was entrenched in his preliminary announcement about the curriculum at the foundation of the Queen's Faculty of Education's first regular session in 1968. He stated,

where teacher performance is gauged not by marks but by such factors as dedication, effectiveness, creativity and interpersonal relations. The object is not to make the work easier or the professional discipline less demanding, but rather to redirect motivation from the secondary consideration of meeting external requirements to the primary task of meaningful achievement. Experience has demonstrated that, when student teachers are relieved of the obsession with final grades, they do, in fact, apply themselves diligently to the real goals of education (Preliminary Announcement for the First Regular Session at the McArthur College of Education, 1968, p. 4).

The influence of the Hall-Dennis Report on the early direction and philosophy as enacted by Dean Vernon Ready highlights how the Faculty of Education at Queen's was receptive to the progressive ideas that were beginning to dominate educational circles in 1968 as the report went on to sell 60,000 copies (Gidney, 1999).

Other similar structures, programs, and curriculum content in the Queen's Faculty of Education were adjusted to incorporate the child-centred philosophy developed by the Hall-Dennis Committee and were increasingly refined at the Queen's Faculty of Education during the Ready's tenure as Dean until his retirement in 1976. The resulting changes laid a solid foundation upon which the Faculty of Education grew, but also left out significant areas such as Indigenous and cultural teachings that required the attention of subsequent administrations.

A central argument of the Hall-Dennis Report was that

there is increasing evidence that the infant years are exceedingly important for establishing the foundation for future emotional, social, and intellectual growth. Bowlby, in his monumental *Infant Care and Maternal Deprivation*, and René Spitz's work on grief in infants, followed by more than two decades of additional research, have demonstrated the intimate relationship between the growing infant and those who provide the world of early learning experience for him. (Provincial Committee of Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, 1968, p. 50)

Specifically, the report found that “[t]alking with children, playing games with children, providing stimulating and diversified learning experiences in the home- all of these [were] important platforms for learning” (Provincial Committee of Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, 1968, p. 50). Ready quickly adopted these principles by establishing an Early Childhood Educators evening course at the Queen’s Faculty of Education in which he sought to achieve those aims in educating the youngest students that were flooding Ontario’s schools (Early Childhood Program, 1967-68). The course officially started in the summer before the final report was published and the opening of the college itself, and reflects the progressive movement towards focusing on individual child needs regardless of their age. In addition, the course remained as a regular offering in the summer months after the Hall-Dennis Report was published, reinforcing Dean Ready’s philosophy of early education.

The new program would be taught by Dr. J. H. Read, head of the Department of Preventive Medicine and Child Health program at Queen’s, and would consist of two-hour lectures on various topics with a host of guest lecturers. These classes included “child development, social and emotional development, some factors influencing physical and behavioural development, developmental problems, speech and language development, and patterns of physical growth” (Early Childhood Program, 1967-68, p. 1). Similar to the recommendations of the Hall-Dennis Report, which valued experiences over grades, the class would have six observation periods over a period of two to three hours each in order to see pre-school classrooms in action. These classes were structured around newer understandings of learning that were being presented in the 1960s by a host of pediatric psychologists including *The Well Child’s Problems* and *Baby and Child Care* (Early Childhood Program, 1967-68). The Hall-Dennis Report noted that

Psychologists have learned that the greater the variety of situations to which a child must accommodate his behavior, the more differentiated and mobile he becomes...[cautioning] Many of the stimulating experiences for such children have failed to take place at the strategic critical points in their development, and

although some of these sequences may be irreversible in their entirety, a thorough understanding of child development from infancy may point the way to reversing a sequence under artificially controlled conditions, so that the earlier stage of development may be simulated, and more complex cognitive patterns linked to it. Such is the basis of much remedial work. (Provincial Committee of Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, 1968, p. 25)

Ensuring that the Faculty could provide students with these opportunities was clearly the intention of the first Early Childhood program developed at Duncan McArthur Hall, which was intimately linked to the 1968 context and progressive new views on early childhood student development.

Upon examination of the lectures that were provided in the first Early Childhood Education program at Duncan McArthur Hall, I found that there was a significant interest in utilizing children's play for learning in the 1968 syllabus. Four of the nine lectures, provided teachers with the opportunity to focus on "the function of play in the life of a young child" (Early Childhood Program, 1967-68, p. 3). This included; "play as a means to learn, to explore, to work out life experiences, act out anxieties, to socialize" (Early Childhood Program, 1967-68, p. 3). Teachers were taught about the different types of play children experience including "solitary, parallel, social or cooperative" and how to plan the school environment for play including designated areas within and outside the school. Moreover, teachers were told to engage with the "play impulse" to create effective stimulations within the environment, peer groups, and teachers to help facilitate the most productive forms of learning.

