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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) report, *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers*, (2015) identified professional experience as one of the five keys areas for reform of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) as this is where pre-service teachers to learn to integrate theoretical knowledge of teaching with their practice. Recommendations in the report are intended to lead to improvements in the structure and delivery of professional experience in ITE.

The Australian Council of Deans of Education established the Network of Associate Deans of Professional Experience (NADPE) in 2016 to develop a national forum for ITE providers to collectively discuss and review the provision of professional experience in ITE. Initial discussions by members of the NADPE have highlighted the breadth of issues that influence the delivery of professional experience in ITE programs. These are:

- accreditation requirements;
- teaching learning and assessment practices;
- higher education funding;
- university-school partnerships and staffing agreements,
- and teaching and work practices in schools and higher education settings.

National course accreditation standards, determined by the Australian Institute for Teaching and Learning Leadership (AITSL 2015) and state registration authorities, require ITE providers to negotiate with schools for a minimum of 60 days of supervised professional experience for graduate programs and 80 days for undergraduate programs for each pre-service teacher. These requirements represent a major investment in time and effort from providers and schools alike. In 2016 for example, school placements were required in metropolitan, regional and remote locations across Australia for over 81,000 pre-service teachers in 375 ITE programs offered by 48 accredited providers.

This report on *Professional experience in initial teacher education: A review of current practices in Australian ITE*, presents data that were collected in 2017 and reflects changes in that are in progress in response to the TEMAG report. The series of five studies that are reported here provide an account of current developments in ITE, their impact on the delivery and quality of professional experience, and issues that need to be addressed to support further improvements.
Each of the five studies presented in this report address a key priority in the design and delivery of professional experience in Australian ITE programs. The studies and the priority they have examined are as follows:

**STUDY ONE: Mapping Professional Experience Placements in Key ITE Programs**
This study reviews course structures and how the organisation of their professional experience component supports the integration of the theory and practice of teaching. This study highlights that the majority of teacher education courses demonstrate high quality provision for professional experience. It is recommended that further research about how pre-service teachers develop and integrate knowledge of teaching with their practice of teaching is needed to further inform programmatic assessment of ITE programs.

**STUDY TWO: Identifying Models of Best Practice for Partnerships Around Professional Experience**
A literature review has been undertaken to identify the features of partnerships that support pre-service teachers to engage in conversations about education theory and teaching practice. This study identified four features of partnership activity that need to be in place to create effective professional experience placements for pre-service teachers. These are:

- partnership alignment of values and vision;
- partnership shared goals and objects;
- partnership operational processes and procedures, and
- actions to minimize barriers.

It is recommended that a partnership audit tool be developed and evaluated for assessment of university-school partnerships for professional experience in ITE.

**STUDY THREE: Pre-Service Teachers’ Portfolios of Evidence: A National Snapshot of the Collection and Assessment of Practice within Australian ITE**
This study demonstrates that portfolios of evidence are integrated into the assessment practices for professional experience in Australian ITE programs. Pre-service teachers regularly collate and submit evidence of their teaching as an ePortfolio. The design and implementation of portfolios reflect program
outcomes and their development is led by senior academic staff. The study found that there is scope for a broader uptake of the use of portfolios within other elements of the ITE program to promote more consistent application of their use. It also found that access to platforms to support effective use of ePortfolios varied among providers. It is recommended that further research and development be conducted to establish a pedagogy that supports the use of portfolios of evidence to inform practice, rather than to be used as a tool to collect information. More information and support is needed on effective platforms to support the use of portfolios of evidence.

**STUDY FOUR: Professional Experience in Australian ITE Courses: Policy, Funding Arrangements and their Impact on University-School Partnerships and Practices.**

This study explores how current policy and funding arrangements impact on partnership activities supporting professional experience placements. The study found that Education academic staff are not well informed about placement costs and funding for the professional experience component of ITE and concluded that this may influence their capacity to create conditions for change. Providers also have little capacity to influence how schools select supervising teachers or to ensure these teachers are well-prepared to work with preservice teachers during placements. There is a lack of research-based evidence to inform providers on how partnership agreements impact the organisation and quality of professional experience placements offered in ITE.

The recommendations from this study emphasise the need for: Education academics to be more informed about the funding and costs of placements; school systems, state and territory governments and AITSL to work together to improve conditions for the selection and preparation of teachers for supervision of preservice teachers during placements; providers to work with AITSL to gather evidence on the impact of agreements between providers and schools on the quality of placements, and for stakeholders to work to raise the status of placements and the role they play in the professional preparation of preservice teachers.

**STUDY FIVE: Indigenous Contexts, ITE and Implications for Professional Experience.**

A review of research and practice in the preparation of teachers for Indigenous Education shows that there is more to learn about how to ensure pre-service teachers are prepared to achieve attributes for teaching that reflect the Australian Professional Standards 1.4 and 2.4. The placement experiences of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous pre-service teachers suggest that many schools continue to struggle with issues of Indigenous cultural knowledge and diversity. While the national response to these issues is
fragmented the research supports the view that this aspect of ITE is a specialist area that requires further research and development. There is a need to continue the work that has been seeded by the More Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Teachers Initiative (MATSITI) project. The collaboration that has been established through MATSITI and the ACDE has led to the formation of the Australian Indigenous Lecturers in Teacher Education Association (AILITEA) group in 2016, as a national specialist group of Indigenous academic advisors for Education.

The recommendations of this study acknowledge the importance of the MATSITS project in raising awareness of Standards 1.4 and 2.4 and their application to both the course work and professional experience placements components of ITE, and that Indigenous education issues in ITE be recognized as a specialist area of study. The study further recommended that the AILITEA group be acknowledged and supported as a specialist group to continue the work of the MATSITI project and that avenues for resourcing be explored to continue to build and support the work of the AILITEA group within ACDE.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

STUDY ONE: MAPPING OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE PLACEMENTS IN KEY ITE PROGRAMS

This mapping exercise demonstrates that Australian higher education providers have instituted significant changes to the structure and content of ITE programs in response to the new national course accreditation requirements. The organisation and structure of professional experience offered at the majority of institutions aligns with current research on best practice in ITE and include the essential features of high quality professional experience. However, some programs reported difficulties in designing and implementing new assessment, feedback and reporting practices to engage pre-service teachers in regular learning activities and dialogic conversations with experienced mentors about their development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards. Research about pre-service teachers’ development is needed to inform current understandings of, and expectations for, assessment of pre-service teachers’ performance leading up to the Graduate Teacher Standards. The findings also suggest that more research is needed to inform the key design features and implementation strategies for developing programmatic assessment of ITE programs.

Recommendations:
That higher education providers demonstrate how the measures and strategies in ITE programs:
- guide pre-service teachers in their attainment of the Graduate Teacher Standards
- provide an accurate measure of skills and behaviours that reflect the expectations for performance needed to meet the Graduate Teacher Standards

That ACDE/NADPE engage with relevant stakeholders to develop a framework for the programmatic assessment of ITE programs.

STUDY TWO: IDENTIFYING MODELS OF BEST PRACTICE FOR PARTNERSHIPS FOR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

A review of the literature has been conducted to explore what partnership characteristics need to be in place to enable pre-service teachers to engage in deep learning conversations that help them to connect education theory with the practice of teaching. It was found that use of the term partnership can create confusion about the requirements and roles of partners in ITE. The findings support the need for a well-
developed audit tool to provide a research base on how processes and outcomes of professional experience partnerships align with the goals and needs of school and university partners. The conditions identified for classroom teachers and education academics to work with pre-service teachers are consistent with the notion of a *third space* that is distinct from university and school but overlaps each. In order to ensure that pre-service teachers are exposed to high quality placements, it is essential that providers have a sound understanding of the effectiveness of their professional experience partnerships. The literature review suggests an effective partnership audit tool will identify four features of effective partnership activity. These features reflect: partnership alignment of values and vision; partnership shared goals and objectives; partnership operational processes and procedures, and actions taken to minimise barriers.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that NADPE develop the proposed audit tool and collate a data base of university – school partnerships in ITE to:

- test the effectiveness of the audit tool in assisting providers to identify and evaluate partnership processes and capabilities
- determine how alignment of partnership expectations and practices contribute to effective placement outcomes.

**STUDY THREE: PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' PORTFOLIOS OF EVIDENCE: A NATIONAL SNAPSHOT OF THE COLLECTION AND ASSESSMENT OF PRACTICE WITHIN AUSTRALIAN ITE**

This study confirms that providers are engaging with the new accreditation requirements for graduate teachers to collate and submit evidence of learning to teach using a portfolio. Providers regularly integrate the use of portfolios with learning and assessment strategies. Portfolio-implementation teams within institutions reported that their decision-making and expectations for program outcomes were based on a commonly shared vision for pre-service teacher learning. However, it was also evident that the broader uptake of this vision and integration of portfolios into activities across all course elements requires further development. Differing perceptions among academic staff were found to exist with regard to: responsibility for the development and implementation of portfolios of evidence; support and scaffolding provided to pre-service teachers to help them use portfolios; responsibilities for assessment; the type of content to be included; and, how and when it is integrated into coursework. These differences suggest
there is a need for a pedagogy to drive the effective implementation of a portfolios of evidence rather than this being viewed as a tool to collate evidence of practice.

This study also demonstrated that the diverse contexts of ITE providers and the range of unique program outcomes create a complex set demands that influence the variability of resources available, platforms used, content required, and assessment processes undertaken. Differences in the response of universities and regulators across Australian providers creates differing capacities for online services to students, technological and financial options for the support and maintenance of large numbers of portfolios.

Thus, while the use of portfolios of evidence are developed and being used across Australian ITE courses, this study demonstrates that their use is still at an early stage of development. Continued research and development is work is needed.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that NADPE to continue support a program of research on the use of Portfolios of Evidence to collate data on:

- how implementation activities are evolving across the sector
- how effective they are in assisting pre-service teachers to collate evidence of their professional development through to the Graduate Teacher Standard.

**STUDY FOUR: PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN AUSTRALIAN ITE COURSES: POLICY, FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS**

Funding and practical arrangements for the organization for professional experience have been examined to determine how these factors influence the operation of university and school partnerships. The findings of this study highlight how current policy and funding arrangements constrain the capacity of university-school partnerships to create the most effective programs of support for ITE placements. The funding constraint reflects long-standing expectations and practice involving the use of Commonwealth funding for placements.

This study has been reported under three related activities. These are:

- Funding for placement activities in ITE;
- Higher Education Support for ITE,
• School sector engagement in ITE

The findings for the review of *Funding for placement activities in ITE* illustrates that the funds for placements that are provided through the Commonwealth contribution for clinical placements and practicums does not cover the cost of delivery of placements in ITE. Providers are constrained in their use of the Commonwealth contribution for clinical placements and practicums as this money is almost fully committed as payments to School Coordinators and Supervisory teachers. Schools do not receive any financial support for placements. Funding for rural and remote placements is inadequate, and many academic support activities for placements are under-costed and rely on goodwill. The findings presented in this section demonstrate that providers are limited in their capacity to make large-scale changes to placement conditions. There is an unresolved question about how schools or teachers should be remunerated for this work.

**Recommendations:**
It is recommended that ACDE and NADPE hold a workshop(s) to support Heads/Deans of Education to understand placement costs and funding structures for placements in ITE programs.

**Higher Education support for professional experience**

The study on Higher education support for professional experience suggests that the TEMAG recommendations for formal partnership agreements for school experience partnership delivery does not account for the way in which schools and school systems engage in the delivery of placements in their schools. Higher Education institutions have little capacity to influence the operational aspects of schools, teachers’ roles and responsibilities or teacher expectations for payments. The delivery of professional experience requires staff in higher education institutions to negotiate with schools to employ teachers for roles and responsibilities that fall outside their professional workplace agreements. Providers find there are considerable variations in expectations for payment for placements and that they are unable to directly influence teacher work to assure the quality of placement support provided to pre-service students in schools.

**Recommendation:**
It is recommended that ACDE and NADPE work with school systems, state and territory governments and AITSL to improve the quality of in-school support provided to pre-service teachers during placements.
through improved selection of supervising teachers and improved training and support for teachers who have responsibilities for placement related activities.

**School engagement with professional experience**

This study demonstrates that systems and schools do not engage consistently in the delivery of professional experience and that the commitment of schools and supervising teachers to professional practice is variable. Teachers typically self-nominate to undertake supervisor roles and there is little professional recognition for their work. As a result the quality of support for pre-service teachers during placements varies considerably.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that:

- ACDE and NADPE work with AITSL to collate data on professional experience agreements and their impact on the organisation, support provided to supervisory teachers and the quality of placement experiences provided to pre-service teachers.
- ACDE, NADPE and AITSL work with school systems and state and territory governments to raise the status and recognition for the importance of ITE placements in the professional preparation of teachers.

**STUDY FIVE: INDIGENOUS CONTEXTS, ITE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.**

This review of Indigenous contexts, ITE and implications for professional experience demonstrates that more needs to be done to ensure that the professional placement experiences of pre-service teachers adequately prepares them with the skills and knowledge to address Standards 1.4 and 2.4. The varied geographical, educational and cultural issues that influence the delivery of ITE create challenges for providers. Specialist knowledge and resources are needed to address Indigenous education issues. The findings of this project demonstrate that while the MATSITI project has created an awareness of many issues there remains a need for systemic measures to be put in place to address the learning needs of both non-Indigenous and Indigenous pre-service teachers. Indigenous education in ITE has been identified as a specialist area requiring further support and development. Importantly, the MATSITI project has brought together a specialist group of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander teacher education academics within ACDE. The formation of the ACDE AILITEA group presents an opportunity to continue the work of the
MATSITI project to more fully embed Indigenous knowledge, cultural awareness into the professional placement experiences in ITE.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that:

- The work of the MATSITI project in raising awareness of ITE providers of some of the issues and the importance of the need to address Standards 1.4 and 2.4 in ITE coursework and professional experience placements be acknowledged.

- Indigenous education issues in ITE be recognised as a specialist area of study in Education and ITE.

- The ACDE AILITEA group be recognised as the key advisory group for Indigenous education and ITE and that this group report to the ACDE on these matters.

- Avenues for resourcing for AILITEA be explored to enable this group to build and support future work.
BACKGROUND TO THE FIVE STUDIES IN THIS REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The delivery of professional experience was identified as a priority in the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) report with a number of recommendations focusing on the interests and needs of pre-service teachers. The provision of structured and integrated professional experience was seen as providing longer-term benefits in attracting, retaining, training/development and recognition of the teaching workforce.

Professional experience placements are an integral part of ITE. They are covered by Standard 5 of the Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures. Standard 5 has a specific focus on establishing formal partnerships between providers and schools/systems to ensure high quality placements for all students. It has clearly identified roles and responsibilities for all parties, especially employers, mentors and educators.

ITE providers find responding to professional experience most challenging as they have difficulty moving beyond processes that repeat existing practice in partnership with schools. The Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE) recognises that the current approach to professional experience is characterised by inconsistency in the quality of placement, variation in teacher judgment and discrepancies in the assessment of graduating teachers. In view of this, the ACDE Board established the Network of Academic Directors of Professional Experience (NADPE) to provide a collective voice and leadership on key professional experience issues.

The Federal Department of Education and Training (DET) provided funding to enable ACDE to research issues associated with the delivery of quality professional experience for ITE students. The deliverables for the resulting project are:

a. developing a roadmap for greater consistency and rigour in the assessment of all professional experience;
b. identifying models of best practice for partnerships around professional experience and sharing these across the Network;
c. capturing a national snapshot of the ways in which ITE providers utilize pre-service teachers’ Portfolios of Evidence;
d. developing recommendations for future reform of professional experience, including actions for providers and consultation with relevant bodies (e.g. regulators) to encourage greater recognition of the supervisory teacher role as ongoing professional development.

e. exploring existing research around Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander issues in ITE and implications for the conduct of professional experience. This relates to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ITE students and non-Indigenous students who have placements in Indigenous and non-Indigenous schools.

The project represents the largest study of professional experience ever conducted on the design and delivery of professional experience in ITE courses in Australia and nationally. NADPE, under the auspices of ACDE has led and managed this project, working in close collaboration with the DET and AITSL. NADPE’s Steering Group has acted as the project Reference Group with members across the wider Network participating in surveys and other information-gathering exercises.
STUDY ONE

MAPPING PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE PLACEMENTS IN KEY ITE PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This study was undertaken to examine the content and structure of courses with a focus on professional experience placements with regard to the rationale of the program for teacher preparation, how this influences placement patterns, the performance expectations of pre-service teachers and achievement of the Graduate Teacher Standards. The data for this study was collected in 2017 and reflects the early stages of implementation of the TEMAG reforms.

The TEMAG report (2015) highlighted concerns that ITE course design did not maximise the integration of the theoretical considerations of learning about teaching with the practice of teaching. Recommendation 6 stressed the need for programs to ensure pre-service teachers were prepared through iterative approaches to become classroom ready. Program Standard 4.1 requires that program elements create the conditions for developmental and iterative approaches for teaching. For example:

Recommendation 6

Initial accreditation of programs requires higher education providers to demonstrate that their programs have evidence-based pedagogical approaches, effective integration of professional experience, rigorous and iterative assessment of pre-service teachers throughout their education, and final assessments that ensure pre-service teachers are classroom ready. Higher education providers provide a set of measures that assess the effectiveness of their programs in achieving successful graduate outcomes (p. xii).

Program Standard 4.1

Program structures must be sequenced coherently to reflect effective connections between theory and practice (p78).
The theory-practice divide is well documented in international literature and has been identified as a persistent problem (Korthagen, 2010). According to Flores, (2017):

*The reasons for this are diverse amongst which are the socialisation process into existing patterns in schools, the complexity of teaching, the nature of the learning process in ITE, the kind of knowledge valued (associated with the tension between the more practical and the more formal) and the ways in which the affected dimension is overlooked within a technical-rationality perspective (p. 287).*

Darling-Hammond (2006) maintains there are three main persistent problems that must be addressed to support pre-service teachers to become adaptive experts who can continue to learn.

*First, learning to teach requires learners to come to understand teaching in ways quite different from their own experience as students. Dan Lortie (1975) called this “the apprenticeship of observation,” referring to the learning that takes place by virtue of being a student for 12 or more years in traditional classroom settings. Second, learning to teach also requires that new teachers learn not only to think like a teacher” but also “act as a teacher” – what Mary Kennedy (1999) has termed “the problem of enactment”. Teachers need not only understand but also do a wide variety of things, many of them simultaneously. Finally, learning to teach requires that new teachers be able to respond to the dense and multifaceted nature of the classroom, juggling multiple academic and social goals requiring trade-offs from moment to moment and day to day (Jackson, 1974). They must learn to deal with “the problem of complexity” that is made more intense by the constantly changing nature of teaching and learning in groups (p. 305).*

According to Darling-Hammond (2007):

*... contemporary research suggests that learning about teaching best develops when prospective teachers encounter content in context in which it can be applied. Teachers benefit from participating in the culture of teaching – by working with the materials and tools of teaching practice and by examining teaching plans and student learning while immersed in theory about learning, development and subject matter (p. 122).*
There is no single optimal approach to the design of prospective teachers’ clinical experiences. “What is important is that the clinical experiences are constructed with careful consideration of what the experience should be like and why, so that the program can optimize the experiences offered” (Darling-Hammond, 2007, p. 124).

Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden (2005, p. 43), successful clinical experiences exhibit the following characteristics:

- clarity of goals, including the use of standards guiding the performances and practices to be developed;
- modelling of good practices by more-expert teachers in which teachers make their thinking visible;
- frequent opportunities for practice with continuous formative feedback and coaching;
- multiple opportunities to relate classroom work to university course work;
- graduated responsibility for all aspects of classroom teaching; and
- structured opportunities to reflect on practice with an eye toward improving it.

Ingvarson Reid, Buckley, Kleinhenz & Masters (2014), argue that: “Whether a clinical perspective is a relevant model for teaching is still being argued” (p. 19). The point is not the debate underlying the philosophy of the approach but to recognise that this model incorporates many elements of high-quality professional experiences and that incorporating best practice in professional experiences is not exclusive to this approach (Ingvarson et al, 2014). To clarify, a lack of knowledge about the characteristics of effective teacher education programs is not the problem. “The challenge is to identify policies and systems that need to be in place to ensure best practice becomes common place in Australian teacher education programs” (p. xvi).

Supervised teaching practice has long been acknowledged as having a profound impact on pre-service teachers’ learning (Darling-Hammond, 2007). However, evidence is scarce on the effectiveness of different types of experiences on teacher development, what pre-service teachers learn during their professional experiences, how this shapes their development as teachers (Wilson & Floden, 2003). This appears largely due to the inherent variability of pre-service teachers’ experiences across school contexts and programs (Cohen et al, 2013). Thus, it is difficult to isolate the effects of specific
components of professional experience due to their interrelationship with other program features (Grossman, 2010). Nevertheless, research suggests that:

- early timing of the first professional experience enables pre-service teachers to preview the profession to determine early in their training whether they are committed to a teaching career (Gomex, Strage, Knutson-Miller, & Garcia-Nevarez, 2009).
- pre-service teachers who participate in professional experience with course work are better able to understand theory, to apply the concepts they are learning in their coursework and support student learning (Baumgartner, Koerner, & Rust, 2002).
- Extended professional experience is a feature of programs that prepare high quality teachers for the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 2012; Ure, Gough and Newton, 2009).

Different strategies to promote pre-service teachers’ learning bring with them different benefits and limitations. Darling-Hammond (2007) puts it best:

> … multiple settings for practice teaching may allow teachers to consider how contexts make a difference in the choice of strategies and how to use them. At the same time, multiple short placements reduce the opportunities for deeply understanding a group of students and a kind of practice; they may make it difficult for student teachers to learn how what came before influences what is happening now in the classroom. Shorter placements also burden schools without the compensating contribution a more-seasoned student teacher (for example, one who spends an entire semester or year) can make, thus sometimes making it more difficult to maintain strong partnerships for practicum placements (p. 124).

Increasing the amount of time that [pre-service teachers] spend in schools is unlikely to result in better preparation of teachers without consideration of other essential features of professional experience that increase the quality of the placement (Ingvarson et al, 2014, p. 21). Features shared by high quality teacher preparation programs include early and extensive professional experiences integrated with coursework. Subject matter is brought together with content pedagogy through courses that treat them together as part of program sequences that create cross-course links. This is facilitated by academic staff which share curriculum and plan together across university divisions (Darling-Hammond, 2006).
In addition, during professional experience placements, pre-service teachers receive intensive supervision by experienced teachers, in schools where the vision of teaching aligns with the practices being taught in courses (Darling-Hammond 2006). This means that: "Virtually all of the closely interrelated courses involve applications in classrooms where observations or student teaching occur. These classrooms, in turn, are selected because they model the kind of practice that is discussed in courses" (Darling-Hammond, 2007, p. 306). These settings:

... feature teams of teachers who work together, using state-of-the-art practices based on sound research, collaboratively developing curriculum and instruction, engaging in peer review of each other’s practice, and conducting ongoing inquiry into the effectiveness of the approaches they use (Darling-Hammond, 2007, pp. 124-125).

Thus, whilst the duration and nature of each professional experience placement is important, a critical element in initial teacher education programs is access to a high quality clinical practicum (Behrstock-Sherratt et al., 2014). It is the quality of teaching, the leadership and mentoring of pre-service teachers which is critical to producing student achievement.

Darling-Hammond (2006) points out that: “These settings do not exist in large numbers” (p. 309). In addition:

It is impractical to expect to prepare teachers for schools as they should be if teachers are constrained to learning in settings that typify the problems of schools as they have been – where isolated teachers provide examples of idiosyncratic, usually atheoretical practice that rarely exhibits a diagnostic, assessment-oriented approach and infrequently offers access to carefully selected strategies designed to teach a wide range of learners well (p. 308).

