THE STATE AND THE CURRICULUM: QUESTIONS AND OPTIONS FOR QUÉBEC

NORMAN HENCHEY *McGill University*

ABSTRACT. What is the role of educators, scholars, cultural and business leaders, parents, and the learners in curriculum development? Who "owns" the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools in Québec? And what is the proper role of the government? Curriculum is more than a set of documents, approved textbooks, or official examinations. It is the script for a dialogue between a society and its young people, a narrative about what we think is important. Over the last half century, there have been four major models of curriculum organization in Québec: (1) prior to the 1960s, divided and centralized Catholic and Protestant structures, with authority largely outside the government; (2) the reforms of the 1960s, with direct centralized government control over policy but decentralized procedures; (3) a tightening up of control over both policy and procedures in the late 1970s, part of a general back-to-basics movement; (4) the current reforms beginning in the late 1990s, with government-directed approaches to organization, competencies and evaluation. These different reforms have exhibited a number of relatively stable characteristics: periodic rather than continuing reform, dominant role of the MEQ (now Ministry of Education, Leisure and Sport [MELS]), initial consultation on broad questions and an unclear relationship with subsequent policy decisions, extensive documentation, managerial and technical approach to curriculum, limited academic and professional influence on final decisions, stress on a single coherent system for all schools, and little emphasis on research, curriculum practices elsewhere and information technologies. At the present time, curriculum planners in Québec are facing a number of dilemmas, especially quality of standards and equality of access, centralization and adaptability, and different views about the relative roles of the public, the government and the teaching profession. For the future of Québec curriculum, a number of scenarios are worth considering: continuing the dominant role of the MELS putting all curriculum on-line, outsourcing curriculum development, forming partnerships with various education bodies, giving more authority to the education profession, accrediting schools, and creating a separate curriculum council to coordinate research and development.

Norman Henchey

L'ÉTAT ET LE CURRICULUM. QUESTIONS ET OPTIONS POUR LE QUÉBEC

RÉSUMÉ. Quel est le rôle des enseignants, des universitaires, des acteurs du domaine culturel et du monde des affaires et des apprenants dans la conception du curriculum ? Qui est le « détenteur du titre de propriété » pour le curriculum au niveau primaire et secondaire au Québec ? Quel est le juste rôle du gouvernement ? Le curriculum est bien plus qu'un ensemble de documents, de manuels scolaires approuvés et d'examens de fin d'année. Il s'agit d'un scénario pour la création d'un dialogue entre la société et la jeunesse, un récit à propos de ce que nous considérons important. Depuis la dernière moitié du siècle dernier, il y a eu quatre principaux modèles d'organisation du curriculum au Québec : 1- celui d'avant 1960 divisés en secteur catholique et protestant avec des structures centralisées; 2-les réformes des années 1960 avec un contrôle gouvernemental centralisé quant aux politiques mais avec des procédures décentralisées; 3- une prise en charge plus serrée sur les politiques et les procédures durant les années 1970 qui s'inscrivait dans un mouvement du retour à l'essentiel; 4-les réformes actuelles qui ont débutées à la fin des années 1990 avec des approches gouvernementales dirigistes à l'endroit de l'organisation, des compétences et de l'évaluation. Ces différentes réformes ont démontré plusieurs caractéristiques récurrentes : les réformes sont ponctuelles plutôt que continuelles, le rôle central du ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport (MELS); des consultations initiales à propos de questions très vastes et des liens plus ou moins clairs avec les grandes orientations décisionnelles; une documentation abondante; une approche gestionnaire et technique du curriculum; une influence limitée de la part des universitaires et des professionnels quant aux décisions finales; un accent important sur un seul système cohérent pour toutes les écoles et finalement peu d'importance accordée à la recherche, aux pratiques curriculaires hors-Québec et aux technologies de l'information. À l'heure actuelle, les concepteurs de curriculum au Québec font face à plusieurs dilemmes, plus particulièrement en ce qui concerne la qualité des standards et un accès équitable; la centralisation et l'adaptabilité et finalement différentes visions quant aux rôles du public, du gouvernement et de la profession enseignante. Pour l'avenir du curriculum au Québec, certains scénarios valent la peine d'être considérés : Poursuivre le rôle dominant du MELS; mettre tous les curriculums en ligne, ouvrir à la compétition le développement curriculaire; établir des partenariats avec plusieurs entités éducatives; donner plus d'autorité à la profession enseignante; accréditer les écoles et créer un conseil curriculaire autonome qui coordonne la recherche et le développement.