The assignments required for instructors enrolled in this course included: "designing a feeling board, observing one particular child and his or her behaviour, planning a playground, one essay, and a book report on Katherine Read's (1966) *Let's Play Outdoors*" (Early Childhood Program, 1967-68, p. 4). The Hall-Dennis Report was also highly influenced by the movement towards play-based learning and enshrined these beliefs into the final report,

Children need to play. Despite the belief held by many adults that learning must be painful and serious, it is the joy and pleasure of play which often sets the stage for learning. Play provides a psychological safety zone in which children can test their competence with out fear of failure. It is out of play that children develop rules of a game and a sense of order. Work and play areas are so closely interwoven in learning situations that it is often impossible to separate one from the other, and teachers aware of the learning process should not feel guilty about the fun and noisy atmosphere that may be engendered. There is nothing sinful about laughter, and

serious, silent rooms are not necessarily working chambers for teaching. (Provincial Committee of Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, 1968, p. 44)

The early philosophies that dictated the programs at the Queen's Faculty of Education regarding the way children learn offered new and exciting opportunities that were reinforced by the provincial committee's review of education. The play philosophy of the Hall-Dennis Report was intrinsically linked with the context of the late 1960s which also led to the founding of the Faculty and its early educational efforts.

Foundation of Educational Research Ethics

As discussed above, a renewed emphasis on child-centered and individualized learning defined the origins of the Queen's Faculty of Education. This approach was implemented throughout the course content but also influenced the early decision to implement new ethical procedures long before the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) mandated reviews on research involving human participants.

In the fall of 1968, within the first month of the Queen's Faculty of Education's opening, Ready, presented the University Senate Committee on Research Studies in Municipal Schools with a request for three projects that involved teacher candidates using local classrooms for research projects. The first involved assigning teacher candidate to the Kingston school system for "observation and practice teaching" (University Senate Committee on Research Studies in Municipal Schools, 1968, p. 1). The second project involved small groups of teacher candidates working in schools on activities such as the "coaching of school teams, tutoring and counselling students, supervisor of extracurricular activities" (University Senate Committee on Research Studies in Municipal Schools, 1968, p. 1). The third project involved research on the usefulness of a social studies kit on the Great Depression, which involved "one visit per school of approximately three hours duration (University Senate Committee on Research Studies in Municipal Schools, 1968, p. 1)." Although, there was not a formalized ethics process at the time, Ready ensured they had the support of the necessary school boards and officials so that teacher candidates could experience a breadth of different teaching opportunities. As these and other research projects underwent review and refinement, the Queen's Faculty of Education also reviewed their ethics approval process. A formalized ethics process was created in 1972, alongside the launch of the Master of Education program, which routinely conducted researched in local schools.

However, the optimism and enthusiasm for new ideas and processes of the 1960s was replaced with pessimism in the mid 1970s. The baby boom ended, the birth rate fell,

and (for the first time since the end of WWII) enrolment numbers in schools dropped (Gidney, 1999). The Queen's Faculty of Education had the space for 900 candidates but only 500 were accepted in the mid 1970s, as Ready feared many graduates would not secure teaching jobs (McDowall, 2016). In addition, a major recession hit and led to high inflation and unemployment in Ontario, which would decrease the available funding for education projects (Owram, 1996).

Of particular concern was the debate over whether B. Ed. Credits counted towards the funding scheme that the province of Ontario used for calculating payments to universities in this period. As McDowall (2016) eloquently describes,

Queen's found itself caught in the middle grounds in turf wars between the ministries of education and of university affairs in Toronto. 'We seem never to be out of the woods with regard to funding McArthur College, Ready dolefully confided....in 1971.' (p. 130)

Despite concerns, the idea to establish both a B. Ed. program and a strong education research graduate program was realized, as space and funding allowed for the creation of a Masters of Education program in the spring of 1971 with sixty part-time students. This program quickly expanded to 125 part-time and four full time students within the year. Faculty members also began supervising research projects within school boards (Report on M.Ed Program in Counselling, 1972 , p. 1). Together with new research expertise, the reinvigorated Faculty was committed to negotiating the healthy tension between educational theory and classroom practice, as emphasized by newly hired faculty members holding Masters and PhDs, while older faculty members had been hired solely with classroom experience (McDowall, 2016).