The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (APST) are viewed by some as the de facto knowledge base for all initial teacher education programs (Lloyd, 2013). "A critical problem lies in the difference between the definitions offered by AITSL and that outlined by TEQSA, with the latter defining its learning outcomes in terms of (a) Knowledge, (b) Skill and Application of Knowledge and Skill" (p. 33). It is also unclear how the Australian Quality Framework, Level 7 aligns with the Graduate Teacher Standard, and how the two hierarchies “progress” and how closely are they align. According to Lloyd (2013, p. 34):
The progression from AQF Levels 7 to 9 is clearly one of increasing autonomy and expertise. A critical development is in the aspect of skill, which results in a Level 9 graduate’s ability to: analyse critically, reflect on and synthesise complex information, problems, concepts and theories. This has developed from more controlled or task-driven analyses at AQF Level 7. Level 9 requires original research as well as the capacity to apply existing research to bodies of knowledge or practice. Each level … includes a capacity to communicate, that is, to transmit knowledge, skills and ideas to others at differing levels of complexity.

When comparing the AQF Knowledge (Levels 7-9) with descriptors in the APST across the four career stages (Graduate, Proficient, Highly Accomplished, Lead) different trajectories between the performative and theoretical become apparent as do the mismatch between criteria. Specifically, Lloyd (2013, pp. 35-36) points out:

- AQF Level 7 appears to align with APST Graduate level. This can be determined semantically through the use of similar verbs, such as demonstrate and understand without the addition of qualifiers to indicate anything other than the “broad coherent knowledge” expected at Level 7.
- Each of the AQF descriptors … include a capacity to transmit knowledge to others, this is only a feature of the Highly Accomplished and Lead levels of the APST where teachers take leadership and mentoring roles.
- The APST descriptors at Proficient are performative in nature (as noted through the verbs [e.g.,] structure, participate and provide) and privilege peer knowledge and experience over research or theory. … research (which is a key component of AQF Level 9) is applied by Lead teachers … [to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching programs].
- The proficient and highly accomplished levels appear to be concerned with professional learning whereas AQF Levels 8 and 9 appear to have assumed such basic acquisition of contextualised knowledge.

Lloyd (2013) argues that the main concern is that initial teacher education programs may be at AQF Levels 7, 8 and 9 and each will be accredited against the Graduate Teacher Standard of the APST, “which does not appear to match the requirements of levels other than Level 7 … [Thus, a tension] arises through the need to balance educational theory with performance in the classroom” (p. 36). This brings into
question the differing expectations of graduates of undergraduate and postgraduate programs and how best to support them in their further development.

There is growing recognition that the work of teachers involves not simply ‘knowing the answers’ (Darling-Hammond, 2007, p. 116) but also having the skills to diagnose what is happening in problematic situations and provide appropriate ‘prescriptions’ for improvement (Hattie, 2009, p. 198). The Australian Government demands that graduates be ‘classroom ready’ (TMAG, 2015) “so that they can be successful from their first day in the classroom” (p. xi). This is contrary to the notion of a graduate teacher being someone in need of ongoing support and mentoring (Lloyd, 2013).

**SCOPE OF THE PROJECT**

The scope of this project was to survey members of NADPE to map professional experience placements in key ITE undergraduate and postgraduate programs. Key programs included: BEd (Primary), BEd (Secondary), MTeach (Primary) or MTeach (Secondary) programs. As not all institutions offer all these programs, respondents could choose which course they reported on.

For this project, professional experienced describes the range of approaches that provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to practice and develop their teaching skills in school environments. This project is limited to the characteristics of professional experiences undertaken by pre-service teachers in primary and secondary schools. It does not address early childhood education settings.

**AIMS OF THE PROJECT**

The aims of this project were to:

1. Identify in each institution, the major recent changes, content, structure and context of the professional experience placements in key ITE undergraduate and postgraduate programs. Specifically,
   - The rationale underpinning the design of the program
   - The duration and nature of each placement
   - The professional experience options
   - The focus of professional experience courses and assessment of pre-service teachers towards the Graduate Teacher Standard
   - Performance expectations of pre-service teachers,
2. Identify trends and variations across institutions to present an overall national picture of what is happening related to professional experience.
METHODS

This project was approved by the Deakin University Faculty of Arts and Education Human Ethics Advisory Group (approval number HAE-17-061). Information was provided to all Australian-based Deans of Education and their respective Academic Directors of Professional Experience. These leaders were asked to identify staff within their institutions who had knowledge of the structure, rationale and implementation of either a BEd (Primary), BEd (Secondary), MTeach (Primary) or MTeach (Secondary) program.

An online survey, which included fixed-response and open-ended questions was developed and distributed. Informed consent was provided by respondents when they read and agreed to a consent statement before submitting their survey responses. Quantitative data were analysed to identify descriptive understandings. Qualitative data were analysed thematically and in response to patterns emerging from quantitative analysis.

Participant Profile

The 17 respondents to this survey represent 17 of 43 (40%) Faculties/Schools of Education in universities across Australia. Respondents identified their area of responsibility in a variety of ways; examples of this include: Coordinator or Director of Professional Experience, to Course Director, Academic Program Director, Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning), Deputy Head Higher Education and Head of Department.

Program Distribution

Respondents were asked to choose one of four identified programs to report in the survey as a priority over alternatives like double or combined degrees. Two double degree primary programs were included in the results. All states and territories, except Tasmania, were represented. Table 1.1 shows the number of each program included in this report and the state or territory represented.

Table 1.1: Program distribution included in this report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTED PROGRAM</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>STATE OR TERRITORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Primary)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>VIC (2); NSW (2); ACT; NT; WA; QLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Secondary)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>QLD; NSW; WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTeach (Primary)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>SA; VIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTeach (Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

Duration of the Program
Participants were asked to identify the duration of their selected program based on a full-time equivalent workload. As anticipated, the six Master of Teaching programs were identified as two-years in duration and the eight Bachelor of Education courses were identified as four-year courses.

Total Current Enrolment
Participants were asked to identify the total current enrolment in their selected program across all year level cohorts at the time the survey was completed. Six of the eight BEd (Primary) programs were also identified as having the most pre-service teachers currently enrolled compared with other ITE programs offered by their institution. Table 1.2 shows the total current enrolment reported by individual respondents for their selected program and the mean for each type of program.

Table 1.2: Total current enrolments by type of program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolments by individual institutions</th>
<th>BEd (Primary)</th>
<th>Bed (Secondary)</th>
<th>MTeach (Primary)</th>
<th>MTeach (Secondary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Most significant change**

Participants were asked to identify the most significant change that had taken place in their selected program in the last one to two years (see Table 1.3). Major reported changes related to administrative structural modifications and improvements to assessment, feedback and reporting processes.

Administrative structural modifications related to:

- The duration of the program
- An increase in the number of days in schools
- Improved alignment of professional experience with coursework
- Improved alignment of professional experience with schools (change of dates and the coordination of volunteer work)
- Increased enrolment in online programs with a national curriculum focus
- Increased regulation of progression hurdles e.g. NSW Entry Standards Authority (NESA), LANTITE, Working with Children (WWC) clearance.

Improvements to assessment, feedback and reporting related to:

- The introduction of new requirements and processes focused on the Graduate Teacher Standards e.g., ePortfolios, Assessment Circles, Teacher Performance Assessment
- The introduction of a common reporting framework for all Queensland Universities.

Two participants had noteworthy different responses related to supervision. One suggested there was increased supervision of pre-service teachers in schools whilst another forecast a move to a “Program Supervision mode Internship, i.e. NO TEACHER IN THE ROOM”. Unfortunately, no details were provided to indicate what the latter statement meant.

**Table 1.3: Qualitative responses about the most significant change to the program in the past one to two years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign to fit within a two-year program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of the alliances (teaching academies) has led to much more connected Professional Experience with pre-service teachers volunteering in a coordinated way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in the PEX dates to provide a range of experience in relation to school terms Increased PEX 2 from 10 to 15 days, five days above the mandated 80 days as a buffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course re-accreditation has led to a realigning of professional experience across courses and this has resulted in rethinking how professional experience has been taught and the introduction of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
targeted days in school where students focus on learning about literacy teaching.

- New units and Professional Experience blocks were introduced [and] linked. In 1st and 2nd year, there is a focus on core units including literacy, numeracy and science. In 1st year, there is a 10-day observational Placement. In 3rd year, students participate in six PCK units, four of which are clinical and are based in schools for half a day per week throughout the semester. The clinics account for 20 days of Placement and 10-day Placements are attached to two other units. Included in the 4th year units is another PCK unit as well as a unit with a 30-day Final Placement attached.

- No PEX / school experience in year 1 of the degree due to changes to meet NESA entry requirements.

- Increased the number of professional experience days to meet changed accreditation requirements. LANTITE testing results prohibit some students progressing within the four years Mandatory checks such as WWC Clearance, not only are they checked at a university level, the schools also require a letter on a university letterhead to indicate the validation of each student’s number. The tertiary supervisor’s validation is also required on this letterhead.

- The implementation of LANTITE and the relationship to the final placement.

- Increasing numbers of Master of Teaching students are choosing to study on-line. While providing flexible opportunities for students to study where they live, this has also provided a challenge to ensure the course has a focus on national curricula and approaches and to find ways to support students whose placements are not located in Victoria.

- Pay rise for supervisors. Paperless process.

**Assessment, Feedback and Reporting**

- The common reporting framework with all the students from all Queensland Universities using the same final professional experience report.

- The biggest change has been the 9-week placement and the ongoing refinement and sophistication of the ePortfolio, guidelines and tools for Mentor teachers, University Liaisons, Site Coordinators and pre-service teachers.

- The profound impact of Assessment Circles where pre-service teachers, mentors, academics and site directors all discuss the pre-service teachers practice in relation to the APST.

- Change in reporting framework and feedback tools to closely align with the Graduate teacher standards Increased tertiary supervision in school contact days.

- Stakeholders … [are] more aware of processes and expectations. The development of an assessment rubric based on the APST has improved moderation and assessment of the practicum.

- Standards based feedback submitted to university after each supervisory visit.

- The implementation of the Graduate Teacher Performance Assessment and discussion with teachers and staff in relation to these requirements.

- We are about to move to a Program Supervision mode Internship, i.e. NO TEACHER IN THE ROOM.
**Total Number and Distribution of Professional Experience Days**

Participants were asked to identify the total number of days for professional experience in their chosen program and specify how when these were situated in the program.

**BEd (Primary) Programs**

Table 1.4 outlines the total number and distribution of professional experience days per year across BEd (Primary) programs.

Four of the six reported BEd (Primary) programs were identified as comprising the minimum number of 80 days. Two BEd (Primary) programs were identified as exceeding the minimum number of days by 20 days. The professional experience days were distributed differently across the four years for each program involving sustained and extended placements in three or more schools. Noteworthy is one program that reported there were no professional experience placements in the first two years of the program and another program that involved 40 days across Terms 1, 2, 3 and 4 as four school-based clinics.

Two respondents reporting on BEd (Primary) programs did not complete all information related to this section of the survey.

**Table 1.4: Total number and distribution of professional experience days per year in the BEd (Primary) Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEd (Primary)</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-day sustained block (5-days per week for 2 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terms 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-day sustained block (5-days per week for 2 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-day sustained block (5-days per week for 4 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Term 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terms 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terms 3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terms 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Term 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terms 2, 3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Up to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes incomplete survey data.
**BEd (Secondary) Programs**

Details for BEd (Secondary) programs are outlined in Table 1.5. Three BEd (Secondary) programs were identified as exceeding the minimum number of 80 days. The number of additional days varied for all three programs by an additional five, 10 or 20 days. Placements were in sustained or extended blocks in three or four schools.

**Table 1.5: Total number and distribution of professional experience days in the BEd (Secondary) programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEd (Secondary)</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>No placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Term 3 15-day sustained block (5-days per week for 3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 2 10-days (1-day per week visits) Terms 2 &amp; 4 15-day sustained block (5-days per week for 3 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Term 3 25-day extended sustained block (5-days per week 5 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Term 3 50-day extended sustained block (5-days per week 10 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MTeach (Primary) Programs**

Out of the two MTeach (Primary) programs reported in this study, one included the minimum number of 60 days and the other included five additional days. Both programs distributed the professional experience days across the first two years of the program. Details are outlined in Table 1.6.

**Table 1.6: Total number and distribution of professional experience days in the MTeach (Primary) programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTeach (Primary)</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1</td>
<td>15-days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-day visits + sustained block*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td>15-days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-day visits + sustained block*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1, 2</td>
<td>30-day extended sustained block (5-days per week for 6 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MTeach (Secondary) Programs**

Out of the four MTeach (Secondary) programs, two included the minimum number of 60 days and the other two included five additional days. All of the programs distributed the professional experience days differently. Noteworthy was one program that included all 65 professional experience days in Year 1 of the program in two schools with no placement in Year 2. Details are outlined in Table 1.7.
Table 1.7: Total number and distribution of professional experience days in the MTeach (Secondary) programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTeach (Secondary)</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-day extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustained block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-days per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 6 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-day extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustained block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-days per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 2 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-day extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustained block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-days per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 5 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-day sustained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block (5-days per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>week for 4 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-day extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustained block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-days per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 9 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-day sustained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-day extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustained block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-days per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 6 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-day extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustained block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-days per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for 5 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-day sustained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS 2 2 2 3
TOTAL NUMBER OF DAYS 60 60 65 65

Rationale for the timing of the professional experience placements

Participants were asked to describe the rationale of the professional experience placements in the program in relationship to the connections to the sequences of courses. The following quotations were provided by respondents.

BEd (Primary) programs

- All of our placements are embedded units. These units have a clear focus and the placement is fully integrated with this focus. The placement is timed to ensure pre-service teachers have received sufficient course input to feel prepared to go on the placement and to have sufficient opportunity after the placement to reflect on their learning seminars.
- The timing of the placements is noted to provide students with an opportunity to see schools in action at all times during the year. Students are placed in a variety of contexts for each placement.
- Students are placed in 3rd year so that they are well prepared for professional experience.
• The timing of placements responds in part to the Program Standards to have an early placement (e.g. in Year 1, and also to fit in with school needs and school terms. Hence why we have two placements in Term 2, 3 in term 3 and 1 in term 4. Term 1 too early given the semester start in late Feb/early March and our need to prepare students before they go on PX2 [professional experience]. Our PX courses are all embedded i.e. combined coursework and assessable tasks while on PX. This gives: connected theory and practice teaching on site in schools teaching by both university staff and practicing teachers in schools.

• An observational Placement is undertaken in the first semester of 1st year as a part of the 'Educational Workplace' unit. This provides an opportunity for students to observe the operation of a school and can assist determine whether their career choice is appropriate for an individual student. There is an academic focus in Years 1 and 2 on core units and pedagogy. Half of the placements are held in 3rd Year in a variety of settings and arrangements. This is a consolidation of three years coursework. A final 30-day placement is undertaken in 4th year to allow students to demonstrate their classroom 'readiness'.

**BEd (Secondary) Programs**

• Balance of theory and practice.

• Program Standard 5.2: The professional experience components are relevant to the classroom environment, c) are as diverse as practicable [and] d) provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to observe and participate purposefully in a school/site as early as practicable in the program.

**MTeach (Primary) Programs**

• There is a balance of theory and practice. Final year pre-service teachers are expected to be in schools for observation and planning from the beginning of the school year to experience setting up a classroom, establish relationships, and learn about students' needs, school and class context etc. Academic topics are programmed to align and connect to the school practicums.

• Maximise student learning in coursework and practical contexts.

**MTeach (Secondary) Programs**
• Timing is a function of whether students are undertaking a fast- or standard-track. All pracs are timed for logistical reasons, i.e. a function of the university calendar, school terms and school holidays. The subject sequence is designed to enable theory to be learned then practice.

• To provide students with a range of experiences over the school calendar. Students have studied subjects that provide the required knowledge and skills to deliver the syllabus content. Sequential knowledge and skill development culminating in capacity to meet graduate teacher standards. Practicalities of synergies with the academic calendar

• Placements are undertaken after Pedagogy, Curriculum and Classroom/Behaviour Management courses are completed Professional Preparation allows for reflection on 1st placement to inform second return after moves into research phase of program, working from practice experience to inform research.

• The design integrates course work and practice within a clinical teacher education program.

• The first placement unit: [Provides] an orientation to the profession and to teaching professionalism. Focus on developing understanding of how pedagogical theory works in practice, relationships with learners, observing learning, getting to know and working with learners, teaching part-lessons and small groups, getting to know the school and how it works, developing collegial relationships with mentor and other school staff. Placed in first trimester of program, in order for pre-service teachers to have an early 10-day school-based experience, alongside first curriculum units and core units which assist them to begin to develop an understanding of diverse pedagogies, the teaching profession, students and schools in their connections to community, and wider critical issues in contemporary education.

• The second placement unit: Focus on extending experience in teaching practice, including planning, teaching and assessment of learning sequences, and critical reflection on these. Placed in second trimester of program, alongside curriculum units and core units which support and develop the above aspects of practice, with an emphasis on developing understanding of learner diversity and the implications of this for teaching practice.

• Third placement unit: Focus on continuing to extend teaching experience, including a capstone task which requires school contextual research, getting to know learners, planning, teaching and assessing a lesson sequence in one method, and critical reflection on this process as a whole. Focus on capacity building, i.e. developing pre-service teachers sense of critical issues in pedagogy and education and of their unique contribution to the profession,
articulating a personal viewpoint on the significance of relationships with learners and colleagues. Placed in last or second to last trimester of program, functioning as a capstone unit, drawing the components of the program together and moving the pre-service teachers towards readiness to join the profession. (MTeach (Secondary)).

**Alternative Professional Experience Placement Options**

Participants were asked to identify alternative placement options available to pre-service teachers in the program. These typically took the form of unique placement arrangements being made for pre-service teachers to undertake professional experience beyond the local area in distant locations and/or involve additional days (e.g., rural, remote, extended, interstate and/or international placements). Participants were asked to specify the year level when these were offered, how pre-service teachers were selected and if financial support is available.

**BEd (Primary) Programs**

Six survey respondents reported details about alternative professional experience placement options in their BEd (Primary) program. Two respondents did not complete this section of the survey. The details are outlined in Table 1.8.

Five of the six programs specified that pre-service teachers could choose to undertake their professional experience placements in rural locations. Four of the six programs specified that pre-service teachers could choose to undertake their professional experience placements in international schools. Three of the six programs specified that pre-service teachers could choose to undertake their professional experience in remote locations. Two of the six programs specified that pre-service teachers could choose to undertake their professional experience placements interstate.

In all six programs, these alternative options were offered in Years 2, 3 and/or 4. Pre-service teachers self-selected, requested or expressed interest in the placement option. In many cases the request was considered based on previous professional experience documentation.

Five out of the six institutions identified financial support was available either through internal or external sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEd (Primary)</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Selection process</th>
<th>No. of pre-service teachers &amp; schools in 2016</th>
<th>Financial Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>Rural, regional, international</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>By request and prior placement performance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes. Rural scholarships from the Victorian Department of Education. International funding available via the New Columbo Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>Rural, remote &amp; interstate</td>
<td>Year 2, 3</td>
<td>By application and previous placement reports</td>
<td>80 schools</td>
<td>Yes. Teachers Mutual Bank and Education Queensland provides funding for rural and remote placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>Rural &amp; remote</td>
<td>Year 3, 4</td>
<td>Upon request</td>
<td>15 pre-service teachers in 10 schools</td>
<td>$2000. Source not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>Rural &amp; interstate</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Self-selected</td>
<td>70 pre-service teachers in 10 schools</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Year 3, 4</td>
<td>Self-selected</td>
<td>15 pre-service teachers in 2 schools</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution F</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Interview &amp; written submission</td>
<td>&gt;100 pre-service teachers in 20 schools</td>
<td>Varies annually and can be up to $1500. Source not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution H</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Year 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Expression of interest</td>
<td>80 pre-service teachers in 20 schools</td>
<td>Yes. Internal school based scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>Year 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Expression of interest</td>
<td>15 pre-service teachers in 5 schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Year 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Expression of interest</td>
<td>20 pre-service teachers in 4 schools</td>
<td>Yes. New Columbo Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**BEd (Secondary) Programs**

All three BEd (Secondary) programs offered optional professional experience placements in rural and remote locations. Only one of these programs identified that financial support was available. Two programs offered international placement options. See Table 1.9.

**Table 1.9: Professional experience options in BEd (Secondary) programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Selection process</th>
<th>No. of pre-service teachers &amp; schools in 2016</th>
<th>Financial Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>Rural &amp; remote</td>
<td>Year 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Self-nomination</td>
<td>16 pre-service teachers in 10 schools</td>
<td>Yes. Department of Education Western Australia. Amount dependent on location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>Rural &amp; remote</td>
<td>Years 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Self-nomination and interview</td>
<td>2 pre-service teachers in 2 schools</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Years 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Elite athlete</td>
<td>1 student in 1 school</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>Rural &amp; remote</td>
<td>Years 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Self-nomination</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Years 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Study Abroad or international student</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MTeach (Primary) Programs**

Two MTeach (Primary) programs identified that pre-service teachers could choose to undertake a professional experience placement over an extended period. In institution A, pre-service teachers could choose to complete the required 65 days by attending schools on a part-time basis of two days per week across a semester or a year. In institution B, the extended option enabled pre-service teachers to undertake an additional 10 days (five days per week for two weeks).

Institution A also offered an international placement and Institution B offered a remote placement in the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands. In both programs, pre-service teachers expressed interest in the professional experience options and this was evaluated before approval was given. See Table 1.10.
### Table 1.10: Professional experience options in MTeach (Primary) programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTeach (Primary)</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Selection process</th>
<th>No. of pre-service teachers &amp; schools in 2016</th>
<th>Financial Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>Embedded placement (2-days per week for 1 semester or a year)</td>
<td>Year 1, 2</td>
<td>Expression of interest and academic performance</td>
<td>20 pre-service teachers in 6 schools</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Year 1 (second placement)</td>
<td>Expression of interest &amp; placement records</td>
<td>10 pre-service teachers in 4 schools</td>
<td>Yes. May be eligible for an Endeavour Grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>Extended rural and metropolitan (5-days per week for 10-weeks)</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Expression of interest, interview and academic record</td>
<td>10 pre-service teachers in 10 schools</td>
<td>Yes. Limited funding is available. Allocations from $1000-4000 depending on location and student’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote (APY Lands)</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Expression of interest and academic performance. Undertook APY Lands field trip in Year 1 and approved by the community.</td>
<td>1 student in 1 school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MTeach (Secondary) Programs**

Three MTeach (Secondary) programs identified that pre-service teachers could choose to undertake an alternative professional experience placement. One respondent did not complete this survey question.

Of note was Institution A offering pre-service teachers an extended 50-day internship placement in addition to the required minimum 60-day placement. This institution also offered two pre-service teachers the opportunity for an interstate placement in one school in the Northern Territory. Institution B offered rural and interstate placements for the first time in 2017. Institution C offered rural, regional and ‘place-based’ elective placement options but no pre-service teachers undertook these. Financial support was identified or planned for the three programs reported. See Table 1.11.
Table 1.11: Professional experience options in MTeach (Secondary) programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTeach (Secondary)</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Selection process</th>
<th>No. of pre-service teachers &amp; schools in 2016</th>
<th>Financial Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>Internship (an additional 50-day placement over 10-weeks on a fulltime basis). Worth 4-credit points.</td>
<td>Year 2 after completion of the required minimum 60 days of placement.</td>
<td>Written application, interview and previous placement records.</td>
<td>24 pre-service teachers in 20 schools</td>
<td>Yes. Rural scholarships from the Victorian Department of Education through The Student Teacher Rural Practicum Placement program provides an incentive valued at $60 per day for pre-service teachers. They can also apply for a University Work Integrated Learning (WIL) Grant of $150 and a limited number of $1500 scholarships from the Australian Collaborative Education Network (ACEN) that supports remote and regional WIL programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Territory Global Experience Program</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Written application and interview.</td>
<td>Many applicants but only 2 selected for 1 school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Year 1 (20-day and 45-day placements)</td>
<td>Self-nomination</td>
<td>New in 2017 16 pre-service teachers in 6 schools</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Year 1 (20-day and 45-day placements)</td>
<td>Self-nomination</td>
<td>New in 2017 1 student in 1 school</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>Rural and Regional</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes for 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place based Elective</td>
<td>Year 2 (coursework pathway)</td>
<td>Self-nomination and academic performance</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Outcomes of Professional Experience Placements and Assessment, Feedback and Reporting of Pre-service Teachers’ Development Towards the Graduate Teacher Standards

BEd (Primary) Programs

Six of the eight BEd (Primary) programs reported details of the aims or learning outcomes of professional experience placements, courses and the assessment, feedback and reporting of pre-service teachers’ development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards. All programs described a unique relationship between these components.