An education system has many aspects – policy, management, resource allocation, quality control, teacher certification – but none is more important than curriculum. What should students learn? How should we organize what they are learning? How well are they learning? How do we know the answers to these questions?

The various waves of educational reform which have taken place in Québec over the last half century have profoundly changed all aspects of education: philosophy, priorities, school board organization, the teaching profession, and the culture of institutions. But few issues have been the subject of such regular periodic reform as the curriculum of Québec's elementary and secondary schools.

Over the years, curriculum reformers in Québec have tried to engage a number of major questions, as have policy makers in other educational jurisdictions.

• What is the influence of curriculum policies like pass standards, program variations and teaching methods on school retention and completion rates?

• How should elementary schools adapt programs and procedures to serve children with special needs or abilities, by separating them in special streams or by integrating them in community schools and regular classrooms?

• How should curriculum be organized in secondary schools – in distinct programs (academic, vocational, general), streams according to ability (advanced, regular, basic), core and elective courses, interdisciplinary studies?

• How much curriculum choice should students be given at different age levels?

• How can academic and vocational courses be linked and should the latter be offered in regular comprehensive high schools or in specialized institutions?

• Should some public schools specialize in certain subjects (like mathematics and science, fine arts, sports) or serve a particular clientele (like high achievers, students at risk of dropping out, students with behaviour problems, students who are academically inclined and proficient)?

• How can we improve the quality of core areas like the language of instruction and second languages, both French and English, and what levels of attainment should we expect?

• How much formal testing is appropriate and what kinds of testing should be used? How do testing policies and practices shape curriculum? Can there be too much testing?

• What importance should be given to the different bases of evaluation: development or progress of the individual, standing in a group (norm referenced), or mastery of a body of content or skill (criterion referenced)?

• How much attention should we pay to Canadian and international comparisons of achievement (like SAEP and OECD indicators) and school rankings (based on pass rates and average marks in government examinations)? Are these good indicators of curriculum quality and effectiveness?

• What is the clearest and most informative way of reporting achievement to students and parents (percentages, letters, rankings, protocols or anecdotal information)? Why is there so much confusion and anxiety about marking and reporting systems?

• What are the advantages and disadvantages of using communications technologies, especially computers and the Internet? Are they more effective for some kinds of learning and for certain kinds of learners than for others?

• What should be the place of different program areas that are not always given priority, like physical fitness, artistic development, spirituality, ethical behaviour, career preparation, environmental concerns, practical experiences in the community and knowledge of other cultures and societies?

• Should religious education have a place in the public schools of a pluralistic society? What about education *about* religion?

• Are our curriculum materials and instructional approaches provoking, inspiring and empowering learners? And teachers? And parents?

• Should certain subjects (once Latin, now advanced mathematics) be used as sorting devices to determine who should go on to selective programs and further studies?

• Should alternative approaches to curriculum and schooling (e-learning, self-directed learning programs, projects, practical experiences outside the school) be encouraged to meet the diversity of learner needs and expectations?

• What is the relative importance of learning products (like information) and learning processes (like thinking skills, creativity, curiosity)?

• How can we balance *equality* of opportunity with *quality* of achievement, or must one be subordinated to the other?

These issues imply other questions: Who should be involved in exploring these issues and making decisions about curriculum? What is the role of the teaching profession, academic scholars, cultural leaders, administrators, parents, the community, special interest groups, and – even – the learners themselves? Who "owns" the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools in Québec? And, above all, what is the proper role of the government – the politicians and the civil servants of the Ministry of Education, Leisusre and Sport (MELS) – who are responsible for the quality of public education?

LEARNING AND CURRICULUM

Curriculum is more than a body of legislation, a *régime pédagogique*, a set of documents with exhortations, tables, diagrams and lists, a compilation of approved textbooks and learning materials, or a series of official examina-

tions. It is the script for a dialogue between a society and its young people, a narrative about what we think is important, an idealization of what is significant in our past, a selection of what we know and believe in the present, and a vision of what we would wish for the future.