With the establishment of a, education graduate program, the Queen's Faculty of Education turned towards fulfilling ethical considerations that were informed by the changing context of the early 1970s. The Hall-Dennis Report (1968) noted the change occurring within school contexts, stating that "new forms of mental and physical stress, changing codes of ethics, and new advances of leisure time have placed new responsibilities on the school" (p. 24). These responsibilities were interpreted by the Queen's Faculty of Education as requiring an established ethical process if graduate students wanted to conduct research on other learners.

In 1972, a request from Professor Jane Gaskell, who would serve as the Dean of OISE later in her career, for formal ethics approval began, as she started research with the Frontenac County Board of Education (Queen's 50th Commemorative Book, 2018). The coordinator of Graduate Studies, D.H. Crawford, sent a letter to Ready stating that he had a number of requests for research into school boards and that he felt that "the time ha[d]

come when we should re-examine the relationships between the university (at least as represented by our Faculty) and the use of county educational facilities, particularly to use of students, for research projects" (Letter from D.H. Crawford to Vernon Ready, 1972). As most student research was conducted within the local Frontenac School Board, a special memorandum regarding the "screening for projects originating within Queen's university which request for the use of resources and/or personnel of the Frontenac country system for purposes of research" was sent to the University Senate with a preliminary ethical outline for obtaining approval to work in the board (Memorandum from the Senate Committee to Screen Questionnaires, 1972).

The early form required all researchers to file an appropriate request form which would provide the department head, with the "nature of the investigation, amount of school personnel time involved, the amount of student time involved, the nature of instruments to be used (enclose a sample if possible) as well as a statement by the investigator of the advantages he sees in his study for the school system or the advancement of knowledge per se" (Memorandum from the Senate Committee to Screen Questionnaires, 1972, p. 1). The Director of Education at the Frontenac School Board, J.B Slack, could also approved small research proposals and projects which would only use limited school resources (Letter from J.B Slack to Departmental Assistant, 1972). The Senate requested that the new committee be called the "Ethics Review Board" and consist of "two persons from the same department (but not involved in the research, and one from a different department.... In addition, the Dean of the Faculty of Education shall sit on all such review committees" (Letter from Mr. J. Hogarth to Margaret Hooey, 1972). The Queen's Faculty of Education strengthened the graduate program and relationship with local boards, paving the way for future investigations into a variety of topics by mandating individual researchers to pursue ethical educational research. Moreover, the Queen's Faculty of Education realized the impacts educational research could have on individual student needs and altered their course of exploration to fit the changing circumstances of this period.

The development of a formal ethics process must also be understood within the larger ethical research discussions of the early 1970s that were just beginning to be addressed at the post-secondary level due to several controversial experiments. It would be another four years before the Belmont Report in the United States articulated a guide for ethical research in the wake of the Tuskegee syphilis experiment. It was not until 1978, when SSHRC and the Medical Research Council of Canada issued ethical guidelines based on the Belmont Report which was written two years earlier (Nichols, 2015). Although SSHRC was only a year old at that time, ethical reviews were not a legal requirement. That

same year, a memo from the Coordinator of the Graduate Department reminded the education department that,

ethical obligations in conducting research also apply to B.Ed and M.Ed students completing course assignments in the schools. When the student is not acting as a teacher in a school system, then it would be very important for the role of the student to be made clear to any participants, to gain the consent of parents, for students who are invited to participate in course related exercises or activities and to allow the usual provisions of opting out of the activity and so on. (Memorandum from Dr. R. J. Wilson to Department of Education, 1978, p.1)

Clearly by 1978, the department was fully on board with ethical reviews, even starting their own semi-formal ethical processes with local school boards six years earlier than the department of Graduate Studies at Queen's University mandated. In this way, as in so many others, the Queen's Faculty of Education continued to establish its role as a progressive leader in educational reform in the province.