Five of the six programs described a clear structure underpinning the program that connected coursework and professional practice by providing pre-service teachers with opportunities to progress from a broad orientation to teaching and examination of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. These led to the final placement in which pre-service teachers demonstrate achievement of the Graduate Teacher Standards and prepared for their transition into the profession.

Specifically, Institution E described strong connections between seven courses focused on a combination of broad professional experience and specific English, Science, Mathematics and the Arts methodology outcomes. Institution A, identified strong connections between six professional experience courses focused on a combination of broad professional experience and specific ICT, numeracy and literacy outcomes. Institution F described a sequence of six comprehensive professional experience courses. Institution B described a sequence of three comprehensive professional experience courses. Institution D also described three professional experience courses that took place in the last two years of the program.

It was noteworthy that Institution C appeared to require pre-service teachers to demonstrate achievement aligned with the Graduate Teacher Standards as learning outcomes starting from the first-year 10-day professional experience placement in Term 2.

The following sections present a summary for each institution.
Institution A

There are six professional experience courses identified in the program that connect content and assessment with professional practice. The description of these courses indicates a progression from a broad orientation to teaching, to a specific focus on Information Communication and Technology (ICT) with early literacy and numeracy that culminates in an applied education project to demonstrate achievement of the Graduate Teacher Standards.

The two, first-year placements of 10-days each are undertaken by first-year pre-service teachers being ‘buddied’ together in the same school setting. During the 20-day placement in the second year, pre-service teachers critically examine the role of educational technologies and develop strategies for using ICT in a safe, responsible and ethical way in the classroom. The aim of the first 15-day placement in Year 3 is for pre-service teachers to learn how literacy is developed in the early years of schooling by conducting a case study of one learner. They explore the components of language and literacy (listening, speaking, reading, writing and viewing). The aim of the second 15-day placement in Year 3 is for pre-service teachers to apply the conceptually-rich, strategy-driven approach to the teaching and learning of number in primary schools. In the Year 4 placement the focus is on examining student’s strengths and weaknesses based on previous placements, which forms the basis of an applied education project.

Institution A identifies the following learning outcomes for the six professional experience courses:

**Year 1: Orientation to Teaching (10 days)**

- Describe ways to engage professionally in an educational setting with colleagues
- Describe characteristics of supportive and safe learning environments
- Observe, record and discuss planned and incidental teaching, observations of teachers, students and wider school matters
- Draw upon theory to critique and analyse your observations of learning and schooling environments
- Demonstrate an awareness of the role of a student teacher within schools
- Develop reflective practice skills that inform curriculum design, planning, assessment and your belief about teaching and learning.

**Year 1: Educational Settings and Society (10 days)**
• Engage professionally in an education setting with colleagues, parents, carers and the community
• Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments
• Consolidate knowledge about how social and cultural contexts impact on children and children’s learning, and how social and cultural contexts shape your own teaching
• Discuss the impact of culture and cultural identity on the education of students from diverse cultural backgrounds, including Asian and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples
• Draw upon a range of resources including ICT to implement creative, inclusive, engaging and challenging learning and teaching activities.

**Year 2: Connected Classrooms (20 days)**

• Apply initiative and judgment in planning, problem solving and decision making to enhance your practice and continuing professional development
• Work with others in a range of roles and contexts, demonstrating cultural, environmental and social awareness and ethical and reflective practice
• Critically analyse, synthesise and reflect on educational policy and practice in both local and international contexts
• Communicate using a range of formats and strategies to audiences within and external to the discipline of education.

**Year 3: Early Literacy (15 days)**

• Engage professionally in an education setting with colleagues, parents, carers and the community
• Apply strategies to create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments
• Critically analyse the development of oral language, reading and writing to maximise literacy learning practices
• Redesign and develop literacy teaching strategies, curriculum materials and assessment practices appropriate to a variety of early years context
• Observe, record, analyse and report information on a literacy learner
• Incorporate effective and strategic Information Communication Technology (ICT) with a critical awareness of its impact
• Engage in personal professional literacy learning in relation to literacy issues, with particular emphasis on locating and evaluating appropriate contemporary academic research.
Year 3: Developing a Sense of Number (15 days)

• Engage with diverse learners in a range of educational contexts in order to develop skills and knowledge for flexible and adaptable participation in professional communities of practice.
• Develop and apply theoretical and practical knowledge and skills to your professional practice and development in curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.
• Demonstrate creativity, critical thinking and innovation when identifying and solving problems in diverse educational contexts.
• Work with others in a range of roles and contexts, demonstrating cultural, environmental and social awareness and ethical and reflective practice.
• Apply initiative and judgement in planning, problem solving and decision making to enhance your practice and continuing professional development.

Year 4: Applied Education Project (30 days)

• Engage professionally in an education setting with colleagues, students, parents, carers and the community
• Reflect upon your professional knowledge and identify your professional learning needs and interests in education in relation to the relevant professional standards
• Further develop your interpersonal and negotiation skills and your capacity to work collaboratively with education professionals on a specific task
• Demonstrate skills in project design and management, negotiation, product presentation and reporting
• Reflect on your role as researcher, partnership builder, innovator and/or educational leader.

Institution A did not specify if pre-service teachers were required to collect and document any particular items related to their development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards before, during or after each placement. No specific processes were identified for providing pre-service teachers with feedback on their development. Pre-service teachers' teaching performance is assessed against a short version of the Standards and pre-service teachers received a grade using the same grading system as other courses (i.e., HD, D, C, P, F). The mentor-teacher determines the assessment for each placement and the university has responsibility for the final decision.
**Institution B**

Professional experience placements for institution B comprise a five-week block placement in Years 2, 3 and 4. In the final year pre-service teachers also complete an additional five-day immersion in Term 1. The aims of the first professional experience placement are to introduce pre-service teachers to teaching contexts and assist them to develop relationships, plan and implement successful lessons. In the second placement, the focus is on effective teaching, the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers, differentiation and meeting the needs of students from varying backgrounds and learning needs. In the final placement, the aim is to support pre-service teachers to understand the importance of assessment (diagnostic, formative and summative) and how this informs practice. Pre-service teachers design summative tasks, engage in moderation activities and make judgments.

Institution B identifies the following learning outcomes for the three professional experience units:

**Year 2: Professional Experience 1: Becoming a Teacher (20 days)**

- Identify and apply skills and strategies associated with effective classroom practice
- Work collaboratively and professionally with peers, tutors and mentors
- Link theory to practice by planning, implementing and evaluating teaching and learning experiences
- Construct detailed planning documents including focused teaching episodes, lesson plans, assessment and evaluation strategies, using the template/s provided
- Reflect upon their growth in professional practice and knowledge through their commitment to and engagement with the unit content and associated school-based activities
- Analyse policy documents and procedures with which teachers need to comply, including child protection legislation, teacher duty-of-care and code of conduct obligations

**Year 3: Professional Experience 2: Effective Teaching (20 days)**

- Identify relevant research that underpins models of effective teaching
- Plan and implement lessons using the NSW Quality Teaching Framework
- Develop learning experiences and, in consultation with a mentor-teacher, classroom policies that promote intellectual quality, the significance of the learning and the quality of the learning environment
- Develop lesson plans across the key learning areas suitable to the diversity of the students in the
• Create materials suitable for supporting teaching and professional development
• Work towards creating a safe and supportive learning environment having regard to child protection legislation, workplace health and safety, and duty of care
• Reflect critically and creatively on teaching practices, drawing on classroom experiences of student learning.

**Year 4: Professional Experience 2: Transition to the Profession (30 days)**

• Work effectively in a learning community that seeks to meet the specific learning needs of students from diverse backgrounds and across a wide range of abilities
• Practise strategies of providing feedback to students about their learning and performance against the standards
• Consider data collection and evaluation to inform planning for teaching; critically review teaching and students’ learning as a way to improve student outcomes
• Analyse and evaluate the range of contexts for teaching, considering the needs of students in the preparation of learning sequences and assessment strategies
• Reflect critically and creatively on teaching practices, drawing on classroom experiences of student learning
• Articulate knowledgeably the importance of polices and guidelines on child protection, health and safety, and professional codes of conduct
• Create a safe and supportive learning environment having regard to child protection legislation, workplace health and safety, and duty of care
• Apply competently the Australian Professional Standards for Graduate Teachers.

Institution B reports that pre-service teachers are expected to gather evidence of their practice against the Standards during the first two placements. Pre-service teachers also write context descriptions, a class profiles and identify their professional experience goals. In addition to the professional experience placements, pre-service teachers also receive regular feedback on their development towards the Graduate Level Standards throughout their coursework.

The mentor-teacher provides written feedback to pre-service teachers for one lesson per day and provides an interim and final report. If a pre-service teacher is identified as at risk, they are provided with a
developmental support plan that the mentor-teacher writes in consultation with the university advisor. On the final report, professional experience placements are assessed against the Australian Professional Standards. The mentor-teacher discusses the pre-service teacher’s progress with the university advisor and then most often the final assessment decision is made in agreement. The professional experience placements are assessed using a satisfactory or not satisfactory grade.

**Institution C**

There are four professional experience placements in the BEd (Primary) program offered by Institution C and these take place in Years 1, 2, 3 and 4. In the first year 10-day placement, pre-service teachers are required to plan and implement a minimum of one lesson and may undertake the placement in pairs. In the second and third year 20-day placements, pre-service teachers write learning reflections and prepare a mini-portfolio.

The learning outcomes of each placement are identified below. It is noteworthy that these appear similar to the Graduate Teacher Standards, even in Year 1 (when pre-service teachers can be placed in Term 2). They appear to require a higher level of achievement for pre-service teachers with the need to ‘apply knowledge' when Graduate Teacher Standards typically state that pre-service teachers are required to ‘demonstrate knowledge'. Some outcomes are also repeated across year levels. For example, the identical ICT outcome is identified for each placement.

**Year 1 (10-days: one-day per week; two x two days per week and five days for one week).**

- Identify relevant research that underpins models of effective teaching
- Begin to plan lessons using lesson planning framework or structures
- Apply knowledge of research into how students learn and the implications for teaching
- Seek and apply constructive feedback from mentors and colleagues to improve teaching and learning practice
- Apply knowledge of a range of resources including ICT that engage students in their learning
- Demonstrate an understanding of the role of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers by beginning to collect supporting evidence and reflecting upon own practices.

**Year 2 (20 days: one-day per week; two x two days per week and five days for three weeks).**

- Plan lesson sequences using knowledge of student and own learning practice, and organise
content into an effective teaching and learning sequence

- Use curriculum assessment and reporting knowledge to design learning sequences and provide timely and appropriate feedback to students and relevant stakeholders, with an understanding of families, peers, media and educational settings
- Apply knowledge of assessment strategies and moderation; how to evaluate student assessment data and the importance of keeping accurate student records
- Apply knowledge of a range of resources including ICT that engage students in their learning
- Understand the relevant policies and processes required for teachers according to school stage, and apply codes of ethics and conduct applicable to the teaching profession
- Collect supporting evidence and reflect upon one's own practices in relation to Australian Professional Standards for Teachers.

**Year 3 (20 days: one day per week; two x two days per week and five days for three weeks).**

- Plan lesson sequences using knowledge of student and own learning practice, and organise content into an effective teaching and learning sequence
- Use curriculum assessment and reporting knowledge to design learning sequences and provide timely and appropriate feedback to students and relevant stakeholders, with an understanding of families, peers, media and educational settings
- Demonstrate an understanding of assessment strategies and moderation; how to evaluate student assessment data and the importance of keeping accurate student records
- Demonstrate knowledge of a range of resources including ICT that engage students in their learning
- Understand the relevant policies and processes required for teachers according to school stage, and apply codes of ethics and conduct applicable to the teaching profession
- Demonstrate an understanding of the role of the National Professional Standards for teachers by beginning to collect supporting evidence and reflecting upon own practices.

**Year 4 (50 days extended sustained block)**

- Plan lesson sequences /units of work using knowledge of student and own learning practice
- Construct a rationale for continued professional learning and the implications for improved student learning
- Apply knowledge of a range of resources including ICT that engage students in their learning
• Engage with professional networks and the broader community and apply to improve student outcomes
• Collect supporting evidence and reflect upon one's own practices in relation to Australian Professional Standards for Teachers.

Institution C reports that supervising teachers are asked to provide constructive feedback to pre-service teachers throughout the placement period. At the interim of the placement period, supervising teachers use provided guidelines mapped to the relevant Australian Professional Standards for Teachers to determine if pre-service teachers are progressing as expected. Further details were not provided. Supervising teachers, in conjunction with university staff, determine the final assessment grade. The supervising teacher provides an evaluation report directly to the university and supplies a copy to the pre-service teacher. A final Pass Ungraded grade is identified for pre-service teachers demonstrating a satisfactory level of achievement.

Pre-service teachers are asked to collect supporting documentation and assessment paperwork from their supervising teachers. Pre-service teachers are encouraged to collect evidence that aligns to the Graduate Teacher Standard across the four years of the program. The evidence can be incorporated into a rich and final portfolio.

**Institution D**
Institution D does not offer a professional experience placement in the first year or second years of the program. Some pre-service teachers are placed in pairs for the 20-day third year professional experience.

The aims or learning outcomes of the professional experience placements were not specified. In the third-year placement, pre-service teachers are required to work in a school under the guidance of a supervising teacher implementing the strategies and techniques being developed concurrently in the primary 300-level methodology units. In the final year, pre-service teachers are required to work in a school under the guidance of a supervising teacher. They must implement strategies and techniques being studied concurrently in the 400-level professional units in which they are enrolled.

Institution D reports that there are no specific assessment tasks identified for the professional experience units. Pre-service teachers are not expected to collect or document specific items before or during placement.
Supervising teachers are encouraged to provide pre-service teachers with lesson observation feedback and complete a register of attendance and a final evaluation report. The final report for each professional experience requires supervising teachers to indicate if pre-service teachers have not demonstrated, have demonstrated or have exceeded expectations in relation to each Focus Area of the Graduate Teacher Standards. An evidence guide is provided to assist in determining if the practices have demonstrated that the pre-service teacher is either engaging with the Standard or demonstrating its achievement. The final assessment is determined by the supervising teacher. The university advisor and the supervising teacher have responsibility for the final decision. The final grade is either a Pass or Fail. At the end of the placement, pre-service teachers are required to reflect and self-assess their progress towards the Graduate Teacher Standards based on a similar report completed by the supervising teacher.

Institution E

Institution E offers professional experience placements in the first, third and final years of the program. The first year provides opportunities for pre-service teachers to observe a variety of teachers and other school personnel. Throughout Terms 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the third year, pre-service teachers are placed in groups of three to complete four, school-based clinics involving 40-days as four school-based clinics in the year (as two x five-day blocks; a 10-day block, and four x half-day visits per week over ten weeks).

The aims of the first-year placement are to develop and utilise the skills of observation and reflection to analyse and interpret the many facets of educational workers and their workplace. The learning outcomes of the third-year professional experience unit in Semester 1 are that pre-service teachers will be able to:

- Critically analyse contested understandings of curriculum
- Account for the influence of social and political considerations upon curriculum
- Understand and apply principles of curriculum in designing lessons
- Understand and apply a knowledge of their students and school context in designing lessons.

The learning outcomes of the third-year professional practice unit in Semester 2 (10 days) are that students will be able to:

- Analyse and design learning area specific assessment strategies (informal, formal, diagnostic, formative and summative) to inform future teaching
- Design learning area specific quality outcomes and directions for a unit of work that aligns with Australian curricula and utilises elements of quality pedagogy
• Interpret student assessment data to evaluate student learning and modify teaching practice;
• Demonstrate use of principles for effective feedback
• Use their knowledge of at least one context, describe strategies used for reporting to students and parents/care givers and the purpose of keeping accurate and reliable records of student achievement
• Demonstrate, within a classroom context, macro and micro planning of learning experiences using knowledge of content, the teaching and learning cycle, and effective teaching strategies.

In addition to the two professional experience units in the third year, four PCK units are undertaken concurrently throughout the third year. The aims of these are for pre-service teachers to:

• Examine the Australian English curriculum and explore, design, demonstrate and evaluate practices for teaching, assessing and promoting children's literacy development
• Explore a range of science concepts; recognise the importance of science specific pedagogy; and, identify opportunities for creative integration of science learning activities when programming
• Select and apply appropriate pedagogical practice to help children make sense of mathematics; and design, deliver and assess a series of mathematical learning experiences for students
• Develop a range of skills in the teaching of the arts to young children. Utilise a range of established arts teaching methodologies and reflection on these experiences to allow development of personal pedagogic frameworks.

The learning outcomes of the final year professional experience are that pre-service teachers will demonstrate:

• Skills in identifying their own professional learning needs
• Learning about the benefits of professional learning and the identification of sources of development in the wider learning community
• Understanding of their legal and ethical responsibilities as a teacher
• Strategies for balancing their school/home responsibilities in productive ways
• Understanding of professional engagement with colleagues, students and the wider community.

Institution E reports that pre-service teachers are required to complete specific assessment tasks for each placement, which are graded by academic staff. These include lesson plans, ePortfolios, situational analysis
and case-based teaching scenarios. In addition, pre-service teachers are also required to reflect on their placement as part of the interim and final reports.

Supervising teachers complete the interim and final report and these are aligned with the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. A Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory assessment of the professional experience is determined by negotiation between the supervising teacher and the school Professional Experience Coordinator (and sometimes involves school executives). Responsibility for the final decision lies with the school Professional Experience Coordinator.
Institution F

Professional experience placements in institution F are undertaken in each year of the program. Some pre-service teachers are placed in pairs for the orientation of five days in the first year. The expectations for each year of the professional experience are:

Year 1 (five days)
- Undertake an orientation to the school environment
- Conduct and record observations of class, teacher and school routines
- Observe and analyse the nature and impact of social, cultural, religious, gender and sexuality issues in their school setting
- Attend meetings, yard duty, school activities etc.
- Supervise the work of small groups of students and work with individuals.
- Collect and analyse policy documents relating to inclusivity
- Keep a teaching resource (portfolio – electronic and/or hardcopy) in which evidence of their planning, observations, collected documents, participation in school activities and teaching reflections are kept. Pre-service teachers will be expected to share their portfolio with their supervising teachers and appropriate University teaching staff. Data collected through portfolio activities will be used in unit assessment tasks.

Year 2 (10 days)
- Observe, identify and record demonstrated features of a safe, inclusive, engaging and challenging learning environments
- Collect and analyse policy documents relating to these features
- Teach one lesson per day for a class, small groups of students or with individuals
- Attend meetings, yard duty, school activities and any opportunities for engagement with the broader school community
- Supervise the work of small groups of students and work with individuals
- Keep a teaching portfolio (electronic and/or hardcopy) in which evidence of their planning, observations, collected documents, participation in school activities and teaching reflections are kept. Pre-service teachers will be expected to share their portfolio with their supervising teachers and appropriate University teaching staff. Data collected through portfolio activities will be used in unit assessment tasks.
Year 3 (10 days, Trimester 1)

- Undertake an orientation to the school environment.
- Identify two learners to focus their attention. Follow these learners across a range of subject areas, classes and learning experiences with the purpose of drawing upon these multifaceted observations to inform their planning in collaboration with the supervisor.
- Teach two lessons a day for a class, small groups of students or with individuals.
- Attend meetings, be involved in yard duty, school activities and any opportunities for engagement with the broader school community.
- Keep a teaching portfolio (electronic and/or hardcopy) in which evidence of their planning, observations, collected documents, participation in school activities and teaching reflections are kept. Pre-service teachers will be expected to share their portfolio with their supervising teachers and appropriate University teaching staff. Data collected through portfolio activities will be used in unit assessment tasks.

Year 3 (10 days, Trimester 2)

- Undertake an orientation to the school environment.
- Design, implement and evaluate their own unit of work if appropriate and curriculum innovations.
- Teach whole class for at least two lessons per day building to one day of full control.
- Attend meetings, be involved in yard duty, school activities and any opportunities for engagement with the broader school community.
- Keep a teaching portfolio (electronic and/or hardcopy) in which evidence of their planning, observations, collected documents, participation in school activities and teaching reflections are kept. Pre-service teachers will be expected to share their portfolio with their supervising teachers and appropriate University teaching staff. Data collected through portfolio activities will be used in unit assessment tasks.

Year 4 (Part A: 10 days over three weeks and Part B: 15-day block, Trimester 1)

- Undertake an orientation to the school environment.
- Plan, incorporate and evaluate assessment principles in their pedagogical and curriculum practices.
- Part A: As determined by your supervising teacher – take advantage of as many opportunities as possible, to teach individual students, small groups and whole class, given the restrictions that occur at the beginning of the year
- Part B: Teach whole class for at least two lessons a day leading to teaching at least 3 whole days attend meetings including a School Council meeting, be involved in yard duty, school activities and any opportunities for engagement with the broader school community
- Attend and participate in parent/teacher (/student) interviews
- Keep a teaching portfolio (electronic and/or hardcopy) in which evidence of their planning, observations, collected documents, participation in school activities and teaching reflections are kept. Pre-service teachers will be expected to share their portfolio with their supervising teachers and appropriate University teaching staff. Data collected through portfolio activities will be used in unit assessment tasks.

**Year 4 (20 days sustained block, Trimester 2)**

- Plan a unit of work/whole class program using an appropriate format for extended planning as discussed with supervising teachers
- Teach whole class for at least two lessons a day leading to full control for at least 10 days straight
- Become fully involved in the life and operations of the school, as per a beginning teacher
- Attend and participate in parent/teacher (/student) interviews.

Institution F reports that pre-service teachers are required to identify their learning goals for each professional experience placement and self-assess their learning against the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers as part of each professional experience report. Pre-service teachers are also expected to collect evidence of the development towards the Graduate Level Standards throughout their coursework.

During the professional experience placements, the mentor-teacher provide pre-service teachers with feedback on their development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards. Mentor-teachers also determine if pre-service teachers are working towards, meeting, exceeding the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers in the final report. The university takes responsibility for the final decision if a student is identified by their mentor-teacher as ‘at risk’ of failure. At the conclusion of each professional experience,
pre-service teachers are expected to write a reflection and are encouraged to discuss this with their mentor-teacher.
Three BEd (Secondary) programs report details of the aims or learning outcomes of the professional experience placements courses and the assessment, feedback and reporting of pre-service teachers’ development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards. All describe a unique relationship between these components.

All three programs describe how the professional experience courses provide pre-service teachers with opportunities to critically reflect on the constructions of effective teaching, develop their expertise in planning and delivering effective teaching and learning, and demonstrate their readiness to transition to the profession. Institution A identifies three professional experience courses totalling 90 placement days; Institution B identifies four courses totalling 85 placement days; and Institution C identifies six courses totalling 100 placement days.

The following sections presents a summary for each institution.

**Institution A**

There are three professional experience courses identified in the program and these occur in second, third and the final year. The first (11-week, 15 credit point) Integrated professional practice unit, which comprises three weeks in schools and eight weeks on campus, is intended as an orientation practicum. It provides pre-service teachers with the opportunity to develop an understanding of schools and schooling from a teacher’s perspective, to start to learn the complex role of a teacher, and to critically reflect and prepare for future practicums.