If we want to look at what is important in our curriculum we need to look at what is *explicit* – the content of official documents, approved textbooks, examinations – and what is *implicit* – the organization of learning, the culture of the schools, the roles and behaviour of administrators, teachers and students, what is considered important and less important, and the relationships among all these elements.

There are, in addition, four levels of curriculum: the *intended* curriculum of policy documents and official statements of aims and priorities; the *planned* curriculum of organization, management, schedules, collective agreements, assignments of teachers, content of textbooks and testing; the *taught* curriculum of what teachers really do in their interactions with learners in the classroom and beyond, what they test and how they test it; and the *learned* curriculum of the skills, knowledge and values that students actually acquire as a result of their exposure to our education system, their use of language, social conscience, sense of identity, aspirations and general understanding of the world.

We would like to believe that there are some links among these four levels – that young people actually learn what we intend them to learn – but we should not be naïve about this.

CURRENT CHALLENGES IN CURRICULUM

Learning and curriculum are much more complex today than they were in the 1960s when Québec's current education system was established. Our changing society and economy, and the world of which they are part, have raised expectations for learning, placed new emphasis on some kinds of learning, and provided new opportunities and means for making learning more accessible and effective.

Young people who were in our schools in the decade of the Parent Report have had to meet important new challenges over the years as citizens, consumers, workers and parents, dealing with sometimes fragile and unstable careers, the growing importance of knowledge, social diversity in values, and powerful new technologies of information and communication. Young people in our schools today, in the early years of the 21st Century and after the start of the current curriculum reforms, will soon be facing no less important challenges of security, global competition, environmental threats, cultural change and alternatives, the decline of traditional systems of meaning, new kinds of institutional relationships, and new ways of "learning a living" and of "having a life."[1]

It is within this landscape that we need to situate the basic questions of the Québec curriculum: What should be the role of the Ministry of Education regarding the curriculum of schools? What innovation is possible when governance is centralized? What kinds of decisions are involved in developing, managing and reforming a curriculum for schools? What groups should be involved in these decisions?

Curriculum decisions need to be made in relation to a number of issues: basic policy (assumptions, priorities), design (research, study of best practices), content (fundamental knowledge, skills, values, methods), implementation (procedures for introducing, preparing and adjusting new programs), management (planning, supervision), evaluation (appraisal of quality and effectiveness, adequacy of resources), and innovation (trial of new programs and approaches).

There are different groups who may participate in these decisions about curriculum. These groups include politicians, civil servants, business groups, professional associations of administrators and teachers, single-issue groups, post-secondary institutions, scholars and researchers, the media, producers of learning materials, school boards, school-level groups (such as administrators, teachers, and governing boards), students (the persons who are, after all, the consumers of curriculum), parent representatives, as well as local community groups and the interested public. Involvement may mean decision-making, consultation, technical assistance, expert advice, practical feedback, critical analysis or the production of curriculum policies, guidelines or materials.

All of this reminds us that, in a modern education system, the curriculum process involves many different kinds of activities and many different participants, other than officials of a Ministry of Education.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN QUÉBEC

Over the past half-century, Québec has seen four different models of curriculum decision-making. Prior to the mid-1960s, it had a traditional system with centralized non-government control; there were in reality two systems, one for Catholic education and one for Protestant education, with centralized control within each system, under the authority of a Catholic Committee and a Protestant Committee. The influences shaping curriculum were religious, traditional and conservative, and the role of the state was quite limited.[2]

A second model was developed in the 1960s and 1970s, the era of the Quiet Revolution, the Parent Report and the major education reforms which followed from its recommendations. In curriculum, these reforms saw centralized government control at the level of policy and evaluation and a decentralized structure of decisions about content. The government role was as designer and leader of comprehensive curriculum reform, illustrated

in *Regulation Number One*, extensive professional development for teachers, and loose program guidelines for elementary and secondary schools. This was the era of progressive attitudes to curriculum, student-centred learning, activist methods, experimentation, core and elective courses in secondary schools, empowerment of teachers and new kinds of courses.[3]

The third model of curriculum reform emerged in the late 1970s and the 1980s: this involved increasingly centralized government control, the establishment of *régimes pédagogiques* following widespread consultation (Green Paper), policy documents (Orange Paper), working groups, regulations and detailed program materials. This model was imbued with the spirit of the back-to-basics movements taking place in the United States and elsewhere in Canada, with a stress on literacy and mathematics, and a trend to centralized curriculum structures for all schools.[4]