Criticism of the Hall-Dennis Report

There were several critics of the Hall-Dennis Report and their perspectives need to be explained to contrast the highly utopian imagery and writing of this period. The beliefs of the Hall-Dennis Report were not seamless and one of largest critics against the recommendations at the time, was Dr. James Daly, a McMaster University history professor. In 1969, Daly published the book, *Education or Molasses: A Critical look at the Hall-Dennis Report* which became a large commercial success. The first page included a scathing review of the Hall-Dennis Report as "an assault on civilization as we know it" (Daly, 1969, p. 1). Daly dismissed the Report as being "a bucket of molasses, sticky sentiment couched in wretched prose" (Daly, 1969, p. 1). Two recommendations lambasted by Daly included the establishment of an ungraded, exam-less system of continuous progress without failure and the proposed new curriculum organized around general areas of learning without any consideration of university structure (Daly, 1969). These views of the report conflicted with the enthusiasm demonstrated by Ready and educators at Queen's University. Some of Daly's comments about the focus of schools were further refined by educational historians to make a larger critique of the report and its effect on education, society, and universities.

Bruno-Jofré and Hill (2011), who have both taught historical foundations at the Queen's Faculty of Education, examined the official reports of the department of education in the 1960s and 1990s and argue that, the version of multiculturalism enacted by members of the Hall-Dennis Committee was inherently flawed. Bruno-Jofré and Skip state that the Hall-Dennis Report pushed all multicultural attempts through the binational version of

Canada, thereby leaving out the “distinctiveness of the needs of different groups in society, for instance, women of colour, aboriginal peoples, and so on” (p. 342). The Queen’s Faculty of Education’s devotion to the Hall-Dennis Report would allow minority groups to be restricted in finding their own individualized education until the early 1990s.

In 1991, the Aboriginal Teachers Education Program (ATEP) was established, and various international projects that extended the opportunities of educational research to other groups began to emerge. Although not perfect in their early attempts at creating equal opportunities for all students, especially in the fields of diversity and Indigenous studies, the early philosophy laid the groundwork for ethical educational research and experimentation within the Queen’s Faculty of Education.

While the Hall-Dennis Report provided a foundation that gave teachers the ability to have individualized and student-centered experiences, these were typically shaped around the dominant Eurocentric ideologies that were embedded in Canadian society at the time. Despite these significant criticisms, the development of the Queen’s Faculty of Education was a product of the 1960s and was therefore, not perfect in creating a system of equity for all teacher candidates. However, as the Canadian population grew and began more diverse, these challenges were quickly remedied because of the ethical and individualized foundation that began in 1968. The ATEP program for example, began five years before the last Residential School would close in Canada and the same amount of time before the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples firmly established significant issues with Indigenous schooling (Truth and Reconciliation, 2015). The Queen’s Faculty of Education’s ability to be reflective and responsive to challenges in the educational sphere has perhaps been the greatest asset in the education of future teachers.

Conclusion

The foundation of the Queen’s Faculty of Education was built around the ethos of the Hall-Dennis Report which called for individualized and student-centered learning. This philosophy was taken up by early educators at the faculty and has continued to play a role in influencing its character. The historians referenced in this work have influenced me—as a current doctoral student in the Faculty of Education—as I revised and individualized the interpretations of the foundation of this school from my current experience in 2018. This group of scholars have supervised, taught, or advised various interpretations of the Queen’s Faculty of Education’s past and helped me more easily find my truth regarding the history of Duncan McArthur Hall. By tapping into my own strengths and background knowledge regarding the Hall-Dennis Report to create a student-centered research project, I have shown that the individualized atmosphere that served as the foundation for the Queen’s Faculty of Education is clearly still pursued here.

The same year that the Queen's Faculty of Education opened its doors and the Hall-Dennis Report was published, educational historian Herbert Kliebard (1968) made a poignant comment regarding the field of education. He wrote,

This inability to see our field in perspective also results in our tendency to repeat the rallying cries and slogans that had their origins in a different intellectual climate and a different social milieu as if they had an immediacy that they no longer possess. (p. 69)

As educators, we must be able to see our past philosophies, decisions, and foundations as linked to the past but also how they are conducted in much different social contexts today. The context of the late 1960s and early 1970s was a period of extraordinary growth and experimentation in the field of education and we can learn how those early decisions still influence the practice of teaching in the province. This sentiment aligns with Queen's University Latin motto, "sapientia et doctrina stabilitas" which translates to "wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability of thy times". The motto is especially poignant in this context, as it does not refer to which wisdom, or knowledge, or truth was most essential but understood the power in learning for the sake of our current time. Perhaps further historical research will determine which wisdom or knowledge was useful for particular teachers in the form of a social history which focuses on the oral histories of earlier classes. This can reveal how the ideas of the administration filter down into the classroom experience of teacher candidates, thereby influencing classrooms around the province.