The second (five-week, 15 credit point) professional practice unit is intended to provide pre-service teachers with the opportunity to work with school students over an extended period of time. Pre-service teachers have the opportunity to work with mentor teachers and their classes, to learn and practice essential teaching skills and critically evaluate and reflect on their own experiences. Typically, pre-service teachers will teach in both major and minor areas during this professional practice period. The final (10-week, 45 credit point) integrated unit prepares pre-service teachers for the Assistant Teacher Program (ATP), an extended professional practice placement in a secondary school lasting for a full school term. In most instances, Assistant Teachers will teach in their major and minor teaching areas.
The learning outcomes for each placement are:

**Year 2 (15-day block)**

On completion of this unit, pre-service teachers should have:
- Achieved a satisfactory level for a first period of Professional Practice, as outlined in the Guidelines
- Completed the minimum requirements in respect of observation, participation and teaching, as outlined in the Professional Practice Guidelines, or as negotiated with the mentor-teacher
- Completed the two structured self-evaluations.

**Year 3 (25-day block)**

On completion of this unit, pre-service teachers should have demonstrated evidence of:
- Assessing, providing feedback and reporting on student learning
- Creating and maintaining supportive and safe learning environments
- Engaging in professional learning
- Engaging professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community
- Knowing students and how they learn
- Knowing the content and how to teach it
- Planning and implementing effective teaching and learning
- Professionalism.

**Year 4 (50-days)**

On completion of this unit, pre-service teachers should have:
- Achieved a competent level in each of the strands in Professional Development
- Achieved a competent level in each of the strands in Teaching Skills
- Completed the minimum work requirements as outlined in the Professional Practice Guidelines.

Pre-service teachers are required to complete two structured self-evaluations as part of the first placement. Pre-service teachers receive daily feedback on their development from their mentor-teacher. They also receive feedback on three occasions from the university supervisor.
Pre-service teachers are assessed on their development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards using an evaluation form specific to each placement completed by the mentor-teacher in consultation with the university supervisor. To pass the placement, pre-service teachers are required to demonstrate achievement in all of the seven standards and an eighth additional category related to professional requirements at a level of satisfactory achievement commensurate with their experience. In the first two placements, the pre-service teachers’ overall achievement is assessed as either Outstanding, Highly Competent, Competent or Fail and they receive an overall grade of a Pass or Fail. In the final placement, pre-service teachers’ overall achievement is assessed as either Outstanding Graduate, Highly Competent Graduate, Graduate or Fail. The Coordinator of the practicum unit determines the final assessment which is reported using a grading scheme for practice-based units (i.e. HD, DN, CR, P, F).

The evaluation forms for each placement are similar, based on the seven Graduate Teacher Standards as well as an additional section listing the professional requirements identified by the university. Each standard is comprised of multiple descriptors. The descriptors for the first seven standards have been adapted from the Focus Areas from the Graduate Teacher Standards. Specifically, each descriptor suggests what each Focus Area may look like in practice. This means that pre-service teachers are not required to simply demonstrate general knowledge and understanding aligned with each the Graduate Teacher Standard Focus Area, as they need to apply this knowledge to the context in which they are placed. The modification of the descriptors in this way would help mentor-teachers to recognise each assessment item.

The development of the evaluation forms is recent and the Strands mentioned in the learning outcomes for year 4 (above) appear to refer to the AITSL Standards. There are two notable omissions from the evaluation forms. The first is a descriptor related to Focus Area 1.2: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of research into how pre-service teachers learn and the implications for teaching. The second is Focus Area 7.4: Understand the role of external professionals and community representatives in broadening teachers’ knowledge and practice.
Institution B

There are four professional experience courses identified in the program. The first 10-day (one-day per week) placement takes place in the first semester of the second year. Pre-service teachers, who are placed in groups of six to ten in one school, complete peer assessments. The aim of this placement is to introduce pre-service teachers to the practical considerations of teaching in a primary school environment and provide the opportunity to apply theory to practice. A second placement of 15-days occurs in second semester of the same year. The aim of the second placement is to reinforce and consolidate pre-service teachers’ working knowledge of the practical considerations of teaching in a secondary school environment with a focus on PDHPE. A 20-day placement occurs in Year 3 and a 40-day placement in the final year.

The learning outcomes for each placement are identified below. At the completion of the course, pre-service teachers will be able to:

Year 2 (10-days, semester 1)

- Build awareness of the primary classroom
- Deepen understanding of children and how they learn
- Recognise and implement a variety of teaching strategies
- Develop basic teaching skills (voice projection, feedback, task setting, questioning, behaviour and classroom management)
- Prepare and implement creative and effective lesson plans in accordance with K-6 curriculum for part and whole lessons
- Use communication to build, enhance and maintain rapport with students in order to establish a positive learning environment
- Implement effective classroom management techniques in accordance with school policy for the duration of a lesson
- Explore own ideas of self as teacher
- Identify constructions of the ‘good teacher’ and the ‘good student’ in particular contexts
- Demonstrate an understanding of professional conduct and ethics.

Year 2 (15-days, semester 2)

- Plan and prepare for specific groups of students
Refine basic teaching skills (such as explanation, demonstration, reinforcement, questioning, discussion and problem solving)

Develop ability to reflect on own performance and evaluate self and students

Develop awareness that knowledge is socially constructed and that there is a clear link between theory and practice

Reflect critically on your own performance and show knowledge of self

Implement effective classroom management strategies and techniques (in accordance with school policy) to create learning environments that encourage positive social interaction and active engagement in learning

Display professional conduct of the highest standard in interactions with school communities, recognising the importance of courtesy, punctuality and cooperation when working as part of a team.

Year 3 (20 days) and Year 4 (40 days)

Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of curriculum content, ICT skills and pedagogy related to Year 7 – 12 Dance and PDHPE syllabus

Demonstrate a wide variety of strategies of adapting lessons in the light of student background, literacy levels, prior knowledge, stage of development and varied learning styles

Demonstrate competence and expertise in planning and implementing sequences of lessons using appropriate content, assessment strategies and effective use and organisation of resources and equipment

Develop knowledge of reporting requirements and procedures

Demonstrate a wide variety of effective communication skills to establish and maintain a positive learning environment

Implement a wide range of effective classroom management techniques to create safe and supportive learning environments where learning is valued

Demonstrate an ability to critically reflect and evaluate (verbally and in writing) their teaching performance in relation to the Professional Teaching standards

Contribute to a professional community through professional development and extra–curricular activities

Interact with the broader professional and school community as required

Demonstrate a sound understanding of the professionalism required of teachers especially in
relation to the school community.

Pre-service teachers are expected to collect and document artefacts before, during and after each professional experience. For example: school policies and procedures, relevant syllabus documents, lesson plans, self-assessment reflections, evidence/artefacts for Graduate Standard ePortfolio, lesson self-evaluations, supervising teacher lesson observation and feedback sheets and record of completed days.

Supervising teachers are required to provide pre-service teachers with comments on lesson observation and feedback sheets as well as complete the interim, final, and non-academic attributes reports. The supervising teacher determines the final assessment for each placement based on a Satisfactory or Non-satisfactory grade. The school supervisor, tertiary supervisor and Head of Departments have the final responsibility for the classification of the final grade.

Institution B reports that pre-service teachers receive feedback on their development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards through the professional experience placements and are expected to respond to feedback in subsequent lesson demonstrations.

**Institution C**

There are six professional experience courses that take place each year of the program. These are designed to introduce pre-service teachers to the foundations of curriculum and pedagogy; explore issues specific to the middle year of schooling; provide opportunities to develop their expertise in planning and delivering effective teaching and learning; employ a range of teaching, learning and assessment strategies and resources in ICT-enriched environments; plan, implement, assess and reflect on units of work; and undertake the duties of a teacher with minimal supervision.

The first course includes an embedded 10-day placement and focuses on developing pre-service teachers beginning understanding of curriculum and pedagogy and how educators might create relevant and meaningful teaching to enhance student learning in a range of educational settings. Pre-service educators are introduced to selected theories of curriculum and (at times contested) notions of pedagogy. The basics of curriculum planning and pedagogical practice across a variety of learning contexts and curriculum areas are also introduced. Pre-service teachers reflect on their past experiences and current knowledge in relation to their practical experience in schools or other learning and teaching contexts.
Two professional experience courses take place in the second year and each includes an embedded 15-day placement in schools. The first of these provides the opportunity for pre-service teachers to explore a range of issues in the middle years of schooling. They develop understanding strategies for teaching in this area and design authentic learning experiences for pre-service teachers. The second course provides pre-service teachers with an opportunity to play an active role in the construction of their own pedagogical practice and the development of professional expertise in planning and delivering effective teaching and learning. Through a range of activities, the course aims to develop pre-service teachers’ general pedagogical knowledge, curriculum knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge.

In the third year, pre-service teachers undertake a fourth professional experience course and this includes another embedded 15-day placement. This course engages pre-service teachers in the design and delivery of learning experiences for individuals and groups employing a range of developmentally appropriate and flexible teaching, learning and assessment strategies and resources in ICT enriched environments. Resources developed throughout the course may be selected by pre-service teachers for inclusion in their digital portfolios, which they will create throughout the program as evidence of their learning.

There are two professional experience courses in the final year. A 25-day placement is embedded in the first course. This placement requires pre-service teachers to plan, implement, assess and reflect on units of work and attend to the daily administrative and professional requirements of an educator. Pre-service teachers play an active role in the construction of their own practical theories and they question, criticise and reformulate their assumptions about the nature of educators’ work.

The final placement is a 20-day internship in which the pre-service teacher takes responsibility for planning and teaching a maximum of 50% of the mentor’s full-time teaching load. For the remainder of the time, the intern engages in teaching or other class related activities working with, and under the guidance and supervision of, the mentor-teacher. The internship is an opportunity for the pre-service teacher to undertake the duties of a teacher with minimal supervision. It is also an opportunity for the intern to demonstrate their competence in aspects of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers and ready themselves for the full implications of beginning teaching.
Pre-service teachers are required to collect and document a range of artefacts before during and after each professional experience placement. For example, lesson feedback, observations, interim and final reports, ICT Statement, and items that may be useful for their ePortfolio, course assessment or resume.

The final assessment is based on a Pass or Fail grade which is determined by the site coordinator and the university Professional Experience Director. Institution C did not specify how pre-service teachers receive feedback on their development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards other than to report that this occurred throughout the program. It was noteworthy that pre-service teachers have opportunities for consecutive placements to return to the same site in the second semester so that they can build on the feedback they received from Semester 1. Pre-service teachers choosing this option would still experience placements in four schools.

**MTeach (Primary) programs**

Two MTeach (Primary) programs reported details about the learning outcomes and the assessment, feedback and reporting of pre-service teachers’ development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards. Both institutions adopted a unique approach. Institution A described how the placement days were embedded as part of two courses (*Primary English* and *Managing Learning Environments*) as well as a revised final placement course focused on demonstrating achievement of the Graduate Teacher Standards. Institution B described how pre-service teachers prepared for their first placement by undertaking a compulsory 0-unit lecture series and then completing the required placement days as part of courses focused on professional experience. Institution B reports using a developmental assessment rubric to assess pre-service teachers’ development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards.

The following sections present a summary for each institution.

**Institution A**

There are three professional experience courses which take place each year of the program. In the first year, pre-service teachers undertake a *Primary English* course in which they develop a firm grounding in the contemporary pedagogies required for teaching literacy, language and literature. Pre-service teachers participate in a blend of online learning experiences and school visits involving explicit observation and teaching practice, designed to expand their personal knowledge and understanding of the new literacies in
the twenty-first century. The course consists of nine online modules with activities & 15 days (five single days plus a 10-day block) school visits in an Early Years setting (preferably F-2).

Also in the first year, pre-service teachers undertake a *Managing Learning Environments* course in which they analyse the key factors in effective teaching, which include participation, engagement and inclusion. This course prepares pre-service teachers to create and maintain positive and successful learning environments that support holistic and relational wellbeing by applying research and theory. Pre-service teachers learn why it is important to have strong skills in planning, organisation and leadership and how to work collaboratively with parents/carers and community agencies. Ethical, responsive and adaptive teaching expertise is explored. Pre-service teachers learn to develop their own classroom management plan and apply the core principles of professional teacher ethical and social conduct during the placement days in schools.

From 2018, in the second year, pre-service teachers will undertake a new course for the final 30-day professional experience focus called the Graduate Outcomes Assessment. The details for this are not yet available.

The learning outcomes for the first-year courses are:

**Year 1 (Primary English – 15-days: 5 single days and a 10-day block)**
- Examine the major issues involved in the teaching of English language, literature and literacy in a primary school setting
- Examine current research and methodologies for teaching oral language, reading and writing in a digital multi-literate world
- Analyse student-writing samples in relation to Australian curriculum standards
- Plan for and implement strategies for integrating ICT into literacy curriculum activities
- Apply a wide range of literacy strategies to design curriculum for a diverse range of student needs.

**Year 1 (Managing Learning Environments – 15 days)**
- Evaluate strategies that support students’ wellbeing and safety working within school and/or system, curriculum and legislative requirements
- Analyse theories and best practice strategies to support inclusive student participation and engagement in classroom activities
• Analyse research and best practice strategies to support healthy classroom relationships which foster student agency and volitional responsibility
• Compare and critically analyse theoretical and practical approaches to managing challenging behaviour
• Explore opportunities for creating and sustaining positive, safe learning environments in collaboration with parents, carers and community agencies
• Understand and apply the core principles of professional teacher ethical and social conduct.

Institution A did not provide details of the assessment, feedback and reporting of pre-service teachers’ development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards.
Institution B

The professional experience courses in institution B commence with a 0-unit professional experience lecture series at the start of Year 1. The lectures prepare pre-service teachers for their professional experience by introducing them to the expectations of professional behaviour for the teaching profession, including legal and ethical responsibilities. Pre-service teachers are also introduced to the expectations for their behaviour and learning during the days of their professional experience. The lecture series is an essential pre-requisite for placement in schools.

In the second semester of Year 1, pre-service teachers undertake a 25-day placement comprising four consecutive weeks plus five planning days (4.5 units). Emphasis is placed on the gradual assumption of the responsibilities of the teacher. Links are made between the theoretical understandings about teaching and learning and the practice of teaching. The pre-service teacher is expected to demonstrate professional relationships with all members of the school community. The pre-service teacher must demonstrate the ability to plan and deliver effective learning experiences to pre-service teachers. Pre-service teachers reflect on their personal performance and respond to feedback, thus beginning the reflective enquiry process that is the hallmark of an engaged professional.

In Term 1 of the second year, pre-service teachers attend the staff planning days at the commencement of the school year, complete a total of 10 days of planning visits through Term 1 followed by a six-week sustained teaching block (30 days) commencing in Term 2. Pre-service teachers assume a full range of teaching responsibilities under the close guidance of their mentor-teacher. The pre-service teacher is expected to plan, implement and evaluate extended teaching and learning programs that demonstrate knowledge of recent developments in primary education. A university-appointed liaison maintains links between the pre-service teacher, the school coordinators and the mentor-teachers to ensure that pre-service teachers analyses their performance and develop a portfolio that, together with their written report, indicates compliance with the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers and readiness for registration as a teacher.

The learning outcomes for the professional experience courses are below.

**Year 1 (lecture series)**

On completion, pre-service teachers will be able to:
• Demonstrate understanding of the professional experience program and its requirements
• Recognise the legal and ethical responsibilities they will assume as they enter the teaching profession
• Transition into the role of teaching professional
• Demonstrate awareness of the many factors that will contribute to successful professional experiences
• Demonstrate reflective teacher practice with the guidance of a registered teacher.

Year 1 (25-days)
On completion of this topic pre-service teachers will have:
• Demonstrated appropriate interactions with all members of the school community
• Assumed the role of teacher with the guidance of a registered teacher
• Linked research and theoretical understandings with teaching practice
• Provided written lesson plans for their teaching
• Demonstrated teaching skill through the preparation for and delivery of lessons.
• Observed and evaluated student learning.
• Reflected on their own learning and responded to the guidance of their mentor-teacher to improve their teaching and management of classroom interactions, thus exhibiting the behaviour of an engaged professional.

Year 2 (40-days)
On completion of this topic pre-service teachers will have:
• Shown that they meet the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers at either the Graduate or Proficient level
• Documented and organised evidence demonstrating their levels of professional knowledge, professional practice and professional engagement
• Demonstrated readiness for entry to the Register of Teachers held by the Teachers Registration Board of South Australia.

During the introductory lecture series in the first year, pre-service teachers are introduced to the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. During the first professional experience, pre-service
teachers are expected to use the university’s developmental assessment rubric to identify their progress towards the Graduate Teacher Standards and set appropriate learning goals.

In the second year, pre-service teachers are assessed on the unit plans they develop in the English and Humanities and Social Science courses in preparation for the final year professional experience placement. At the commencement of the final placement, pre-service teachers are required to complete a self-assessment of their development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards using the university’s developmental rubric. Pre-service teachers are expected to discuss their self-assessment with their mentor-teacher and identify and document specific learning goals as part of the interim report. Throughout the placement, pre-service teachers are expected to collect evidence of their impact on student learning and their achievement of the Graduate Teacher Standards. Upon conclusion of the placement, pre-service teachers give an oral presentation about their impact on student learning. As part of the final report, they also submit a written reflection on the achievement of their learning goals. In the capstone course of the program’s final semester, pre-service teachers are required to show evidence, via an ePortfolio, of what they have achieved in relation to the Graduate Teacher Standards.

The final assessment grade for the professional experience placements is a non-graded Pass or Fail. The grade is determined by consensus between the mentor-teacher, school coordinator and university liaison. If there is disagreement, the university Professional Experience Director has responsibility for the final decision. Recently, the final report has included an optional additional section that pre-service teachers can choose to submit with their future employment applications. This provides an opportunity for the pre-service teachers’ performance to be aligned with the university grading system of High Distinction, Distinction, Credit, Pass or Fail. This section of the report has received widespread support from employers who are seeking to quickly identify quality graduates.

**MTeach (Secondary) programs**

Four MTeach (Secondary) programs reported details of the learning outcomes and the assessment, feedback and reporting of pre-service teachers’ development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards. Each institution adopted a unique approach.

All four described how the professional experience course includes practicum and academic components that are assessed by academic staff. Institutions B and D describe how the assessment is graded into High
**Distinction, Distinction, Credit, Pass or Fail.** Institution C required pre-service teachers to satisfactorily meet the expectations of the professional experience. Pre-service teachers’ course grades are determined by their performance on the related academic assessment tasks. Institution D reports that 70% of pre-service teachers’ practicum performance contributes to their final grade with 30% contributed by their related academic ePortfolio.

Institutions A and C describe how professional experience courses are assessed on an *Ungraded Pass, Pass, or Fail* basis. Pre-service teachers needed to satisfactorily meet the expectations of the practical component of the placement and successfully complete an ePortfolio assessment task, which is assessed by academic staff.

Institutions A and D identify specific Focus Areas aligned with the Graduate Teacher Standards for all placements. Institution A assesses pre-service teachers’ performance aligned with the Graduate Teacher Standards as an *Ungraded Pass or Fail*. The first placement requires pre-service teachers to demonstrate achievement of 12 of the 37 Focus Areas related to Standards 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7. The second placement included all Standards and all (except one) Focus Area (2.4). The final placement included all Standards and Focus Areas except three (4.2, 4.3 and 4.5). Institution D assesses all Standards and all Focus Areas except 1.4 and 2.4 across the first two placements in the year 1 placement. All Standards and Focus Areas (except 2.4) are assessed in the Year 2 placement.

The following sections presents a summary for each institution.

**Institution A**

Two 30-day professional experience courses are undertaken by pre-service teachers and these take place in the first and second year of the program. The first course targets classroom management by exploring what effective teachers do to proactively organise the inclusive learning environment to maximise student engagement in learning and minimise disruption. The subject draws upon evidence-based classroom management practices to provide pre-service teachers with the skills and understanding required to begin to manage learning environments in a secondary school.

The second 30-day course builds on learning from the previous professional experience and pre-service teachers enhance and demonstrate their achievement of Graduate Teacher Standards. This course builds classroom management capabilities introducing the concepts of careful instructional planning and
delivery, and relationship development as effective classroom management practices. The course draws upon evidence-based classroom management practices. The course includes three modules:

1. Planning and organising instruction
2. Conducting and facilitating instruction to maintain lesson momentum
3. Getting the year off to a good start and building positive classroom climate and communication.

The placement days for both courses provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to apply learning from a variety of sources in school settings during an extended workplace experience. Using classroom management research as a knowledge base, pre-service teachers critically examine classroom environments, rules and procedures, and intervention strategies that maximise pupil engagement in learning and to meet the instructional objectives. They work in teams and individually to analyse their personal classroom management beliefs, best practice classroom management strategies, case studies, and engage in problem solving activities. The process is supported by workshops activities and supplemental online materials.

The learning outcomes and aligned Graduate Teacher Standards (GTS) for both courses are below.

**Year 1 (30 days).**

- Know students and how they learn (GTS 1.1)
- Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning (GTS 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5)
- Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments (GTS 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)
- Engage in professional learning (GTS 6.3)
- Engage professionally with colleague, parents/carers and the community (GTS 7.1, 7.2).

**Year 2 (30-days)**

- Demonstrate achievement of the Graduate Teacher Standards
- Plan and execute a variety of instructional formats in the classroom that engage all pupils and minimise their misbehavior
- Deliver clear classroom-based instructions, checking for pupil understanding, active monitoring, and time-efficient transitions
- Communicate clearly their expectations concerning academic and social behaviours that promote respect for all and that build classroom community.
During professional experience placements, pre-service teachers receive feedback on their classroom management skills and progress towards the teaching domain standards from their university advisor and supervising teacher. No formal conversations such as, for example, an interim report, were identified as a means to let pre-service teachers know if they are meeting the Standards.

Half of the final assessment for both courses is determined by the supervising teacher in consultation with the university advisor. This is based on the practical performance in schools. The other half is based on completion of an assessment task related to classroom management. The university’s Director of Professional Experience has responsibility for the final decision. The final grade is a Pass or Fail.
**Institution B**

Professional experience is embedded in three courses consisting of academic and practicum components. The first two placements take place in Year 1 with the final placement in Year 2. Both components of each course have to be passed before pre-service teachers can proceed to the next professional experience course.

The first course involves a 10-day block placement during which pre-service teachers explore learners in context. Pre-service teachers examine their own learning processes to develop skills in becoming a reflective practitioner. They develop an awareness of the importance of inclusive practices required in secondary classrooms and learning environments, staff rooms, and broader learning communities. Pre-service teachers take an inquiry approach to investigate understandings of learning in school settings. They consider cultural practices and begin to understand how to use their knowledge of and relationships with learners to build meaningful learning experiences which positively impact learner outcomes. They begin to develop the skills of planning, teaching and evaluating learning with individuals and groups of learners. Pre-service teachers begin to understand curriculum as policy and the theories that underpin this. They start to formulate their understanding of pedagogy as central to effective teaching and learning and the educational theories that inform their emerging pedagogical stance.

The second course involves a 25-day placement and focuses on working effectively with learners both in small groups and as a whole group. Pre-service teachers plan learning experiences for a specific cohort of diverse learners. They critically reflect on and analyse teaching practice working from the position of a practitioner researcher. Pre-service teachers use effective communication practices in learning contexts and ensure safe, supportive and challenging inclusive learning-friendly environments. Pre-service teachers review and analyse effective pedagogy including the demonstration of the use of ICT and digital literacies to engage learners. Discussions with peers, colleagues, supervisors and academic staff are designed to critically reflect on and improve the effectiveness of their planned and enacted teaching. This involves considered engagement with, and implementation of, a range of learning assessment tasks. Pre-service teachers are expected to articulate an informed emergent professional position through discussions with colleagues, peers, parents and mentors.

The final course is a capstone experience involving a 25-day block placement during which pre-service teachers examine teachers’ work and align these practices to the relevant Professional Standards. During
this placement, pre-service teachers undertake the university’s Authentic Teacher Performance Assessment (ATPA) that is assessed by university staff. Using the skills of inquiry required by a teacher-researcher they gather evidence, document, analyse and reflect on practice. Pre-service teachers independently investigate and examine the role of the teacher and Professional Standards in secondary contexts. Pre-service teachers select key teaching, learning and assessment artefacts and build their professional portfolio to evidence impact on learning with a focus on assessment. The course requires critical reflection in and on the professional practice of teaching through critical engagement in teacher-research, professional learning and communication with members of the profession and the wider school community.