The most recent wave of reform has been taking place between the mid-1990s and the early years of this century, inspired by the slogan "Success for All." This followed the traditional Québec model of centralized government control emerging from consultations, this time in an Estates General on Education, and a series of complex curriculum working documents. In many ways this was the most thorough curriculum reform since that of the 1960s and 1970s. It included the introduction of new kinds of integrated cycles in elementary and secondary school, a curriculum structure based on a large number of what were called "competencies," a set of cross-curricular themes like technology, intellectual skills and social competencies, greater school responsibility for results, and a new approach to the evaluation and reporting of learning.[5] This reform has been proceeding through the elementary schools and is now meeting increasing resistance, especially related to the proposals for evaluation and reporting as well as the implications for secondary school programs and certification.

Despite differences in approach and changing circumstances over time, curriculum decision-making in Québec has had certain stable characteristics:

• Periodic major curriculum reform more than continuing changes and adjustments,

• Dominant role of the MELS and civil servants in the formulation of general curriculum policy and the preparation of major documents,

• Initial consultation on broad questions,

• Unclear relationship between results of consultation and subsequent proposals, structures and policies,

• Extensive documentation and detailed curriculum guidelines,

• Administrative, technological and management approach to curriculum with less attention paid to philosophical, social, cultural or ethical issues,

• Limited academic, scholarly and professional input of professors in scholarly communities, policy makers in post-secondary institutions, researchers in education and other fields, and the various associations of teachers of different subject areas,

• Stress on a single coherent curriculum system for all schools, urban and rural, French-language and English-language,

• Limited ongoing public discussion and debate after the initial period of consultation,

• Little foresight about consequences of curriculum proposals for student retention and teacher readiness,

• Limited attention to curriculum research, developments, policies and practices outside Québec and little effort to justify reform proposals on the bases of ideas and precedents outside Québec,

• Limited use of information and communication technologies in the development of programs, as delivery systems (like e-learning), as means of promoting the reforms, and as sources of content for teachers and learners (the Internet).

Since the 1980s, there has been a trend in other places in North America to increase the role of government in curriculum decision-making. This is the result of a number of influences: interest in international comparisons of student achievement and education indicators; recognition of the political and economic implications of education; complexity and diversity of educational aspirations; demands for public accountability for the quality of education; costs of maintaining educational services combined with fiscal constraints. In most Canadian provinces and American states, there have been trends towards standards, benchmarks, outcome-based education, measures of school effectiveness and the use of standardized testing. In some ways, then, there has been a convergence in the policies, design, content and procedures of curriculum development between trends in Québec and elsewhere, but in most other jurisdictions, there tends to be a greater degree and variety of discussion, debate and involvement of interested groups in curriculum proposals and the way they are implemented.

In the current iteration of the curriculum development process, Québec is facing some important dilemmas. These include: how to balance the desired equality of opportunity and quality control implicit in centralized structures with the need for ongoing flexibility and adaptation to changing needs and to the different expectations of various communities within Québec; how to balance reasonable standards with improved retention and the reduction of the high number of drop-outs; how to engage effectively the collaboration of school administrators, teachers, parents and students in curriculum im-

provement and in the evaluation and reporting of learning; how to develop curriculum designs and materials that are appropriate to the needs and goals of Québec society and still ensure consistency with curriculum being developed outside Québec, to profit from best practices elsewhere, and to use the wealth of curriculum materials and approaches being developed in other places; how to continue the success of Québec students in international comparisons,[6] especially in such areas as mathematics and science, and at the same time raise the relatively low level of school retention. And, in all this, how can the Québec Ministry of Education, Leisure and Sport most effectively play its role of responsibility, leadership and oversight?[7]

SCENARIOS

As we think ahead about possible roles for the MELS and other stakeholders in decisions about curriculum over the next few years in Québec, and about possible directions and approaches, there are a number of possible scenarios, some of which may be combined with others. A few examples:

Curriculum = MELS

The MELS decides when curriculum change should occur, sponsors consultation, designs policies, controls the development of programs, publishes documents, writes regulations, approves learning materials, and presides over the evaluation and certification of achievement. The tasks of school administrators and teachers are to adapt, manage and apply curriculum. Curriculum change is largely periodic rather than ongoing and there is little opportunity for critique and modification and for different perspectives on structures and content. There is little sense of "ownership" on the part of teachers, administrators, schools or students; it is not uncommon to hear reference to the "programs of the MELS." This has been the scenario Québec has generally been following until now.

www.curriculum-québec.qc.ca

The complete elementary and secondary curriculum is on-line, with programs, expectations (requirements, outcomes and benchmarks), and documentation available to everyone, including parents and students. Each school is expected to have its own web site which would include specific learning programs and options, materials available and locally created program variations. In some cases, learners have an opportunity to follow a course or part of a course through e-learning. Exit profiles for completing each cycle or level are clearly indicated and self-diagnostic tests are provided for major areas of competency. This scenario represents an "e-learning" approach to curriculum, making it accessible to parents, students, educators in other jurisdictions, and the community. It would also make Québec one of the most innovative jurisdictions in North America.

Outsourced curriculum

The MELS contracts out most activities for developing programs of studies, identifying learning materials, management, standardized assessment, research and evaluation. The government establishes general guidelines and expectations (e.g., exit profiles, program specifications), supervises the overall process, accepts or rejects proposals like a regulatory body, and deals with disputes and appeals. Service providers (consultants, private enterprise, researchers, individual schools, groups of teachers) compete for contracts and funding. The aim of this scenario is to stimulate competition to produce the best programs available anywhere and the approach is consistent with what often happens in the private sector and other areas of the public sector.

Partnerships

The MELS provides leadership and funding to establish both ad-hoc and permanent partnerships of researchers, scholars, community groups, administrators and teachers to design and modify the overall curriculum structure, create individual programs, do ongoing research, evaluate program effectiveness and prepare learning materials and resources to support learning at all levels. Curriculum is seen as a social project with many groups participating and sharing responsibility at the levels of society, the community and the individual school. This scenario would stimulate cultural and academic groups like artists, professionals, and researchers to become involved in curriculum development and would improve the links between schooling and the real world of scholarship, culture and work.

Professional control

The teaching profession, at the elementary-secondary, collegial, university and adult education levels, is recognized as the body with the greatest expertise in all aspects of curriculum development. Teachers' associations (unions, professional corporations, subject specialists and communities of academic scholars and researchers) assume major responsibility for designing, developing and managing programs, while school administrators and teachers use these programs and adapt them to their particular needs. The government maintains overall supervision, establishes guidelines for all programs, and provides development funds when necessary. Many research granting agencies include requirements for curriculum development in their specifications. This would be the scenario most likely to place ownership of curriculum in the hands of those professionals charged with implementing it.

Institutional accreditation

The MELS maintains basic program control but establishes a system of school accreditation based on competence, academic record, performance of students and proposals coming from the schools. This allows individual

school communities to develop their own programs and market them to other schools. A system of quality assurance needs to be established as well as an assessment program to evaluate competence. This scenario would be the one most consistent with a policy of school-based management and school responsibility.

Curriculum council

The Government establishes a public corporation to control curriculum and be responsible for its continuous evaluation and updating. This body would have regulatory power and would include persons appointed by the government, as well as persons recommended by professional organizations, post-secondary institutions and associations, business and community groups. It would be responsible for research and development, official examinations, approval of programs and learning materials, and curriculum leadership for school boards and schools. This scenario means the government would place curriculum decisions "at arm's length" from its own structure but retain overall responsibility for program quality and relevance.

CLOSING QUESTIONS

A framework for curriculum policy for a 21st Century education system should engage the following questions:

1. How can the government most effectively discharge its responsibility for ensuring the quality of public education?

2. How can the essential characteristics of a modern curriculum – especially program coherence, individual and social relevance, content quality, innovative flexibility and economic sustainability – be assured?

3. How can those working with curriculum – especially school administrators, teachers, learners, parents and community groups – be given a sense of ownership and involvement in the curriculum?

4. How can we be assured that our learning programs represent the best of what we know and can do, on the basis of professional expertise, research and best practices in Québec and elsewhere?