The Queen's Faculty of Education was significantly influenced by the Hall-Dennis Report as it laid a foundation for the future educational programs and research by allowing learning to be more broadly conceived. However, it was not perfect. Issues surrounding diversity were slowly remedied by other educational leaders, which led to a stronger faculty as a whole. As Christou (2018) wrote to the Queen's Gazette after the Celebration of Faculty Activity, "our Faculty of Education has a strong research culture. Our faculty members are involved in diverse projects involving educational stakeholders at local, national, and international levels" (Communications Staff, 2018). This sentiment echoes Ready's comments who in 1965, recommend that "patterns and procedure will therefore be suggestive not prescriptive. Our members will search co-operatively for a diversity of creative solutions" (Basic Principles for the College Program, 1965, p. 3.)

The Queen's Faculty of Education has fostered individualized learning within a community of scholars who are seeking a variety of different educational truths. This belief in research has continued through fifty years of its history, as we educators and educational researchers continue to attempt to provide the most child-centered, ethical, and useful education for education students in our contemporary society.

References

Primary sources

Queen's Journal, Queen's University Archives, September 1968, Vol 96.

Communication Staff. (2018, February 28). Celebrating a 'strong research culture'. *Queen's Gazette*. <https://www.queensu.ca/gazette/stories/celebrating-strong-research-culture>

1185.1 Faculty of Education, Box 1. "Basic Principals for the College Programe, Faculty of Education 1965-1970". Queen's University Archives.

1185.1 Faculty of Education, Box 1 "Report on M.Ed. Program in Counselling," 1972. Queen's University Archives.

1185.1 Faculty of Education, Box 1, "Preliminary Announcement, First Regular Session at McArthur College of Education, September 1968." Queen's University Archives.

1185.3 Faculty of Education, Box 2. "Early Childhood Education Course, 1967-68,-1989" Queen's University Archives.

1185.3 Faculty of Education, Box 1, file 3. "Letter D.H. Crawford to Vernon Ready, October 11, 1972", Queen's University Archives.

1185.3 Faculty of Education, Box 1, file3 "Letter from Mr. J.B Slack to Department Assistant," March 27, 1972. Queen's University Archives.

1185.3 Faculty of Education, Box 1, file3 "Letter Mr. J. Hogarth to Margaret Hooey," October 31st, 1972. Queen's University Archives.

1185.3 Faculty of Education, Box 1, file3. "Memorandum from Dr. R. J. Wilson, 1978 to Department of Education." April 20, 1978. Queen's University Archives.

1185.3 Faculty of Education, Box 2. "University Senate Committee on Research Studies in Municipal Schools", October 21, 1968. Queen's University Archives.

Provincial Committee of Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario. (1968). *Living and Learning: The Report of the Provincial Committee on the Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario*. Toronto: Ontario Department of Education.

Queen's University Mottos. (n.d.) Accessed June 4, 2018. Retrived from: <http://www.queensu.ca/encyclopedia/m/mottos>.

Secondary Sources:

- Bruno-Jofré Rosa and George (Skip) Hills. (2011). "Changing visions of excellence in Ontario school policy: the cases of living and learning and for the love of learning." *Educational Theory* 61, no. 3 (2011): 335-349.
- Bruno-Jofré, R & Cole, J. (2014). To serve and yet be free: historical configurations and the insertions of faculties of education in ontario. In Bruno-Jofré, R& Johnston J. (Eds.), *Teacher Education in a Transnational World* (pp. 71-95). Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/j.ctt1287q56.7>
- Christou, T. M., & Sears, A. (2011). From neglect to nexus: Examining the place of educational history in teacher education. *Encounters on Education*, 12, 37-57. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest.com.proxy.queensu.ca/docview/1367581990?accountid=6180>
- Gidney, R. D. (1999). *From Hope to Harris: The reshaping of Ontario's schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Nichols, J. (2015). The Canadian model: A protentional solution to institutional review board overreach. *Journal of Academic Freedom* 6, 1-13.
- Owram, D. (1996). *Born at the right time: A history of the baby boom generation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Paikin,S. (2016). *Bill Davis: Nation Builder, and Not So Bland After All*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- Truth and Reconciliation Canada. (2015a). *What we have learned: principles of truth and reconciliation*. Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.