The aims for each course are that pre-service teachers will:

- Observe and work alongside the supervising teacher and students in a range of contexts including individual, small group and where appropriate whole class
- Be involved in team teaching, but not expected to take whole class lessons independently
- Research and learn about the school and community context
- Develop an understanding of learners and the ways in which teachers need to know their students
- Build appropriate relationships with students
- Establish strong working relationships with colleagues
- Seek assistance where necessary to support teaching
- Maintain a professional development journal
- Fulfil professional and academic obligations related to the school, the Master of Teaching program and the university’s Graduate Learning Outcomes.

*Expectations of Pre-service Teachers*

Before each placement, pre-service teachers are expected to gather information about the school and classes they are likely to teach and prepare resources for teaching. During the placement, pre-service teachers collect and document evidence of meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards. Evidence sets should arise from day-to-day teaching and not constitute substantive extra workload. Evidence Sets might include the following:

- Lesson plan sequences (individual and unit) annotated to demonstrate understanding of planned, enacted or proposed adjustments of strategies, curriculum, resources, and assessments that meet the needs of diverse learners in a particular class cohort or teaching area
• Observation notes they have taken of other teaching and learning that evidences the development in their ability to critically reflect on effective practices of teaching and learning
• Photographic or video evidence with annotation or analysis to show strategies, organisation, engagement or feedback on assessment (includes obtaining relevant permissions to meet ethical requirements)
• Examples of ideas from professional learning that have been adapted in their planned or enacted teaching for the purposes of enhancing teaching and learning
• Records of learner achievement that demonstrate engagement, stability or growth
• Samples of learner work or feedback that demonstrate engagement, stability or growth
• Annotation of policy for the purposes of understanding inclusive approaches within their planning or classroom environments
• Professional documentation with clear organisation and guidance to enable pre-service teachers to demonstrate the above points
• Samples of relevant critical reflection from their professional journals that demonstrate understanding and support evidence of their working towards the Graduate Standards.

Constant critical reflection as a self-assessment is expected of pre-service teachers in all core education unit assignments. In the final unit, the ATPA requires pre-service teachers to critically reflect on and evaluate their own teaching practice. They also complete a self-assessment reflection task worth 10%. This involves a peer conversation but not a peer assessment.

Expectations of Supervising Teachers

Supervising teachers are expected to:

• Meet with the pre-service teacher on a regular basis to discuss progress and ongoing needs
• Facilitate professional learning opportunities and avenues of support
• Prompt the pre-service teacher to demonstrate professional organisation and evidence of meeting the Australian Professional Teaching Standards for Graduate teachers at regular intervals
• Liaise with the assigned university staff as required
• Complete the mid-placement review and provide the pre-service teacher with a copy
• Complete and return the final placement report provided by the university’s and provide the pre-service teacher a copy.
Supervising teachers document the number of days that pre-service teachers have attended. As part of the mid-placement review meeting, supervising teachers are asked to be prepared with examples of the pre-service teacher’s strong areas of practice and areas for improvement, using specific examples and keeping points objective. This is an opportunity to recommend actions pre-service teachers can take to improve their work. Pre-service teachers should have opportunities to discuss these points.

Supervising teachers are encouraged to offer support and guidance to help pre-service teachers prepare for their assessment. This includes viewing AITSL website resources to further understanding of the types of supporting evidence sets and illustrations of practice to show they have addressed the Standards. Before completion of the final assessment, supervising and pre-service teachers are encouraged to meet to discuss the evidence sets: the organised, annotated and thematic, research or practice-based linked sets that will, in most, cases, address multiple standards at once.

The final report is completed in discussion with the pre-service teacher. University staff reserve the right to determine the final assessment. The final reports are graded as Satisfactory or Fail. For the capstone unit, the final report is assessed on whether it has exceeded, satisfied or not satisfied the expectations for Graduate Standards. There can be an Unsatisfactory or Fail outcome only after consultation with the Professional Experience Office and/or visiting university academic staff. If the university or the school identifies a pre-service teacher as at risk of being assessed Unsatisfactory or At Risk, it is the responsibility of the pre-service teacher to be prepared for the final report discussion with documentation or artefacts as evidence of their progress towards meeting the Standards.

**Feedback**

Pre-service teachers receive feedback on their development in two assignments in each of their core education units. There are two formal feedback points for each placement:

- The Mid-Placement Review: This is completed with the pre-service teacher about half way through the placement. It provides an opportunity discuss their progress and inform them about any areas that need improvement with sufficient time to work on any highlighted area.
- The Final Report: This report assesses the pre-service teacher’s performance against some of the Graduate Teacher Standards and provides comments on their strengths and areas for improvement.
Each placement experience and the related reports provide feedback on development and inform the next placement. Pre-service teachers have an opportunity to discuss progress and respond to feedback in debriefing sessions in class and online. They also have an opportunity to respond in the mid and final placement reviews. Each time pre-service teachers are given feedback, they are expected to use it to actively plan to improve their teaching and to meet the Graduate Teacher Standards. The ATPA is a further opportunity to formally reflect on improvements based on feedback. The assessment task in the final placement unit is an opportunity for pre-service teachers to reflect on past placement feedback and develop an action plan.

**Final Assessment**

For professional experience core courses, grading is: *N (Fail), Pass, Credit, Distinction, High Distinction.* Assessment for the first placement requires a planning for managing learning document analysis (worth 40%) and a literature review and reflective narrative (worth 60%). Assessment for the second unit requires a planning for learning concept map (worth 40%) and a critical analysis of planned teaching SWOT analysis (worth 60%). The final course is a capstone experience requiring pre-service teachers to satisfy the expectations for Graduate Standards during the 25-day placement and complete the university Authentic Teacher Performance Assessment (worth 90%) and a professional experience reflection (worth 10%) of the final grade.

**Institution C**

The professional experience placement days are embedded in two courses comprising a 20-day and a 45-day block in Year 1. The professional experience and preparation of an ePortfolio constitute the capstone requirements for the completion of the program.

The learning outcomes for these courses are identical and identified below:

**Year 1 (20-days) and (45-days)**

On successful completion of this course pre-service teachers will be able to:

- Understand, and account for in planning, the diversity of student cohorts and how they learn
- Understand and apply the teaching methodologies of their curriculum area(s)
- Plan for and implement effective and appropriate learning activities
- Create supportive and safe learning environments, including the initial development of a
repertoire of effective and ethical behaviour management strategies

- Understand assessment and reporting processes, including the provision of feedback to students, and other stakeholders, about their learning
- Engage with other professional educators, such as Curriculum area associations
- Create and maintain professional relationships with teacher-colleagues and school leaders, as well as the wider school community.

**Expectations of Pre-service Teachers**

Early in both of their placements, pre-service teachers complete a self-evaluation and then discuss this with their mentor-teachers. The aim is to produce an interim report that reflects their shared evaluation of early performance and areas for improvement. A formative assessment component of the both professional experience units is the ePortfolio in which pre-service teachers reflect and self-evaluate and provide supporting evidence of their performance against all Focus Areas of the Graduate Teacher Standards. The ePortfolio is internally assessed by university academic staff.

Pre-service teachers are expected to collect artefacts during all parts of their program including their professional experience units. This can include unit and lesson plans, feedback from mentor teachers and pre-service teachers. These cover their impact on student learning for final placement; assessment instruments and other formative and summative assessment resources; teaching resources, self-evaluation reflections on teaching practice; professional association membership; their classroom management handbook (pre-service teachers must create their own and revise it in line with practice); ICT resources; documents and training certificates required for registration and employment applications (Reporting Abuse and Neglect training, Police Clearance, LANTITE, First Aid training, Child Protection Curriculum training); and self-evaluation of performance against all 37 Focus Areas with supporting evidence.

**Expectations of Supervising Teachers**

Supervising mentor-teachers are expected to complete an initial evaluation of pre-teachers’ performance to create a reference point for development during the placement. This is created in collaboration with the pre-service teachers. It is aligned with the 37 Focus Areas of the Graduate Teacher Standard through a provided form which contains guiding notes on interpreting the standards. When required, supervising mentor-teachers complete an Additional Support and Development Plan documenting areas that require
significant improvement, actions to be taken and resources provided to achieve improvement within an agreed time frame.

Feedback
The interim report establishes the pre-service teacher’s level performance during the first weeks of each placement. The mentor-teacher and pre-service teacher discuss this and identify areas for improvement. Pre-service teachers are expected to reflect on their final report at the end of the first placement to identify areas for improvement for the second placement.

Assessment
The final grade of a Non-Graded Pass or Fail is determined by the professional experience lecturer. For both placements, the grade is based on the mentor-teacher’s final report aligned with the Graduate Teacher Standards and the pre-service teacher’s ePortfolio which is internally assessed by the university academic staff.

Institution D
The professional experience placement days are embedded in three Clinical Teaching Practice courses; two 21-day placements in Year 1 and one 21-day placement in Year 2. During clinical teaching practice, experienced mentor-teachers support pre-service teachers in collaboration with school-based Teaching Fellows and Clinical Specialists who are also engaged in the on-campus teaching program.

The first course provides opportunities for pre-service teachers to begin to demonstrate the nexus between theory and the practice of teaching, drawing on a range of theoretical perspectives and contemporary research to support their teaching practice. The school placement focuses on developing an understanding of student characteristics, principles of learning and teaching, classroom management and school organisation in typical secondary school settings. Pre-service teachers begin to analyse teaching and learning to identify lesson formats that make productive classrooms and pedagogies and are effective for individual students. They integrate the content of academic subjects taught during the semester with their teaching practice in an intentional manner in order to demonstrate developing understanding of students’ progression along learning and development trajectories. Pre-service teachers take graduated
responsibility for the planning, implementation and assessment of lessons based on national and state curricula. They differentiate their teaching to include students with diverse needs and backgrounds and consider Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives on learning and development.

In the second course, pre-service teachers consolidate and deepen their understandings of professional knowledge, clinical teaching practice and professional engagement in the secondary school context. This course particularly focuses on assessment of individual students. Pre-service teachers learn how to closely track student learning, to record and analyse assessment data and make clinical judgements for future teaching. They also examine a range of strategies for reporting to students, and parents/carers utilising records of student achievement. Pre-service teachers extend their responsibility for the planning, implementation and assessment of lessons based on national and state curricula during extended periods of supervised teaching. They continue to differentiate their teaching to include students with diverse needs and backgrounds. They also take into account Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives on learning and development.

In the final course pre-service teachers’ synthesise their understanding of the characteristics of professional knowledge, clinical practice and engagement for professional accountability in the secondary school context. They reflect critically on the ways in which educational theory and research informs practice. They recognise an area of practice which they identify as a professional learning priority and reference this to the relevant components of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. The school placement is focused on clinical teaching of designated learning areas in secondary classrooms. Pre-service teachers demonstrate capacity to make sound clinical judgements and to independently deliver high impact clinical instruction for sustained periods using sequenced lessons and units of work. They demonstrate a high level of 21st century skills and their ability to develop these skills in students.

The learning outcomes for the clinical placements are below.

**Year 1 (21-days: two-days per week and a 10-day block)**

On completion of this course, Teacher Candidates should be able to:

- Demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics of learners (Graduate Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)
- Demonstrate subject and pedagogical content knowledge to create inclusive and productive learning environments (Graduate Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7)
- Design and implement relevant curriculum and pedagogy, integrating digital technologies and differentiating teaching to engage students in their learning (Graduate Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6)
- Create and maintain safe and supportive learning environments demonstrating knowledge of practical approaches to promote positive behaviours (Graduate Standards 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)
- Collect and analyse assessment data and evidence to inform clinical judgments about teaching interventions and reflect on teaching on learning outcomes (Graduate Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 3.6)
- Reflect on the ways in which educational theory and research inform teaching practice (Graduate Standards 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4)
- Demonstrate knowledge of key principles of the Code of Ethics for the teaching profession (Graduate Standards 7.1, 7.3, 7.4)
- Demonstrate knowledge of the relevant legislative acts and regulations (Graduate Standard 7.2).

**Year 1 (21-day block: two-days per week for three weeks and a 15-day block)**

On completion of this course, Teacher Candidates should be able to:

- Consolidate knowledge of the characteristics of learners (Graduate Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 2.4, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)
- Consolidate pedagogical content knowledge to create inclusive and productive learning environments (Graduate Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7)
- Design and implement relevant curriculum and pedagogy, integrating digital technologies and differentiating teaching to engage students in their learning (Graduate Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6)
- Create and maintain safe and supportive learning environments using practical approaches to promote positive behaviours (Graduate Standards 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)
- Design assessment tools and tasks and interpret data and evidence to make clinical judgments about teaching interventions and reflect on the impact of teaching on learning outcomes when reporting to students and parents/carers (Graduate Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5)
- Consolidate understanding of how educational theory and research inform teaching practice (Graduate Standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4)
- Consolidate knowledge of key principles of the Code of Ethics for the teaching profession (Graduate Standards 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4)
- Consolidate knowledge of the relevant legislative acts and regulations (Graduate Standards 7.2).

**Year 2 (21 days)**

On completion of this course, Teacher Candidates should be able to:

- Critically reflect on the ways in which educational theory and research inform teaching practice in understanding the characteristics of learners (Graduate Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.4, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1, 4.4)
- Apply subject and pedagogical content knowledge to create inclusive and productive learning environments (Graduate Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6)
- Design and implement relevant curriculum and pedagogy, integrating digital technologies and differentiating teaching to engage students in their learning (Graduate Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6)
- Create and maintain safe and supportive learning environments effectively using practical approaches to promote positive behaviours (Graduate Standards 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)
- Design assessment tasks and interpret data and evidence to make clinical judgments about teaching interventions and critically reflect on teaching on learning outcomes (Graduate Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5)
- Demonstrate an understanding of the role of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers in identifying professional learning needs (Graduate Standards 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4)
- Establish and maintain ethical and respectful relationships with students, colleagues and parents, working independently and collaboratively across the school community (Graduate Standards 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4)
- Understand key principles of the Code of Ethics for the teaching profession (Graduate Standards 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4)
- Understand relevant legislative acts and regulations (Graduate Standards 7.2).

Institution D does not specify what pre-service teachers are required to collect before, during or after the clinical practice subjects. Mentor-teachers are required to document formative feedback throughout the placement and summative feedback at the end of each placement.
Institution D reports that for all three clinical placement courses, 70% of the final grade is based on teaching performance against the Graduate Teacher Standards and 30% based on a clinical ePortfolio that analyses the teaching performance. These assessments are completed throughout the placement. The final grade for the course is determined by the university-based teacher educator in collaboration with the school mentor-teacher.
FINDINGS

The introduction of the AITSL (2015) Program Standards requires institutions to produce evidence “to demonstrate, at the program level that graduates can both meet the Graduate Standards and show their practical skill in the classroom” (AITSL, 2015b, pp. 2-3).

This project explored the structure, content and context of professional experience placements in eight BEd (Primary); three BEd (Secondary); two MTeach (Primary) and four MTeach (Secondary) programs in Australia. An aim of the project was to identify trends and variations across institutions to present an overall national picture of what is happening related to professional experience.

The findings of this project indicate that most providers have made program changes to respond to the TEMAG (2015) reforms. There continues to be considerable diversity in the structure and management of professional experience as the changes that have been made have been adapted to program designs. These results reflect the mapping study by Ingvarson et al. (2004), which noted that variation is not necessarily negative and that this has developed as a response to history, conflicting interests and differences in state-based education authorities and school community needs (Ingvarson et al., 2004).

The participants in this study reported several significant changes, which have recently been made to the structure and content of ITE programs, in response to the new national program standards. Specifically, administrative structural modifications have been made to:

- increase the duration of programs and the number of professional experience days in schools
- improve the alignment of professional experience with schools and coursework
- increase student enrolment in programs with a national curriculum focus
- implement external progression hurdles e.g. LANTITE, Working with Children (WWC) clearance.

Significant changes have also been made to assessment, feedback and reporting practices as a result of the introduction of new accreditation requirements and processes focused on the Graduate Teacher Standards (e.g. ePortfolios; Assessment Circles; common reporting frameworks for all Queensland Universities). Limited details about these changes were provided. However, it is evident that some programs are finding it difficult to design and implement new assessment, feedback and reporting practices to ensure that pre-service teachers engage in learning activities and dialogic conversations with experienced mentor-teachers.
about their development towards the Graduate Teacher Standards and demonstrate their achievement of these. This finding is consistent with current research showing potential gaps in initial teacher education programs related to specific Focus Areas within all of the Graduate Teacher Standards (except Standard 6) (Hudson, Hudson, Weatherby-Fell, & Shipway, 2016). Particular concern has also been raised calling for programs to prepare assessment capable beginning teachers (Wyatt-Smith, Alexander, Fishburn & McMahon, 2017).

The findings of this project demonstrate that most institutions have made quality changes to their programs. In most cases the structure of professional experience has been shown to align with the essential features of high quality professional experience defined by Darling-Hammond (2007). Almost all programs offer pre-service teachers opportunities to engage in early and frequent school experiences. In addition, the intended learning outcomes suggest that during professional experience pre-service teachers gradually take on a range of responsibilities typically within a school setting which include planning and implementing learning and assessment activities, reflecting on and evaluating teaching performance and interacting with the broader professional and school community. It is also evident that some programs require pre-service teachers to engage in structured opportunities to build their capacity to self-regulate their learning (Endedijk, Vermunt, Verloop & Brekelmans, 2012), engage in evidence based or evidence-informed practice (QCT 2012), and reflect on and communicate their developing professional identity (Ruohotie-Lyhty, & Moate, 2016).

The increased control of initial teacher education is a trend that has been growing along with the discourse of the New Public Management Doctrine widely adopted internationally in the public sector (Heikkinen, Tynjäla, & Kiviniemi, 2011). Therefore, it is unsurprising that the findings of this project characterise a current discourse of professional standards. That is, institutions are able to show how the design of their programs meets with Stage One of the accreditation requirements. Wyatt-Smith, et al., (2017) argue that the next challenge is for institutions to move towards a complementary discourse of evidence (p. 250). This necessitates conceptualising teacher development as a system of collective effort rather than only an individual undertaking (Darling-Hammond, 2017) and reviewing the intended, taught and assessed curriculum. There is a need to ensure that professional experience is a valuable learning opportunity. Research indicates that learning during professional experience is currently often left to chance and many learning opportunities are wasted (Mattsson, Eilertsen, & Rorrison, 2011, p. 10).
Making this transition towards a discourse of evidence, requires engagement with the public and international debate about what is best practice in education and how this should be nurtured. This raises the question: *If judgements about ‘practice’ should have external and international frameworks as the legitimate point of departure, should these ‘judgements’ be formed by the professionals in their own communities of practice?* (Mattsson, Eilertsen, & Rorrison, 2011, p. 6). When responding to this question, a tension emerges between those who argue that initial teacher education should be more ‘academic’ and be based on higher degree research and those who argue for a more collaborative and action research (Mattsson et al., 2011). Whichever approach is adopted, complex and multi-dimensional questions need to be considered about: how best to prepare teachers for professional autonomy; how participatory experiences are best embedded into professional experience; what facilitates and constrains learning; and how the growing passion for evidence-based assessment can be accommodated (Kemmis & Ahern, 2011).

The findings of this project suggest that moving towards a discourse of evidence continues to be an area of challenge. The Queensland College of Teachers identifies eight broad principles that would assist in this process. These include founding a system on authentic assessment; meeting requirements of reliability and validity; enhancing the capacity of pre-service teachers for self-assessment and reflection on their developing knowledge and practice; capturing the complexity of teaching; capturing the multi-faceted nature of teaching; advancing the goals for education elaborated in the Melbourne Declaration; aligning with national and state policies; and securing support from key stakeholders (QCT, p. 2012). Deploying these principles will enable assessors to guide pre-service teachers to gather evidence to demonstrate their achievement of the full scope of the Graduate Teacher Standards, and provide them with continuous formative feedback about their development leading up to this career stage.

Attention is needed to ensure that the assessment system is transparent and enables quality assessment to be implemented, supported by the provision of adequate resources. Work is needed to improve the consistency of report formats. Specifically, a step forward would be agreement on the wording of the descriptors aligned with the Focus Areas in the final placement report. Agreement would also be helpful on the Focus Areas that should not be omitted (e.g., 1.2: *Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of research into how students learn and the implications for teaching*).

The feedback provided to pre-service teachers during the professional experience also requires stronger alignment with specific Focus Areas of the Graduate Teacher Standards. A range of assessment
instruments are required to support pre-service teachers to understand and monitor their development as some tools are better suited for summative and formative purposes (Mattsson et al., 2011). For example, whilst the use of an evidence guide may be helpful for summative assessment in the final placement, this may not provide the nuanced feedback and goal setting to support pre-service teachers’ learning in the preceding placements. Clarification is also needed to ensure that the monitoring process differentiates between aspirational practice and minimum requirements. Wyatt-Smith (2017) makes the point that while both of these can and should be encouraged, there needs to be clear lines between the two in order to avoid what [they refer to] as ‘standards creep’ towards extremely high expectations as the minimum requirements for any one Focus Area (Wyatt-Smith, 2017, p. 263).

Meeting the challenge of evidence informed practice highlights the need for further research about pre-service teachers’ development to inform understanding about the expectations and assessment of pre-service teachers’ performance leading up to the Graduate Teacher Standards. It would be valuable to share examples of structured learning approaches and activities (e.g. case methods, inquiry, assessment dialogues, 360-degree feedback), which support pre-service teachers to focus on their impact on students’ learning and development and demonstrate their achievement of the Graduate Teacher Standards throughout their programs based on a comprehensive sample of data. It would also be helpful if key design features and implementation strategies were identified for developing programmatic assessment. This radical approach to assessment in medical education is argued to be relevant to education and shows potential to address endemic problems in assessment by using Entrustable Professional Activities and mentoring (Ellis & Hogard, 2016).

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That higher education providers demonstrate how the measures and strategies in ITE programs:

- guide pre-service teachers in their attainment of the Graduate Teacher Standards
- provide an accurate measure of skills and behaviours that reflect the expectations for performance needed to meet the Graduate Teacher Standards

That ACDE/NADPE engage with relevant stakeholders to develop a framework for the programmatic assessment of ITE programs
STUDY TWO

IDENTIFYING MODELS OF BEST PRACTICE FOR PARTNERSHIPS AROUND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This chapter provides an integrated literature review (Torraco, 2005) of the characteristics and inherent factors required for effective high-quality school-university partnerships. Using this method allows for the review, critique and synthesis of representative literature in an integrated process that results in new frameworks and perspectives to be generated. The chapter looks at the ways university-school partnerships1 can provide quality professional experience opportunities for pre-service teachers within initial teacher education courses. It draws the literature together to identify the key aspects and critical factors for quality partnerships between schools and universities, thus allowing for the development of an evaluation tool to identify best practice in Quality Partnerships in Professional Experience (QPiPEx) [see page 103]. The tool is designed to be used as a method of evaluating the alignments, processes and outcomes of working together in professional experience partnerships.

Professional experience forms an essential and core element of ITE courses (Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation, 2016) and has a major objective of ensuring pre-service teachers are classroom ready. The delivery of professional experience programs is dependent on the partnering activities between schools and universities (Handscomb, Gu & Varley, 2014). It emphasises the importance of quality connections and partnerships between schools and universities in providing opportunities for pre-service teachers to understand the realities of school, to develop the confidence, pedagogical skills, knowledge and attitudes required by practicing teachers. At the same time, the experiences need to connect the theory and practice of teaching with the ultimate goal of being ready to teach. Adoniou (2013) explains this further:

Ultimately, universities alone cannot prepare beginning teachers for the realities of school. However, they can be an integral part of the process when they find a contingency with the personal motivations of the pre-service teachers and the professional contexts those

---

1 For the purpose of this chapter the use of university-school/school-university partnerships will be used interchangeably, noting that much of the literature denotes school-university partnerships. However, the focus of this chapter is from the standpoint of teacher education providers and by no means indicates power of universities over schools.
teachers find themselves working in. Universities cannot operate in isolation from what happens in schools. We do beginning teachers no favours when we do not connect university learning to the other contextual influences on their teaching (Adoniou, 2013 p.55).