5. How can we ensure that our learning programs have balance – between the intended curriculum and the learned curriculum, the explicit and implicit curriculum, general education and specialization, knowledge and skills, intellectual and moral literacies, quality of program and equality of learning opportunity, human and technological resources, the needs of the present and the needs that we project for the future?

CONCLUSION

Forty years ago, curriculum reform in Québec was a social project – exciting, engaging, creative. It offered leadership by the government, involvement by academic and professional groups, innovation and experimentation in activist methods, flexible grouping, cooperative learning, variety of learning projects, comprehensive schools and new approaches to teaching and learning. There was a broadly based effort to expand equality of learning opportunity and diversity of learning approaches, even admitting there were also problems with maintaining coherence, rigour, and public responsibility for quality assurance.

Today, we need to re-capture some of that excitement, engagement and creativity in our efforts to reform learning programs and improve the quality of learning for all students in our schools. This will require a new social project with broad participation, something of a new Quiet Revolution in education.

NOTES

1.   A good survey of recent developments and new challenges in curriculum is provided by Allan A. Glatthorn and Jerry Jailall (2000), Curriculum for the New Millennium, in *Education in a New Era*, ASCD Yearbook 2000, Ronald S. Brandt, editor (Alexandria Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), pp. 97-122.

2.   For a brief survey of this period, see: Québec (1963), *Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Québec* (The Parent Report), Historical Sketch, Vol. 1, pp. 1-21.

3.   These reforms were described in a special issue of the *McGill Journal of Education* (Fall 1972), Vol. VII No. 2. The major documents on curriculum reform in this period were: Québec (1964), *Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education in the Province of Québec*, Vol. 2, Chapters 4 and 5, and Vol. 3; Québec, Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec (1966), *The Cooperative School: Comprehensiveness and Continuous Progress*; for an evaluation of this period, see Arthur Tremblay (1969), Dix ans de reforme scolaire au Québec: Un bilan et un avenir, *Papers 1969 Communications*, The Comparative and International Education Society of Canada, pp. 46-68.

4.   See Norman Henchey and Donald Burgess (1987), *Between Past and Future: Québec Education in Transition* (Calgary: Detselig), Chapter 4; Québec, Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec (1977), *Primary and Secondary Education in Québec: Green Paper*; Québec, Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec (1979), *Policy Statement and Plan of Action*.

5.   See Norman Henchey (1999), The New Curriculum Model: What Does It Really Mean?, *McGill Journal of Education* (Vol. 34, No. 3), pp. 227-242. The major documents of this reform were: Québec Task Force on Elementary and Secondary School Learning Profiles (1994), *Preparing Youth for the 21st Century*; Québec, Commission for the Estates General on Education (1996), *Renewing Our Education System: Ten Priority Actions* (Final Report); Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec (1997), *Québec Schools on Course: Educational Policy Statement*; Task Force on Curriculum Reform (1997), *Reaffirming the Mission of the School*. In addition, there were a number of important reports of the Conseil Supérieur de l'Éducation, notably *Rénover le curriculum du primaire et du secondaire* (1994), *Pour un renouvellement prometteur des programmes à l'école* (1998), *Les enjeux majeurs des programmes d'études et des régimes pédagogiques* (1999).

6. See, for example: Human Resources Development Canada and Statistics Canada (2000), *Measuring Up: The Performance of Canada's Youth in Reading, Mathematics and Science*, (OECD PISA Study). Québec, with Alberta, performed toward the top of the scale in international comparisons among 32 countries in the three fields.

7. See, for example, the annual report of the Conseil superieur de l'éducation, (2001-2002), *La gouverne de l'éducation: Priorités pour les prochaines années*.

NORMAN HENCHEY is an emeritus professor of Education, McGill University. Born and educated in Québec, he was on the staff of the former St. Joseph Teachers College in the 1960s and the McGill Faculty of Education between 1970 and his retirement 1990. He has written frequently on Québec education, policy, reform, and curriculum development.

NORMAN HENCHEY est professeur émérite de la Faculté d'éducation de l'Université McGill. Né et formé au Québec, il a été un membre du personnel de l'ancien *St. Joseph Teachers College* durant les année 1960 et à la Faculté d'éducation de McGill durant les années 1970 jusqu'à sa retraite en 1990. Il a écrit abondamment à propos de l'éducation au Québec et plus particulièrement au sujet des politiques, des réformes et du développent curriculaire.