The interest in understanding university-school partnerships in providing opportunities for professional experience, school-based practicum, teaching-clinics and practical placements and work integrated learning in pre-service teacher education programs is not a recent phenomenon (Allen, 1967; Cooper & Allen 1970; Sutherland, Day, 1998; Scanlon & Sperring, 2005; Walkington, 2007; Turner, 2008; Watson, et al. 2008; Bartholomew & Sandholtz, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Walsh & Backe, 2013; Groundwater-Smith, Ewing & Le Cornu, 2015; Kertesz & Downing, 2016). This long-term interest comes from what Day (1998) refers to as the deep-rooted connection for many teacher educators with schools, that they trained as teachers at university and have a complementarity of moral purpose in their work.

This coincides with the substantial interest in the issues surrounding pre-service teacher preparedness as classroom-ready teachers, as shown by numerous government enquiries, reports, papers and reviews (see Table: 2.1) and media interest (Watson, et al. 2008). Education authorities, governments, universities and members of the wider community have been concerned about teacher quality and how well pre-service teachers are being prepared for the classroom. Some view this as a national imperative in teacher education (Kertesz & Downing, 2016). Le Cornu (2015) echoes this and points out that:

*This is a critical time for teacher education in Australia. The myriad challenges surrounding professional experience in Australia currently are beyond the capabilities of individual schools and universities. There must be a high-level commitment of the Australian Government, together with state and territories’ Government, Catholic and Independent education systems to address the challenges and develop new forms of shared responsibility for preparing future teachers. It will require a determined effort from all parties* (p.17).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enquiries, reports, papers and reviews about teacher education – professional experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Council for Educational Research (2014), Best Practice Teacher Education Programs and Australia’s Own Programs, prepared by L Ingvarson, K Reid, S Buckley, E Kleinhenz &amp; G Masters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (2015), Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education, Science and Training (2006), Survey of Final Year Teacher Education Students, Surveys &amp; Workforce Analysis Section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

The literature shows that school-university partnerships are dynamic, complex and diverse (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Handscomb, Gu, & Varley, 2014; Groundwater-Smith, Ewing & Le Cornu, 2015). They may range from the informal individual connections between classroom teachers and education academics to system-wide formal agreements with universities (for example, NSW Department of Education Professional Experience Agreement – Hub Schools). Yet, there are often tensions surrounding these partnerships, particularly the need for ensuring that views of all parties involved in professional experience are considered and valued. As argued by Day (1998) nearly twenty years ago:

*There is an abiding dilemma for universities around the world who wish to connect with emerging new professionalism of teachers and schools is how to give importance to the legitimate interests and concerns of both the academy and the schools* (p.818).

The extensive work of Darling-Hammond (2010) in reviewing teacher education learning over the past twenty years in the United States, shows that one of the critical design principles in effective Teacher Education programs is *strong school-university partnerships* that develop common knowledge and shared beliefs among school- and university-based faculty and allow candidates to learn to teach in professional communities modelling state-of-the-art practice for diverse learners and collegial learning for adults (Darling-Hammond 2006 p.276).

Providing high quality professional experience opportunities for pre-service teachers through effective school-university partnerships has also been of interest in Australia. This is evident in the deliberations of

---

the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) (Craven et al. 2014), which issued the report *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers*. The report makes 38 recommendations of which eight relate to professional experience and partnering in some form. It highlights the need for universities and schools to work closely in providing pre-service teachers with enhanced school-based teaching experiences during their courses – something that has now become paramount.

The report indicates that *providers, school systems and schools are not effectively working together in the development of new teachers. This is particularly evident in the professional development component of initial teacher education, which is critical for the translation of theory into practice*” (TEMAG, 2014, p.ix).

To gain a greater understanding of what this means for partnering activities it is necessary to conduct some form of analysis of the key recommendations as they relate to university-school partnerships for professional experience provisions.

Using a thematic analysis offers a flexible method in the search for themes or patterns in qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This is illustrated below (see Table 2.2) as the suggested partnering activities between higher education providers and schools (systems) as recommended by the TEMAG (2014) report. These activities include integrated and structured professional experience; formalised partnership agreements and guaranteed placements; exposure to the classroom; systems/schools working with higher education providers in assessment of pre-service teachers; their integration in activities and the culture of schools; consistent assessment of their classroom readiness; working together on evidence gathering; and higher education providers consulting with employers. The diagram below identifies the thematic nodes and identified themes present, particularly in TEMAG Recommendations 19; 20; 21; 23; 24; 26; 28 and 38.
Having a greater understanding of the core themes in the TEMAG recommendations highlights the need to develop an audit tool that can assist teacher education providers in identifying best practice in professional experience partnerships. It also allows providers to detect areas requiring further development in their partnerships with schools through a process of quality assurance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Thematic nodes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Identified themes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional experience</td>
<td>• Deliver integrated and structured professional experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess their suitability for teaching, including through exposure to the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership activities</td>
<td>• Formalised partnership agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guarantee sufficient placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration of pre-service teachers in the activities and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistently assess the classroom readiness in consultation with employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highly skilled teachers to supervise professional experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.2: Thematic of Analysis of TEMAG Recommended Higher Education Providers and Schools

#### Partnering Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 19</th>
<th>Recommendation 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher education providers deliver integrated and structured professional experience throughout initial teacher education programs through formalised partnership agreements with schools.</td>
<td>School leaders actively lead the integration of pre–service teachers in the activities and culture of their school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 20</th>
<th>Recommendation 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher education providers guarantee that sufficient placements of appropriate timing and length are available for all pre-service teachers.</td>
<td>The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership develop a national assessment framework, including requirements for a Portfolio of Evidence, to support higher education providers and schools to consistently assess the classroom readiness of pre-service teachers throughout the duration of their program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 21</th>
<th>Recommendation 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher education providers ensure pre-service teachers have early opportunities to assess their suitability for teaching, including through exposure to the classroom.</td>
<td>Higher education providers and schools work together to assist pre-service teachers to develop and collect sophisticated evidence of their teaching ability and their impact on student learning for their Portfolio of Evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 23</th>
<th>Recommendation 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems/schools required to use the <em>Australian Professional Standards for Teachers</em> in identifying highly skilled teachers to supervise professional experience, and work with higher education providers to ensure rigorous, iterative and agreed assessment of pre-service teachers. The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership develop guidelines to ensure supervising teachers have the skills required to be effective in the role.</td>
<td>Higher education providers take into account national workforce needs, in consultation with employers, when making decisions about student intake to better respond to market demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE WIL AGENDA

Another recent driver to improved partnerships between schools and universities is evident in the Work Integrated Learning (WIL) strategy of key industry and representative groups. The Australian Collaborative Education Network, Universities Australia, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Australian Industry Group and the Business Council of Australia cooperatively framed the National Strategy on Work Integrated Learning in University Education – (Universities Australia, 2015).

Universities Australia has said it intends to develop a coherent approach to build workforce capability, skills and individual prospects and Work Integrated Learning (WIL) does that (Universities Australia, 2015).

The strategy encourages the development of purposefully designed university curricula. WIL is aimed at improving the employability of graduates by giving them valuable practical experience which is directly related to courses being studied at university (Universities Australia, 2015).

WIL demonstrates the high stakes nature of professional experience but does little to explain how this can be achieved and who pays. Those in initial teacher education have a lot to offer in understanding the WIL space, particularly in supporting other disciplines who are newcomers to incorporating practice-based experiences in their programs.

PUTTING THEORY INTO PRACTICE – CONNECTING COURSEWORK WITH PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE

Teacher education students often perceive the theoretical knowledge and skills they learn during university study as separate, or in competition with, the practical knowledge and skills they aim to apply in future workplaces (Capraro, Capraro, & Helfeldt 2010; Adoniou, 2013). For many vocationally-orientated disciplines like education, this disconnect can lead to student disengagement with course content and delivery. Pre-service teachers cannot make the link between theory and practice while on placement (Lacina & Collins Block, 2011):

One approach to overcoming the disconnection between university-based teaching and student professional experience is in formulating partnerships between universities and practising teachers for the delivery of professional experiences. Such partnerships aim for
"better integration of theoretical content and practical experiences" (Ingvarson, Reid, Buckley, Kleinhenz, Masters, Rowley, 2014 p.21).

It is reasonable that many university-based educators and classroom teachers may feel uncomfortable moving beyond their traditional domains of practice and into a collaborative mode – particularly in the professional experience space that is sometimes messy and conflicting. However, there are those with the experience level, qualities and knowledge as mentoring teachers and teacher educators who do work in this third space (Elsden-Clifton & Jordan 2015). They play an important role - as boundary riders between the university and the classroom. In essence, ‘third space’ suggests coming out of our normal working environment (school or university) and into a neutral ‘third space’ to design, develop and deliver teacher education with jointly shared understanding and vision” (Burch & Jackson 2013, p.57).

Mentoring teachers are effective in this role when they have a clear understanding of the theory/praxis-nexus. However, this cannot be one-sided, as the partnership between university staff and classroom practitioners is critical for the success of supporting pre-service teachers to move across and beyond the boundaries between coursework and the practice of teaching. Adoniou (2013) found that pre-service teachers feel that getting a good mentoring teacher on placement relies on chance.

University courses most usually respond to the perceived theory–practice gap with the inclusion of practicum experiences, and certainly there is a strong perception that this time in schools is advantageous during a degree. However, the practicums experienced by the participants in this study had no quality control. As pre-service teachers they were randomly assigned mentor teachers and schools. Very often there are not enough placements for pre-service teachers, and teachers in schools are cajoled and pressured to take them on. Thus, mentoring teachers are of all qualities and have varying motivations. These are not uncommon conditions around Australia and internationally (p. 55).

As a result of the TEMAG (2014) recommendations, teacher education providers are engaging with school partners further in developing innovative approaches to professional experience that focus on addressing concerns around mentor training and understanding the theory/practice divide. These target pre-service teachers’ exposure to the school ‘workplace’ – classrooms – earlier in courses; pre-service teachers team teaching under the supervision of one mentor teacher; cohort-based placements where pre-service teachers are in schools as teams more often; establishment of formal arrangements between providers and
schools (systems) through hub-schools, professional experience academies, school centres for teaching excellence, professional practice communities, and alliance schools.

Those programs providing structured teaching experiences within disciplinary studies, which are organised and co-supervised by a university lecturer and the classroom teacher, encourage greater understanding of content and teaching practice, professional collegiality and the appreciation of shared purposes. The university academic located in the school with the pre-service teachers, where the content (theory) is being learned in real-time and at the point of delivery, enables the pre-service teachers, school and academic to work in partnership during the learning process. This demonstrates that the teacher and academic are both in teacher education and working together with pre-service teachers in that third space of work integrated learning. Nevertheless, this outcome is not always achievable, as Walsh & Backe (2013) point out:

_These partnerships require a sustained commitment from multiple stakeholders to collaborate on a shared vision, goals, and strategies. Although implementing these partnerships requires significant time and effort, successful resolutions of challenges can pave the way for both systemic change in the school district and important developments in practice, theory and research at the university”_(p.595).

The sustainability of these approaches is still heavily dependent on strategic partnerships and strong professional relationships between system leaders, school principals, teachers and academics. As indicated by Kruger, Davies, Eckersley, Newell & Cherednichenko (2009), successful partnerships are achieved through and characterised by trust, mutuality and reciprocity (p.16).
AUTHENTIC LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION THROUGH PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Similar to other disciplines with practical requirements like health care and social workers, lawyers, architects, accountants, journalists and psychologists (Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation 2016), a significant component of initial teacher education is vocationally focused with a WIL methodology. Teacher Education, specifically, is concerned with training individuals to enter a professional career space - as classroom teachers with a high degree of confidence, proficiency, and competency. This is not always simple to achieve although again getting pre-service teachers working closely with practicing teachers sooner in their courses can be a step forward in assuring that the pre-service teacher understands what it means to be a teacher.

It is often more a question of *when* rather than *if*. As a part of enrolling in their education degree, most pre-service teachers plan to work with ‘real’ people in ‘real’ community contexts (i.e. schools, education centres and government departments). Pre-service teachers can be disappointed if their university experience deprives them of the opportunity to engage with, and learn, in these communities. It is crucial to understand the importance of engaging our students with authentic and rich learning, which moves beyond the online mode of delivery that currently dominates in higher education. There continues to be a need for ‘real-life’ professional experience for teacher education student so they can develop the appropriate knowledge, skills and attitudes required for the modern classroom. Popenici (2013) reminds us that:

*The overall challenge ahead for higher education is to find alternative ways to capture students’ imaginations and fuel their curiosity and capacity for effort in the search for knowledge. Many universities are building on the idea that we cannot look at a sustainable future with a system that values set time and student numbers rather than love for learning, student engagement and the university’s contribution to the world* (p. 34).
A key university objective is to provide students with authentic experiences and meaningful learning environments throughout their degree. In initial teacher education, these opportunities reside in professional experience. Generally, it is teacher educators that have to grapple with the new paradigms for tertiary education delivery that are more work integrated (Collins, Hay & Heiner, 2013). The idea that learning must take place in relevant and meaningful contexts is not new. For years, various researchers (Cleak & Wilson, 2007; Hinde McLeod & Reynolds, 2007) have been writing about the benefits of meaningful learning contexts and pedagogies in Early Childhood, Primary and Secondary schooling. It is interesting how little of this knowledge is translated, at least in practice, to the tertiary setting. As Watson (2009), cited in O Keefe (2009, p.10) suggests:

Most of the recent reviews on the subject [of Teacher Education] have suggested that university education departments are out of touch with reality. The view is that students are not prepared in the art and craft of teaching; that there’s too much focus on theory and not enough on practice.

As a response to the historical lack of meaningful learning contexts in Teacher Education courses, ITE providers continue to develop professional experience programs that have been constructed with the belief that pre-service teachers need quality opportunities in schools so they can have ongoing experiences with ‘praxis’ (Adoniou, 2013) before they enter the workplace. In other words, we believe that effective teacher education courses provide pre-service teachers with greater opportunities to merge theory and practice, to apply and reflect on their knowledge in real (not simulated) environments as a part of their formal learning (Hellyer et al. 2013). To achieve this, it takes human and financial resources. Funding constraints and stagnation mean that a great deal of teacher preparation work remains under-resourced. There is also a lack of alignment and understanding of the real costs involved in providing new approaches to professional experience. The provision of professional experience in ITE is expensive and requires extensive goodwill between schools and universities. Sustained and solid partnerships are pivotal to the success of programs that require greater time in schools, demanding more of school leaders and classroom teachers as well as teacher educators.

There remains a tension in schools between their core business of educating their students and being a teacher education provider.
Over the years there has been much expected of school-university partnerships, which in turn has increased the sense of frustration and disappointment when they are perceived not to have delivered (Handscomb, Gu, & Varley, 2014 p12).

Understanding that there is more to gain in educational partnerships than lose in educational partnerships is still a journey for both schools and universities. They need to appreciate that their core business is complimentary. The need to have a shared understanding of and about school-university partnerships has become more important now than it may have been in the past, as traditional approaches and expectations of school placements continue to evolve in dynamic and changing environments.

**DEFINING PARTNERSHIPS**

Taken literally, partnership signifies a relationship between two or more individuals or organisations that are committed to, or involved in, the same activity. The deceptively simple way in which the term partnership is applied and discussed can create confusion about what it actually entails (Jones, Hobbs, Kenny, Campbell, Chittleborough, Gilbert, Herbert & Redman 2016). A shared understanding of what constitutes effective school-university partnerships is vital when stakeholders negotiate arrangements and enter into agreements. It is suggested that developing partnerships between higher education institutions and schools should be based on a collaborative, rather than a cooperative, model. Here a ‘deeper’ interpretation of collaboration – ‘working together’ rather than ‘working with’ – is facilitated through Third-Space activity (Burch & Jackson, 2013 p.57). It allows greater engagement between pre-service teachers and practicing teachers in professional experience (Sutherland, Scanlon & Sperring, 2005).

The work of McQuaid (2000) suggests that the term partnership covers greatly differing concepts and practices and is used to describe a wide variety of relationships in myriad circumstances and locations (p.3). For example, in the business world there has been a concerted effort in recent years to address the challenge of how best to engage the public and private sectors in more innovative partnership arrangements and pool financial, technical and commercial resources (Reid, Hayes, & Stibbe, 2014). This has also been reflected in school-university partnerships where problematic funding has required creative approaches that promote partners sharing limited resources.

The complexity of school-university partnerships can often be under-estimated. This ‘complexity’ is evidenced by the lack of any clear definition of university-school partnerships in the educational
literature (Walkington, 2007, p.283). However, the schooling sector has been more explicit in defining their interest in the idea of partnerships, as highlighted in the example below. The Victorian Department of Education and Training defines education partnerships as mutually beneficial relationships that go beyond what individual organisations can achieve in isolation to seek a common outcome.

Effective education partnerships are **mutually beneficial relationships** that extend beyond what schools and organisations can accomplish in isolation and provide opportunities to:

- achieve improved learning
- enhance engagement, wellbeing and development
- contribute to successful transitions.

A partnership is a **relationship** between a school and an organisation where **all partners engage** in the relationship to **seek a common outcome** of maximising learning and development outcomes for children and young people.


This aligns with the overall goals of ITE programs, particularly in reference to mutually beneficial relationships that move organisations beyond acting in isolation with professional experience programs particularly. As well as developing, enhancing and sustaining school-university partnerships, which provide a variety of opportunities for pre-service teachers to access quality professional experience activities in schools, it allows school staff with professional earning opportunities and creates an environment for educational research (Kertesz & Downing, 2016).

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) guide materials and resources advise on the development of successful partnerships. *The Successful Partnerships: A Guide* (2006) provides a partnership checklist; roles and functions within partnerships; communication; funding partnerships; legal aspects; monitoring and evaluation; and lessons from partnerships in various OECD countries. The following characteristics of good partnerships are of particular interest for school-university partnership work:

> A successful partnership enhances the impact and effectiveness of action through combined and more efficient use of resources; promotes innovation and is distinguished by a strong commitment from each partner. Cooperation within a partnership is collaborative; it will be effective if the partners share a strategic vision, pursue compatible
targets, and are all equal members in a predetermined organisational structure. The notion of ownership is often used in this context to describe the emotional binding of the institutions and persons involved. The partnership should be able to bring together different actors in collaborative action as well as in collaborative efforts to effect change (LEED, 2006, p.7).

There is already a great deal of goodwill in school-university partnerships, particularly in the delivery of professional experience, although there are direct costs for both partners. Although not formally listed in school budgets, the allocation of staff to coordinate school placements suggests this represents a major contribution to placements by schools (Ure, Gough & Newton, p.78, 2009).

Government under-funding for professional experience remains problematic for ITE providers, particularly when it comes to the additional funds needed to enhance staffing improvements in provider-school partnerships (Ure, Gough & Newton, 2009). Collaborative approaches require resources to operate fully yet governments have not been prepared to provide these. The evidence does not fully support the notion of collaborative initiatives can being resource-neutral, and this has remained an issue for Australian and international ITE providers for more than a decade (Smith, Brisard, & Menter, 2006; Ure, Gough & Newton, 2009).

Conversely, government continues to view school-university partnerships and collaborations as a cost-effective way for educational organisations to mine their own knowledge and experiences, particularly in times of fiscal restraint (Handscomb, Gu & Varley 2014).

Partnerships, collaborations and networks are popular with policy makers as they can be a means of delivering more with less by making better use of existing resources and adding value by bringing together complementary services; they can also foster innovation and synergy and be emancipatory in the formation of new relationships and systems of working (Baumfield & Butterworth, 2007 pp.415-416).

This maybe the case but there is still the question of how these partnerships become sustainable without appropriate funding when there are external expectation of success.
CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS FOR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

The literature shows a number of characteristics for effective school-university partnership (see Table: 2.3). These include: a shared conceptual understanding, mutuality in roles and relationships, sound operational strategies, and evaluation of both the partnership and its outcomes (Walsh & Backe, 2013, p.599).

**Table 2.3: Identified Partnering Characteristics by Author**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Author/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A shared conceptual understanding, <strong>mutuality</strong> in roles and relationships, sound <strong>operational strategies</strong>, and evaluation of both the partnership and its outcomes.</td>
<td>(Walsh &amp; Backe, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to <strong>reciprocal learning</strong> relationships, explicit and agreed roles and responsibilities, genuine collaboration, responsiveness.</td>
<td>(Rossner &amp; Commins, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders develop <strong>collegiality</strong> and professional interaction from positions of <strong>trust, respect and sense of contribution</strong>, establish strong, authentic partnerships, interdependent relationships, commitment to bridging any theory/practice nexus as authentic ‘learning partners’.</td>
<td>(Turner, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence and alignment between schools and the university, <strong>communication, logistics/systemic</strong> considerations and equity issues.</td>
<td>(Allen, Howells &amp; Radford, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of third space learning, <strong>shared responsibility, shared (distributed) power</strong>, localised and adapted core content, interactive outline learning.</td>
<td>(Elsden-Clifton &amp; Jordan, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to give importance to the <strong>legitimate interests and concerns of both</strong> the academy and the schools.</td>
<td>(Day, 1998)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A good understanding of these characteristics allows teacher education providers to self-identify how well their own school-partnerships activities align with the identified core partnership characteristics particularly those listed here.
KEY COMPONENTS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS FOR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Figure 2.1: Aligned components of effective school-university for professional experience

Aligned Characteristics, Values and Vision

Successful school and university professional experience partnerships are underpinned by clearly aligned values, identified characteristics and shared vision (Walkington, 2007; Turner, 2008; Kruger, Davies, Ekersley, Newell & Cherednichenko, 2009; Handscomb, Gu, & Varley, 2014). Mutual understanding of the importance of high quality professional experience in developing the skills, knowledge and attitudes of Teacher Education students is critical to the quality of our future teacher workforce. Key characteristics illustrated in the literature – trust, respect, mutuality, reciprocity, collegiality, and professionalism are foundational to the success and effectiveness of school-university partnerships.

Goal-aligned partnerships, as well as operational processes and procedures for professional experience, need to have genuine commitment from both organisations with buy-in by all concerned, not only the top level (Sutherland, Scanlon & Sperring, 2005). Having clear lines of communication between partners is essential to achieving shared goals although communication between the world of schools and that of universities has never been simple and straightforward (Halasz, p.10, 2016).

There are other several potential dangers to effective partnerships: unclear goals, resource costs, unequal power, cliques usurping power, impact on other ‘mainstream’ or core school services; philosophical differences between partners and organisational problems (McQuaid, 2000). Schools may also be unable to
be loyal to just provider because they are working with multiple higher education institutions (Edwards & Mutton, 2007).

It is necessary to be realistic about the pressure responding to changes, external drivers and shifting goals put on partners. In busy, diverse and demanding schools and universities opportunities arise often so in partnerships between complex organisations, communication activities can help create opportunities for theory and practice to inform one another (Barge & Little, 2002; Yamagata-Lynch & Smaldino, 2007 p.364). Clearly partnerships that move beyond formal agreements to more embedded practices are more likely to have long lasting and sustainable relationships in their provision of professional experience placements Burton & Gena, (2007).

DEVELOPING AN AUDIT TOOL FOR SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

There have been attempts to encourage higher education providers and schools to review procedures and processes for teacher placements. The Victorian Council of Deans of Education and the Victorian Institute of Teaching partnered with the Australian Learning and Teaching Council to produce the Practicum Partnerships: Exploring Models of Practicum Organisation in Teacher Education for a Standards-Based Profession report. The Report’s audit recommendations, which are still relevant, consider the quality of organisational support and processes; communications and reporting; integration of academic content; alignments of philosophy; diversity of placement across the schooling spectrum; length of placement; teacher workloads; and the prevision of high quality mentors.

Of particular interest is Draft Recommendation 3.2, which calls for all higher education providers and schools participating in pre-service teacher placement programs to conduct an audit of the procedures and processes supporting placements.

3.2.1 Higher education providers should audit:

- The quality of the organisational and academic support provided to placements
- Communications with pre-service teachers, schools and supervising teachers
- The purpose, form and quality of information regarding the goals of the placement and how these are to be achieved
- The design of the placement program, and how it promotes integration of academic content with practical teaching experience
• The assessment of practicum requirements to ensure they align with program philosophy and the VIT Professional Standards for Graduating Teachers

• The timing of placements to ensure they provide teaching experiences in the senior school years for pre-service teachers

• The length of placements to ensure they are long enough to provide high quality professional learning experiences for pre-service teachers.
3.2.2 Schools should audit:

- The communication and organisational processes in the school for the support of placements
- The commitment of the school to providing high quality placements including attention to the workloads of supervising teachers to ensure there is time for them to meet with pre-service teachers
- Procedures to ensure placements are supported by high quality mentors who understand the developmental needs of pre-service teachers and who are able to use evidence-based strategies to support this development.

(Ure, Gough & Newton, 2009 p.36).

Further to this, an extensive literature review conducted by Handscomb, Gu & Varley (2014 pp.4-7) identified key messages surrounding effective school-university partnerships. They highlight the central aspects that matter in school-university partnerships that include:

1. Understanding the dynamic nature of school-university partnerships
2. Developing the capacity to work with different organisational structures and cultures
3. Creating a bespoke partnership space, based on trust and mutuality
4. Leadership
5. Conditions
6. Involving the wider community.

These findings reflect the broader literature examined in this chapter and form the basis of the PIPEx audit tool, which can be used to develop a theoretically based method to evaluate, plan, and implement new partnership activities (Yamagata-Lynch & Smaldino, 2007 p.364). The key messages are presented with further explanations below in Table 2.4.
### Table 2.4: Key messages from literature review of what matters in school-university partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key messages from literature review (Handscomb et al. pp 4-7, 2014)</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding the dynamic nature of school-university partnerships matters. The management of change is a necessary and constant function.</td>
<td><strong>School-university partnerships involve a wide spectrum of activity</strong> They embrace both broad relationships between universities and schools focussed on widening participation in universities of under-represented groups, to the more specific relationship between faculties of education and schools, focussed on ITE, continuing professional development, consultancy and collaborative research. <strong>School-university partnerships can be sites of both struggle and enjoyment</strong> They can involve clash of cultures, perspectives, and aspirations, whilst at the same time be valued for their dynamism, vibrancy and opportunity for children, teachers and the wider community to come together to bring about improvement. <strong>School-university partnership working has raised both considerable expectations and disappointment</strong> They are popular as a means of delivering more with less by making better use of existing resources and adding value by bringing together complementary services. However, this optimism is also matched by a spirit of pessimism by others who report on the gap between promise and implementation. <strong>Effective collaboration requires breaking out of traditional roles and relationships</strong> Nowhere is this more important than the need to revisit the traditional approach to research and knowledge production that promotes researchers as knowledge generators and teachers as translators. Schools and teachers need to be seen as research partners and a crucial part of the process rather than just the objects of enquiry. <strong>Successful partnering often requires pragmatism and incremental change</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problems partnerships tackle are complex and involve multiple strands. Therefore, making headway can requires tackling each in turn and securing step by step small gains.

2. **Developing the capacity to work with different organisational structures and cultures matters.**

   **Structures and culture can get in the way of partnership working**

   There is a need for commitment and capacity building over the long term from both partners. However, this can be undermined when policy concerns interfere and affect the structure, culture and resources of partnerships in highly contradictory and uneven ways.

   **University organisational arrangements in particular can prove a barrier to partnering**

   The organisational structure of the university, reflecting the values underlying it, often limits its ability to do interdisciplinary work and team approaches and, in so doing, inhibits the building of a professional community within the university and with schools.

   **Cultural differences in school-university partnerships can pose significant barriers to effective partnering**

   There are stark differences in outlook between universities and schools relating to knowledge, language, audience, accountability and even mismatches in the different pace and scheduling of the working year.

3. **Creating a bespoke partnership space, based on trust and mutuality, matters.**

   **Successful partnerships involve mutuality and symbiotic relationships**

   Much of the literature emphasises a mature view of partnering based on recognition of the value of all community contributions, of mutuality and a dynamic, often risky area, distinctive from either the school or the university.

   **Successful partnerships are built upon mutual trust**

   They foster a sense of transparency and vulnerability which can be a tool for bridging the school/university cultural divide. This cultural dialogue in turn can only thrive on trust.

   **Partnerships are a third space distinct from the culture of the partnering organisations**
This hybrid space not only draws on the knowledge and discourses of two distinct communities but also facilitates them.

**Partnership involves uncertainty and risk**

In committing to the partnership there is a sense of uncertainty, of risk, of operating outside one's comfort zone - but at the same time it is a vibrant, creative space which may offer up potentially great dividends. The differences between schools and universities are thus seen as a source of creative tension rather than discord.

**Mutuality can be achieved through joint working and joint development**

One key element is to put in place arrangements by which school and university colleagues work together on specific developments and to support this activity with joint professional development. This helps to ensure that there is mutual learning and a values approach of mutual benefit, mutual esteem, and shared responsibility.

**Partnerships can have a collaborative advantage or dividend.** Mutually-constructed learning communities provide opportunities that are both different from and richer than the opportunities either the school or the university can provide alone.

4. **Leadership matters.**
   - **Leadership is vital in ensuring coherence and success in such vibrant and volatile partnership environments**
     It is only when school leaders make it a priority that partnerships can be used as external sources of support and that joint research communities can become sustainable.
   - **In successful partnership, there is leadership vision combined with distributed leadership**
     Partnerships need to be led and have vision in order to be sustained over time. Leadership often bubbles up pragmatically to fulfil partnership tasks where it is needed.
   - **Leadership across organisational boundaries makes an important contribution**
A crucial feature in partnership leadership is how this operates across the boundaries between the partners and the pivotal function carried out by key roles. This emphasises the role of the ‘blended professionals who work across institutional boundaries.

### 5. Conditions matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions matter.</th>
<th>There are key conditions for successful partnership working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There can be conflict of interest in partnerships.</td>
<td>These relate to certain skills, dispositions and relationships and also to the issues of time and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful partnerships draw upon shared values, mutual commitment and a wide range of expertise and material resources.</td>
<td><strong>Material resources</strong> Partnership working has its costs and requires commitment Partnership can easily become a soft, warm and cuddly process of unchallenging relationships between professionals to achieve some modest outcome. Partnerships pose a challenge and have transaction costs - the time, energy and resources necessary to keep the partnership alive and well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Funding</strong> Funding is a crucial contributor to partnership success, but partnerships also need to develop strategies to persist in austere times Partnership working has its costs and requires commitment Partnership can easily become a soft, warm and cuddly process of unchallenging relationships between professionals to achieve some modest outcome. Partnerships pose a challenge and have transaction costs - the time, energy and resources necessary to keep the partnership alive and well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strategic fitness and relevance</strong> Partnerships work well when there is joined-up coherence and strategic fit Projects work best when relationships are developed over time, are strategic and support the missions of universities, colleges and schools involved in a targeted way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Localism</strong> Localism is an important feature of partnership working This involves a sense of a coming together to jointly address problems and craft local solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Successful partnerships</strong> Successful partnerships are often design led and focussed on local problem solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This involves a problem-centred approach that joins academic research, clinical practice and commercial expertise in sustained program of activity.

**Collaborative enquiry enables effective partnership working**
What promotes and drives exchange of understanding and learning across the membrane between partners is enquiry. As problems are posed and solutions sought then expertise is located in different people and in different places within the partnership.

**Successful partnerships have a wider community dimension**
School-university partnerships may have an extended membership from the wider community including parents.

**Ownership, power and control**
**Power and control issues are the most persistent features of school-university partnership dynamics**
This has particularly focused upon who drives the partnership and the continuing perception of this being university dominated. Too often teachers’ contextual knowledge feels inferior and threatened in comparison to what universities bring to the partnership.

**Policy developments have aimed to move control towards schools**
The recognition that, despite often good intentions, universities still tend to drive partnership direction and activity has resulted in some movement to shift power and control towards schools.

**School driven partnerships can raise other concerns**
Prominent among these are that it insufficently takes account of the challenges of a school-based approach delivering the Initial Teacher Education system at scale, or of the reduced incentives for Faculties/Schools of Education to participate. There is also the danger of schools becoming inward-looking, trainee teachers uncritically taking on the possibly poor practices of established teachers.

**There is a need for all voices to be heard**
The development of a partnership culture needs to be based on sharing and valuing differences as an alternative to the power and control pendulum swing between universities and schools.

**Effective outcomes are generated through ownership by the partnership**
Meaningful and potent outcomes are more likely when they are conceived and achieved as part of the partnering process itself.

**Monitoring and evaluation**
Successful partnering requires more attention to monitoring and evaluation
Understanding on what works and is generated in local contexts can help to inform wider policy and scaling up.

6. **Involving the wider community to improve the benefits of widening participation and increase STEM participation matters.**

**Widening participation is a persisting problem**
Despite a number of attempts to address this issue, participation and retention of students from lower income families in university remains extremely low.

**Improving widening participation requires reciprocal action and partnering with the wider community**
There needs to be close reciprocal interaction sustained over time within the partnership. There is also a need for the university to reach out to the community and develop both an educational and social presence in the lives of the residents of its immediate community, thus enhancing its credibility.

**Increasing STEM participation and number of STEM graduates involves early intervention**
Action post 14 is too late; more needs to be done in the early stages of education. There is also a need for more capacity and greater coherence in research and evaluation.

**AN EVALUATION TOOL THAT IDENTIFIES BEST PRACTICE IN SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE PARTNERSHIPS**
An evaluation tool that identifies best practice in school-university professional experience partnerships has been developed from this review. Drawing the literature together to identify key aspects and critical factors for quality partnerships between schools and universities has led to the development of a tool that
evaluates best practice in professional experience quality partnerships. The tool is designed as a method of evaluating the alignments, processes and outcomes of working together. Ideally it should be used in conjunction with other forms of data collected from partnership activities. Interestingly, there are a number of existing partnership audit and evaluation tools that have successfully evaluated the quality of health provider and community partnerships. The following have been adapted for the purposes of developing the Quality Partnerships in Professional Experience (QPiPEx) audit tool (see below):

- **Partnership Self-Assessment Tool – Questionnaire (2002).** Center for the Advancement of Collaborative Strategies in Health.
- **Collaborative Partnerships Evaluation Tool (2008).** South Australian Community Health Research Unit (SACHRU).
- **VicHealth Partnerships Analysis Tool – Checklist (2011).** A resource for establishing, developing and maintaining partnerships for health promotion.

It has been suggested that partnership assessment tools require clearly defined objectives to be effective (Jolley, Lawless & Hurley 2008). According to Halliday, Asthana and Richardson (2004), partnership evaluation tools should have three functions:

- To reflect on the effectiveness of their partnership
- To describe or ‘benchmark’ its current status
- To provide a developmental framework by focusing on identified strengths and weaknesses.

These functions are the foundation of the draft Quality Partnerships in Professional Experience (QPiPEx) audit tool.

**THE QUALITY PARTNERSHIPS IN PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (QPIPEx) AUDIT TOOL**

The literature identifies the need for a tool with the capacity to evaluate the quality of school-university professional experience partnerships to move beyond a *tick-n-flick* template that merely records partnership activity to one that identifies the quality of partnership practice and recognises areas for improvement and growth. An audit tool should evaluate how the processes and outcomes of professional experience partnerships align with the partners’ goals and needs.

For example, the Quality Partnerships in Professional Experience (QPiPEx) audit tool has been developed to assess, monitor and measure the impact and quality of school-university professional experience
partnerships. It will assist teacher education providers to ascertain the effectiveness and quality of their partnerships. Providers will be able to learn about the strengths and weaknesses in their partnerships and at the same time identify areas that require further development or improvement. The QPiPEx audit tool also has the capacity to illustrate best practice in professional experience partnerships.

The QPiPEx is divided into four sections:

- Partnership aligned values and vision
- Partnership shared goals and objectives
- Partnership operational processes and procedures
- Minimising the barriers to professional experience partnerships.

The tool uses a five-point Likert scale with 40 statement responses. Each section has a sub-total from a total of 200. There is a score scale and band descriptor to rank the quality of the partnership. This draft tool aims to show how an audit tool may look. It requires validity testing to ensure the scoring scale is appropriate and is relevant to the task of evaluating the quality of school-university professional experience partnerships. With further work this tool could be automated to tally response values with a detailed break-down of key components.

The audit tool provides space for general comments and background to the context of the partnership and space for actions to be recorded. Future development will incorporate more sections to capture greater detail in partnership demographics and more targeted statements about school perspectives.
### A. Partnership aligned values and vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0</strong> There is a well-defined and long-term vision for the Professional Experience partnership and both organisations are committed to ensuring its success.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong> There is a clear set of agreed values underpinning the Professional Experience partnership which all parties understand and promote.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2</strong> There is strategic value for all involved in the Professional Experience partnership and this is promoted within the respective organisations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3</strong> The benefits of the Professional Experience partnership are valued beyond apparent costs. Partners are committed to exploring innovative financial solutions to ensure program sustainability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 There is an appreciation of the diverse and dynamic nature of the respective partners organisations and that the management of change is constant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Partners view their core business as partially interdependent and value working together for a common good.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Partners have a realistic understanding of the drivers, challenges and opportunities the Professional Experience partnership provides.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 The respective partners are willing to move beyond traditional roles and relationships to ensure the Professional Experience partnership is effective and successful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 There is regular review/evaluation of the Professional Experience partnerships activities, achievements and/or direction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 If changes are required everyone is consulted prior to decisions being made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background/comment(s):**

Subtotal /50
### Domain of Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.0 There is a set goal that has been developed collaboratively by partners, including pre-service teachers, teachers, principals and teacher education providers.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 All partners agree on and have a shared understanding and commitment to the goal(s) of the partnership. This is supported by managers/leaders in the work they are doing.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Partners meet regularly to review the goal of the Professional Experience partnership. The partnership is able to deal with conflict in a positive way.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 There are sharing of resources and information between partners, including ideas, influence, research and power to fulfil.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 There is a participatory decision-making system that is accountable, responsive and inclusive. Partners get a chance to give their input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5 All members in the partnership are involved in the planning and setting of priorities for collaborative action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.6 There is an investment (from all parties) in the partnership of personnel, time, resources or facilities/space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.7 Staff in the respective partnership organisations have opportunities to engage with professional development that will enhance partnership activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.8 Pre-service teachers have voice; agency; representation in the Professional Experience partnership and are part of the decision-making processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.9 The partnership is able to adapt to changes in staff/leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Background/comment(s):

Actions:
### C. Partnership operational processes and procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0 There are shared understandings of management structures between partners.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 There are established management and operational protocols between partners, including terms of reference that are reviewed and everyone is aware of and agrees with them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Some staff have roles that transverse boundaries. There are opportunities for staff to work in each other’s organisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 A steering group/committee with partner representation has Professional Experience partnership oversight.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Formal agreement/MoU between partners is established with built in review processes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Leaders/managers in the respective organisations support and promote the partnership in their own organisation,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Regular meetings between partners are held on a regular basis. Meetings have agendas and minutes recorded.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>There are formal reporting mechanisms in place to share information about the activities within the partnership.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Lines of communication are open, with designated key contacts within each organisation identified.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>There is an established risk management plan in place if the partnership fails/suspended/dissolved.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background/comment(s):  

Actions:
D. Minimising the barriers to professional experience partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Barriers have been identified and solutions have been developed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Differences in organisational priorities, goals and tasks have been addressed with a set plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Experience and committed staff (from the respective partner organisations) are in the leadership team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Whole of organisation (both partners) buy-in are invested in the success of the Professional Experience partnership from the beginning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 There are strategies in place to deal with the break-down of relationships within the Professional Experience partnership.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 There are clear and open communication processes that allow for honest and robust conversations about the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Professional Experience partnership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.6 The value of the Professional Experience partnership is clearly articulated within partner organisations.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.7 There are financial and resource management structures that are well established and transparent.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.8 Processes are streamlined to ensure that there is not a doubling up of procedures/processes/systems.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.9 There are processes in place to address, complaints, relationship breakdown and blockers.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Background/comment(s):**

**Actions:**

**TOTAL: /200 (see band description below)**

---

**QPiPEX score key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CONCLUSION

Professional experience, field experiences and the practicum or internship are viewed collectively as integral to pre-service Teacher Education. The professional experience process is complex and challenging for many ITE students (Groundwater-Smith et al. 2015). The diversity of schools involved makes organisation and administration of school placements problematic and there is the constant challenge of securing enough placements for pre-service teachers. The lack of placements is seen as a symptom of ineffectual university-school partnerships (Walkington, 2007; Watson et al. 2008).

The Victorian parliamentary report *Step Up, Step In, Step Out* addressed ineffectual partnerships and identified innovative approaches that strengthened school-university links and increased the amount of time that pre-service teachers spent in schools (Parliament of Victoria 2005). The development of innovative practices in school-university professional experience partnerships requires time. This report notes that *these innovations have largely evolved through partnerships with schools and have resulted in many pre-service teachers spending much longer in professional settings and experiencing much higher quality in their placements* (p.154).

This literature review chapter emphasizes the critical role of effective school-university partnerships in providing quality professional experience, which connect teaching theory with practice through classroom teachers and education academics working in a third space with pre-service teachers. It is essential for providers to have a sound understanding of the effectiveness of their professional experience partnerships through the data they collected with self-audit tools like QPiPEx, so pre-service teachers are ensured high quality placements.

This chapter shows the factors inherent in effective high-quality school-university partnerships and draws on the literature to identify the key aspects and critical factors for quality school-university partnerships.
This has allowed the development of the Quality Partnerships in Professional Experience (QPiPEx) evaluation tool to identify best practice in school-university professional experience partnerships by evaluating their alignments, processes and outcomes.
RECOMMENDATION:
A well-developed audit tool is needed to provide a research base of how processes and outcomes of professional experience partnerships align with the goals and needs of school and university partners.

It is recommended that NADPE develop the proposed audit tool and collate a data base of university – school partnerships in ITE to:

- test the effectiveness of the audit tool in assisting providers to identify and evaluate partnership processes and capabilities
- determine how alignment of partnership expectations and practises contribute to effective placement outcomes.
STUDY THREE

PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS’ PORTFOLIOS OF EVIDENCE:
A National Snapshot of the Collection and Assessment of Practice within Australian ITE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
The increasing international concern about the quality of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) since the 1990s stimulated research within ITE and the development of an evidence-base for practice (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). In Australia, the sustained critique of ITE during the past four decades (Mayer, 2014), led to the 2015 Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) review.

TEMAG’s brief was to examine three central ITE elements, including opportunities for pre-service teachers to put theory into practice through professional experience in ITE programs. The Government’s Response, *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers* (TEMAG, 2014), highlighted the importance of professional experience in providing pre-service teachers with opportunities to apply their content and pedagogical knowledge in practical settings. It also emphasised the need to produce Portfolios of Evidence to demonstrate their readiness for the classroom.

The …large repertoire of personal as well as professional qualities, knowledge, skills and understandings… required of modern-day teachers are not always taught or assessed within university confines or through isolated teaching and learning events (Mattsson, Eilertsen and Rorrison, 2011, p. 3). Rather, the range of knowledge, skills and capabilities embedded within the Graduate Teacher Standards (AITSL, 2014) can be realised through the use of Portfolios of Evidence (Fox, White & Kidd, 2011) if pre-service teachers apply them within authentic contexts and with others (Mattsson, Eilertsen & Rorrison, 2011; Kertesz, 2016). Portfolios of Evidence have also become a mechanism for ITE providers to demonstrate program impact through the knowledge, practice and engagement of graduates (AITSL, 2015; Kilbane & Milman, 2017).

The use of Portfolios of Evidence is now commonplace (Light, Chen & Ittelson, 2012) but the ways that providers implement them remains challenging (Masters, 2016). However, new challenges bring
opportunities for innovation. Within this rapidly changing context, implementation activities have the potential to move beyond merely capturing evidence of learning to simultaneously shape pedagogical arrangements that can re-organise it (Herrington, Reeves & Oliver, 2010). This includes looking at how learning managements systems align with initial teacher education providers’ internal needs while also making evidence available for other purposes and audiences (Masters, 2016).

A survey instrument was developed, administered and the results analysed to better understand the use of Portfolios of Evidence in Australian initial teacher education.

**AIM OF THE PROJECT**

The aim of this project was to capture a national snapshot of the ways in which ITE providers utilise pre-service teachers’ Portfolios of Evidence.

**METHODS**

This project received approval from the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number H0016625). Consent was sought from all Australian-based Deans of Education along with their respective Academic Directors of Professional Experience. The original project dates were planned over a 10-month period.

![Figure 3.1: Key project dates](image)

The approach used a mixed method design that integrated the collection and analysis of qualitative and qualitative research data. The collection of qualitative data offered the opportunity to provide open-ended responses while the quantitative data required closed ended responses. Building on the strategies provided
by Creswell (2013) and Tashakkori & Teddlie (2010), a combined 37-item online survey instrument was prepared. The mixed method approach provided ways to integrate the quantitative and qualitative data; retain the 'human' focus reflective of social science research; and, maximised the opportunity to use the instrument that best suited the sample. In addition, information from one type of database could offer insights into the other and corresponding form of collected data. In this way, the convergent data can provide comprehensive analysis. The project team believed also that the mixed method offered additional opportunities for longer-term and longitudinal studies.

The quantitative survey items were designed to generate descriptive understandings of the implementation activities being undertaken by Australian ITE providers and to develop understandings of the workforce undertaking this work. Fixed-choice and open-ended questions were developed from the research team’s ITE expertise and through working with Portfolios of Evidence with the intention of producing credible data that would be of value to the ITE community. Each item was developed and reviewed by the research team to ensure it reflected the project’s research questions, the contemporary ITE context and the drivers for Portfolios of Evidence implementation.

The qualitative survey items were designed to provide the respondents with opportunities to direct the research team’s attention to additional issues relevant to Portfolios of Evidence implementation and teacher educators’ work. Qualitative items systematically related to quantitative items so that content analysis was responsive to both forms of data (Patten, 2002).

Gaining insights into these institutional and individual responses to the drivers for Portfolios of Evidence implementation required purposive sampling to target those charged with the implementation. Survey items were constructed to be accessible to ITE staff working across a range of roles and fields.

The themes for survey development were derived from the following research questions:

- How are pre-service teachers’ Portfolios of Evidence being collected and assessed within ITE?
- How are Portfolios of Evidence supporting pre-service teachers to demonstrate evidence of meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards?
- Where is innovation occurring through the use of Portfolios of Evidence?
- How are Portfolios of Evidence influencing pedagogical delivery of ITE?
- How are institutions re-aligning resources, personnel and infrastructure to support implementation?
• What challenges are ITE providers encountering through implementation and how are they responding to them (including issues related to data ownership, management, storage and confidentiality)?

The dataset from the distributed survey were analysed initially quantitatively and qualitatively by the research team to identify patterns and emergent themes. Mixed method approaches were taken to analyse the data through descriptive statistics and content analysis. Descriptive statistical analysis investigated the demographics of survey respondents, while the descriptive content analysis assisted the development of somatic identification and meaning-making obtained from the open-ended survey questions. Corresponding with the focus of the survey, qualitative responses were categorised, listed and coded to reflect the frequency of occurrence of responses (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013; Bryman, 2008). The structure of the online survey meant that the data were organised and represented in ways that made it possible to initially analyse the data in multiple ways, moving backwards and forwards between individual survey items while at other times moving through the complete data set to explore and clarify initial themes across items before undertaking more analysis. This process progressed into reading and re-reading the data along with the project’s research questions to further identification of patterns within responses to single items and identifying relationships between items (Richards, 2009).

LIMITATIONS

The participant cohort was small (n=67). Some respondents were diverted out of the survey following Question 8 to the final question based on their self-reported lack of expertise and/or experiences of implementing Portfolios of Evidence.

The findings may not be generalisable.

The instrument used to collect data has not been validated as it was constructed in response to the research questions and in response to a rapidly changing context.

Further data collection is required to be able to demonstrate how these findings can be applied to other contexts. Future research may help to understand why some teams are able to overcome the challenges that they face within the complexities of their contexts. Competing challenges of resourcing, staffing, digital technologies and platforms and the contextual factors themselves all mean that implementation
activities are impacted by myriad of other constraints. Examining how some teams are able to move beyond those constraints while innovating, conceptualising and articulating their priorities for implementation may be of immense benefit to the field.
ETHICAL APPROVAL
This project received Human Research Ethics approval from the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number H0016625).

SAMPLING METHODOLOGY
Participant selection involved a targeted initial approach to the Academic Directors of Professional Experience (ADPE). An introductory email was first sent to each Australian Dean of Education (Appendix B) with the project’s Information Sheet (Appendix C). This email included a rationale for the project, project overview and explanation of the funding and support for the collection of this information and research ethics clearance.

It was anticipated that the ADPE would have knowledge of where this work was occurring within their site and the staff involved. The ACDE Manager of Projects, Policy and Networks, Anne Szadura sent an introductory email (Appendix D) to ADPE that included a request to forward an invitation to all staff within their Faculty/School and a request to target five specific staff they knew were associated with this work. Disseminating the survey at Faculty/School level through the ADPE was paramount to capturing how, why and where this work was occurring.

The introductory email contained a link to a survey instrument (Appendix E) designed specifically for this project. The instrument was designed to reflect the research questions, listed in justification section above. The survey instrument was designed to collect demographic and institutional data in Section 1 before presenting questions relating to each of the research themes.

ADAPTIVE QUESTIONS
To keep the survey succinct some question logic was incorporated with some respondents given the opportunity to respond to a particular question based on their response to a previous question. For example, questions relating to the type of portfolio were only presented to those who indicated that they had a portfolio. Only respondents who selected A or B in Q7 were directed to Q8. If they marked C, D or E they were re-directed to Q36 (and will show as ‘skipped’ for all questions in between). Question 12 received only five responses because only those that selected item A in Q11 were directed to Q12, all others went straight to Q13.
This accounted for variability in the ‘n’ number of those responding, whereby some questions may not provide reliable or valid information.

**PARTICIPANT PROFILE**

The 67 respondents to this survey represent 21 out of 34 (62%) of Faculties/Schools of Education (and 43 (49%) universities) in Australia, with two respondents preferring not to say, plus there were three specialist teaching organisations (non-university) represented (Question 2; n=67). All states were represented at least once (Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1: Respondents by State (Question 1, n=66).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question skipped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey participants (or ‘respondents’) were invited to respond to items within the survey instrument based on their current role and experiences of implementing portfolios into ITE. They indicated which generic role best described their main role(s) (Table 3.2).

The majority of respondents were currently in roles where their involvement in implementation of Portfolios of Evidence was related to teaching and learning activities and technical or administrative support that supported this work, rather than management or procurement of digital technologies associated with implementation. Of the two respondents reporting a role as ‘other’ one gave their role as a Practicum Supervisor, and one an Administrator (Table 3.2).
Table 3.2: Main role(s) indicated by respondents (Question 3, n=66).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Unit Coordinator</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Course Coordinator</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLearning Support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Support</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Developer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison or Mentor (visiting academic)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Officer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience Coordinator</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional Experience</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Head/Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of School/Dean of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some respondents have chosen more than one option

While the research team had hoped to generate greater interest in the survey, given the priority for the development of Portfolios of Evidence through national accreditation requirements, the results included 11 Directors of Professional Experience, five PE Coordinators and 15 Program/Course Coordinators – a response rate of approximately 25%.

This limited response rates means that the data needs to be interpreted as indicative only, and limits how the research team can explain implementation of PoE more generally within the sector.

The main challenges in recruiting participants included:

- **Timing** – the survey was circulated at the end of Semester 1 and during the mid-year semester break. This is a time of conference attendance and leave for many staff
- **Duration** – the data collection window was relatively tight (3 weeks), and may have exacerbated issues related to timing
- **Selection** – ADPE may have overlooked the request or may have overlooked staff with relevant involvement and expertise in implementing Portfolios of Evidence
- **Prioritising** – ITE staff may not have understood the intent of the request.

**Recommendation:**
An additional data collection round is recommended to generate a larger participant cohort across more ITE providers; and to investigate and implement strategies for directly targeting ITE staff to participate.
RESULTS

Location and Profile of ITE Staff Implementing Portfolios of Evidence

All Australian jurisdictions were represented in the data with six institutions identified from New South Wales, five from Western Australia, four from Victoria, three from South Australia, two from Queensland and one each in Australian Capital Territory, Northern Territory and Tasmania. Data was collected from a diverse collection of ITE providers including Group of Eight universities, regional universities and independent institutions (Figure 3.2).

Figure 3.2: Responses by State/Territory (Question 1; n=66).

The profile of respondents was almost exclusively represented by academic staff, appointed full-time as Lecturers or Senior Lecturers (Figure 3.3-3.5). This profile of participants identifies full-time, academic staff in lecturer/senior lecturer roles as those with most responsibility in relation to PoE implementation. Their responses to survey items also confirmed that they had the responsibility for, and experiences of, implementing Portfolios of Evidence.

Initial data analysis directed the researchers’ attention to the profile of the workforce implementing portfolios and the nature of their roles and appointments. Ninety-five percent (95%) of respondents were in academic roles and 5% in professional roles (n=67) (Figure 3.3-3.5).
Of those nominating their role as an academic position, **83% of respondents (n=50)** recorded that they were appointed as Lecturer (55%) or Senior Lecturer (28%) while undertaking implementation activities (Figure 3.4).

**Figure 3.3: Respondents’ employed in an academic or professional staff capacity (Question 4; n=67).**

**Figure 3.4: Respondents’ level of appointment (Question 5; n=60).**
Of those responding ‘other’ in

Figure 3.4 five gave an alternative: Supervisor/Head of Professional Practice at School, Dean, Academic Level C Director, Principal, Lecturer and Program Manager, while seven skipped the question.

Ninety-two percent of all respondents were also in full-time positions, indicating the homogeneity of the participant cohort (Figure 3.5). Of those responding ‘other’ one noted that they were tenured full-time, while one was on a contract. Three skipped the question.

**Figure 3.5: Type of appointment (Question 6; n=64).**

![Bar chart showing type of appointment: Full-time, Part-time, Casual](chart)

Where academic staff reported involvement in the implementation and use of Portfolios of Evidence, they had involvement across a range of development and implementation activities, with each respondent who was involved with Portfolios of Evidence choosing, on average, three ways that they were involved in the implementation and use of Portfolios of Evidence (Table 3.3).

**Table 3.3: Respondents’ reporting all of the ways that they were involved in implementation and use of PoE (Question 7; n=64).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved in the design of PoE tasks</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in content development to support PoE</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in teaching about PoE</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in assessment/mark of PoE tasks</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in moderation of PoE tasks</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in the administration of PoE</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Not involved with implementing the PoE</em></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>182*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some respondents have chosen more than one option*
These data highlight that the majority of staff associated with Portfolios of Evidence were also active in a wide range of development, implementation and administration responsibilities associated with implementation of Portfolios of Evidence. The implementation activities predominantly belonged to lecturer/senior lecturer staff within program teams and these individuals also performed key roles in coordinating programs/courses and units/subjects.

Eighty-three percent of respondents (54) reported holding either a leading role in the implementation of Portfolios of Evidence (28%) or were actively engaged in implementing Portfolios of Evidence in their areas of specialisation or academic responsibility (26%) (Table 3.4). Only 8% were not sure about the Portfolios of Evidence in their institution.

Table 3.4: Respondents’ familiarity with the implementation of the PoE in your institution (Question 8; n=65).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a leading role in the implementation of the PoE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am actively engaged in implementing the PoE in my area</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subjects/units/programs I work with incorporate PoE activities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware that the pre-service teachers we work with need a PoE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not really sure about the PoE in my institution</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 8 forced respondents to choose a single answer. It was an adaptive question where the first and second answers led respondents to Question 9, whereas anyone answering the third, fourth or fifth option was taken to the final question (Question 37).
**Recommendation:**

These findings indicate there is a need for more research to determine to what extent implementation activity is being undertaken almost exclusively by academic lecturing staff within other ITE providers and to consider the risks and benefits of implementation activities being concentrated in these ways.

**Program/course implementation of Portfolios of Evidence**

Reported decision-making about the implementation of Portfolios of Evidence (Table 3.55) emphasised the influence of program/course teams to shape this work. *Program/course teams was selected by 56.3% of participants as the most influential unit shaping decisions* associated with implementation activities. Of this group, 38.8% also identified the Faculty/School as an influential factor shaping this work.

**Table 3.5: Decision-making processes that have most influenced how Portfolios of Evidence have been implemented within your Faculty/School (Question 14; n=32).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/subject</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/School-led</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/course team</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit/subject team</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual team</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual staff</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service teachers have initiated Portfolios of Evidence for themselves</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **52**<sup>*</sup>

<sup>*</sup> Some respondents have chosen more than one option

Equally, *program/course team was identified as the main driver for implementation by 56.3% of participants*.
Figure 3.6). A similar group (44.4%) also identified the Faculty/school as a main driver for implementation. Of particular note, external bodies (such as regulatory authorities) were highlighted as the main driver for implementation by seven participants and the institution itself was only seen as the main driver for implementation by three participants (
Questions 14 and 15 indicate that the participant cohort that is making decisions about PoE implementation is also driving it, in concert with decision-making processes.
Other data also demonstrated that Portfolios of Evidence implementation activities were being led by programs/courses. For example, 37.5% of participants reported that PoE had been introduced systematically and rolled out at program/course level within their sites while a further 28% reported that implementation was happening at individual program/course level (Question 17).

Implementation of Portfolios of Evidence appeared to be concentrated within a handful of program/course options across most institutions. All but one participant nominated multiple programs/courses where implementation was occurring. Participants identified Bachelor of Education (Primary) (71.4%), Master of Teaching (Primary) (65.7%), Master of Teaching (Secondary) (65.7%), Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood) (60%) and Bachelor of Education (Secondary) (51.4%) as focal points of implementation activities (Question 13). While 12 options were offered, seven respondents also had ‘other’ courses such as Bachelor of Education K-12 and Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary) Double Degree.

Where implementation of Portfolios of Evidence occurred at program/course level, implementation occurred consistently across a range of program/course activities. For example, participants reported that implementation occurred in the pattern outlined in

Figure 3.6: Main drivers for implementation of PST PoE within respondent’s Faculty or School (Question 15; n=32).
Table 3.6.


Table 3.6: Focusing on just one program/course within your Faculty/School where PoEs have been implemented, indicate how this has occurred (Question 27; n=30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the embedding</th>
<th>Yes % (count)</th>
<th>No % (count)</th>
<th>Not Sure % (count)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded within unit/subject documentation</td>
<td>90% (25)</td>
<td>11% (3)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded within unit/subject weekly teaching and learning arrangements</td>
<td>74% (20)</td>
<td>19% (5)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded within Faculty/School learning management systems</td>
<td>50% (13)</td>
<td>42% (11)</td>
<td>8% (2)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded within unit/subject assessment items</td>
<td>90% (26)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>4% (1)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of formative assessment practices</td>
<td>64% (18)</td>
<td>25% (7)</td>
<td>11% (3)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of summative assessment practices</td>
<td>96% (27)</td>
<td>4% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves tasks performed during Professional Experience placements</td>
<td>96% (26)</td>
<td>4% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is viewed/assessed in part by supervising teachers/others during Professional Experience placements</td>
<td>60% (17)</td>
<td>36% (10)</td>
<td>4% (1)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative responses about the most influential person within the faculty/school in relation to implementation (Question 16) also emphasised that **those most close to implementation of PoE were seen as most influential in the decision-making.** Over 79% of participants’ qualitative responses to Question 16 identified academic staff with direct involvement and leadership in implementation as those with the most influential role. An example of this is how Participant 3 responded:

…Fourth Year and Practical Experience Coordinator…[who] interacts with the final year students to a higher degree than others…They coordinate the program within which the portfolio sits… *(Participant 3)*.

This and other examples highlighted the **link between role that academic staff members performed in relation to components of ITE programs/courses and their involvement in implementing Portfolios of Evidence** (for example, end of program and proximity to career entry; professional experience placements). These links were regularly cited as drivers for leadership and influence, for instance:

*I have a role as a 4th year coordinator who has developed and implemented a program…to deliver options and suggestions about the development of portfolios for course completion as well as an ongoing tool as part of their teaching practice…*(Participant 5)*
The Head of Department [is] involved directly with the course and aware of the importance of students collecting evidence to meet the Graduate Teacher Standards. (Participant 8)

Course coordinators and the e-Pedagogue [because of their] knowledge of course content and graduate requirements combined with…skills/understanding for implementation. (Participant 13)

These examples emphasised that academic staff working in the latter stages of ITE programs/courses were connecting Portfolios of Evidence implementation activities, indicating their awareness of accreditation requirements for graduating pre-service teachers to evidence the Graduate Teacher Standards through Portfolios of Evidence.

Responses to Question 16 also highlighted that those influencing implementation activities were having influence beyond their immediate spheres and were seeking to have impact with colleagues and pre-service teachers by creating a shared responsibility for implementation and influence on how they were utilised. For instance:

Portfolios need to become a way of life for pre-service teachers, embedded throughout the course and therefore Unit and Course Coordinators hold the power to make it happen. (Participant 17)

If all academic unit coordinators see the value and importance then [pre-service teachers] obtain consistent messages about portfolios and [they] will progress… (Participant 18)

This was also reported in the ways that those with influence over their implementation had taken strategic action to support implementation in systematic ways across their programs/courses:

The Master of Teaching course development working party initiated the integration of a digital portfolio…into all units. Simultaneously, the Bachelor of Education course review supported the integration of a digital portfolio into the courses in all units… (Participant 7)
Additionally, the link between theoretical and Professional Experience components was an important theme raised by more than half of the respondents in their text-based responses (Question 16) when discussing those colleagues with most influence over implementation:

*Program and Practicum Coordinators [are most influential] as they are in leadership roles and aware of best practice and key priority areas.* (Participant 1)

*The Course Director and Director of Professional Experience play the crucial role as they can provide the overview and…holistic insight [to influence implementation].* (Participant 16)

*To date it has been individual academics who see the value of portfolios for pre-service teachers about to graduate and enter the job market. However, that is changing…There is a much more coordinated approach emerging…that will cross teacher-education programs.* (Participant 4)

*Prior to the national push for implementation…these were mainly [implemented within] professional experience units and their associated pedagogy units…more recently implementation has been led by the Deputy Dean and specialist staff.* (Participant 24)

These responses reflected participants’ survey responses to Question 9, which identified that Portfolios of Evidence were predominantly being implemented within both theoretical (campus-based) units and practical (Professional Experience placement) units (65.7%). A further 17.1% of participants reported implementation of portfolios occurring exclusively within placement-based units and 14.3% locating them within theoretical units alone.
Figure 3.77).
Thirteen participants identified the changing policy environment as likely to have most influence over how Portfolios of Evidence implementation are used in Faculties/Schools over the next two years (Question 19; n=27).

Some participants described this as a knee-jerk response to TEMAG and accreditation requirements while others saw this as an opportunity because of the changing expectations of AITSL, TEQSA and QCT. Four respondents mentioned the Teaching Performance Assessment and expectations, one of whom linked this to a need for ‘pedagogy development’.

Participant 3 saw this policy driver as a timely opportunity to implement some changes…within teacher education…under the new AITSL accreditation processes… and Participant 4 saw it as an opportunity to Identify and more explicitly integrate…APST descriptors throughout units and more clearly identify how assessment can be used as evidence… in relation to pre-service teachers meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards. Three respondents simply cited the national context: policy and accreditation, program accreditation and driven by policy.

“We are currently upgrading our platform and providing Professional Learning for all staff, so all pre-service teachers have the opportunity to make connections with their theory and practice and how this aligns with the AITSL standards.” (Participant 17)
Others saw the opportunity that changing accreditation requirements were bringing to program/course design, with three respondents indicating that they were starting out on their changes:

*We haven’t take a coordinated and systematic approach [previously] but with the new accreditation and implementation of revised and new courses we are changing this. We will have a rollout in new courses where PoE will be embedded.* (Participant 7)

Two respondents discussed how the Portfolios of Evidence were embedded in specific Units, for example, *In Semester 1 and each semester there will be a unit responsible for checking and having a task linked to the Portfolios of Evidence.*

*The Portfolio of Evidence will be embedded in every unit in all ITE courses. This is being rolled out in selected units in selected courses to ensure that the platform and templates are the most appropriate in meeting the needs of the School and students. This requirement will be most influential in continuing to move forward with the digital professional portfolio.* (Participant 5)

There was a clear emphasis on staff development and capacity building, for example Participant 13 cited the need for *availability of trained mentors in schools and the availability of enough personnel to assess the Portfolios of Evidence.*

*Professional development [and staff PD] and support for staff to develop a course-wide and coherent approach to implementing portfolios. Currently it is picked up by champions and so practice is variable and use occurs in pockets.* (Participant 8)

There was still some angst around *understanding the pedagogy and the provision of suitable portfolio infrastructure where platforms [and usability] are there, PL support needs to be provided to staff and pre-service teachers to maximise use/impact of practice.*

**Recommendation:**
Research is needed to explore implementation activities by program teams that are creating innovation in Portfolios of Evidence that are in systematic ways across ITE programs.

**Reported success of implementation of Portfolios of Evidence**

Most participants (68.8%) saw the implementation of Portfolios of Evidence as successful (Figure 3.8). A quarter of participants strongly agreed that implementation had generally been successful while another 43.8% agreed. 19% disagreed with this statement while 6.3% strongly disagreed.

![Figure 3.8: Implementation of Portfolios of Evidence has generally been successful (Question 20; n=20).](image)

Seventy percent of participants either strongly agreed (20%) or agreed (50%) that their institution was addressing the challenge of implementing Portfolios of Evidence effectively (Question 37) while 13% disagreed and 3% strongly disagreed (n=60).

Thematic analysis of the qualitative responses to the linked question *What has supported this success?* (Question 21; n=27, although some respondents made several different points, which have been aggregated into general themes) indicated that consistent processes, mechanisms, expectations and practices supported success. *Helping pre-service teachers become more prepared* and a *Desire to improve student success* were overall goals for the justification emerging from the qualitative comments about what supported the success of Portfolios of Evidence.
At least eight respondents emphasised **sophisticated curriculum design** with **first pedagogy that linked portfolio to student learning and their development of professional teaching competencies** and a need to embed portfolios:

*The Portfolios of Evidence have been effectively contextualised and pre-service teachers have been made well aware of the depth and breadth of the elements of the Portfolios of Evidence and how they connect and interrelate to each other.*

*The Portfolios of Evidence are strongly connected into the semester-long Units in which the professional experience placements are embedded. They are not stand-alone activities, rather integral to the unit of work.* (Participant 3)

*Genuine understanding of the pedagogy. Embedded throughout the entire course. Used to complement other types of teaching/assessment (not standalone).* (Participant 9)

This emphasis on integration of program/course components included **well-designed capstone topic. Coordination of academic topics with professional experience and portfolio integration with practical, and practical debriefing.**

There were also at least **three** comments highlighting the need for **clarity of information or structure and guidelines** and **having clear purpose of what we want to achieve and thinking through logistics.**

General **IT support** and providing a step-by-step resource for students to set up the digital portfolio. The **level of technical familiarity with systems were seen as important to success**, where the University has always had some form of Portfolios of Evidence. We have now developed the instrument substantially was raised by **three** respondents with a **fourth** crediting **IT support and adoption of a platform that will be available to students after they leave the institution has increased student uptake.** At least one respondent urged caution with technology: **Not being too focused on the technical possibilities – and getting the pedagogy in place first.**

**Table 3.7**: Participants assessment of the level of digital technology/infrastructure provided to support the implementation of pre-service teachers’ Portfolios of Evidence (Question 29; n=30).
A fifth respondent blurred the IT Support saying the general use of the Portfolio of Evidence has utilised Portfolios of Evidence [sic] for a number of years already and staff are familiar with this model. Another observed that the students …have been required to complete Portfolios of Evidence in a digital form prior to the introduction of APST. Many students enter courses …with the knowledge that a portfolio evidence will be required and embrace the opportunity to develop their Portfolio of Evidence in a format that best suits their needs.

Two more implied the Graduate Teacher Standards: commitment to educating and informing the pre-service teachers about the importance of showcasing their abilities through a Portfolio of Evidence and Identifying during teaching sessions and practical placements, evidence that students could be uploaded as evidence.

Two respondents mentioned accreditation as a driver for adopting Portfolios of Evidence, and consistency: Reaccreditation process for our programs via AITSL. This enabled us to embed the ePortfolio across all our courses more strongly and the accreditation of the new iteration of the MTeach also provided opportunity to embed PoE into the degree.

Only one specifically mentioned assessment in this context, stating academic staff involved in assessment of Portfolios of Evidence find that a high standard is typically reflected on submission of the Portfolio of Evidence. This is undertaken on completion of the final placement at the host school and uploaded to the University’s LMS.

At least three respondents expressed value of staff who are champions for Portfolios of Evidence, are coordinators of the first pedagogy unit in BEd and MTeach Primary and knowledgeable in the use of [their] platform, experienced with PoE and good at explaining the value of the portfolio for future employment. A fourth linked excellent resources and consultation with [colleague] teachers as being important.
Strategic support for embedding Portfolios of Evidence was cited in three responses that took a Faculty focus, across all courses with key staff members championing Portfolios of Evidence and a supportive Provost. The role a limited number of staff played in supporting students that enables consistent and timely advice was highlighted, while another linked support and resourcing more lately the School of Education-wide support, and resourcing. A fifth secured some funding to assist the BEd course advisor [who] had a grant for developing Portfolios of Evidence within the degree. The existence of teams with good communication where determination of the course team to ensure that they succeed and a team approach to implementation with ongoing dialogue were valued in three responses.

Participants identified four main areas about what has inhibited this success (Question 21; n=20) that deserved to be unpicked further.

Organisational Awareness and Cohesion (10 statements)
Respondents were most concerned about how their own leadership skills aligned with AITSL Standards and other requirements. They also had broader concerns about organisational awareness and cohesion.

Their responses echo those for Question 19 where the comments go philosophically deeper than simply staff development (see below). Here colleagues were concerned about commitment and particularly ‘coordination’ at a range of levels. These went from a lack of consensus and commitment across teaching staff regarding the value of portfolios’ and “the lack of a coordinated approach to institutional undervaluing of teaching - lip service statements when everyone knows it’s all about the research and lack of institutional understanding and support for the pedagogy of portfolios. Put bluntly, some staff do not feel that what is being implemented are genuine portfolios. These need to be looked at and modified to be genuine portfolios and staff are calling for a more coordinated approach needed to that which has existed previously.

The word ‘failure’ featured in two separate respondents: academic failure to connect university practices with classroom practice and student learning, and in academic failure to assume ownership and evidencing of teaching performance expectations in their own institution. These could be linked to comments about inertia of program change approval processes and lack of clarity surrounding pre-service teacher Construct requirements and procedures.
Ownership was a theme that appeared in more than one response, summed up by: The lack of ownership of Portfolios of Evidence outside the designated units within which they are assessed. Finally, the critics worried about too much autonomy over program design and implementation resting with individual academics rather than seeing the program as a whole.

On a brighter note, some respondents held out for positive change and there seemed to be examples of good practice: Steps are currently in place to facilitate this and from here on I believe this will be much more successful in our Faculty and in some units that I know of it has been effective. These units have been in Early Childhood and linked to PEx. Success has obviously been achieved elsewhere: Where I came from (a previous role) the ePortfolio was rolled out for all courses in the institution and became a central tool for documenting student achievement.

**Staff and Staff Development (10 statements)**

The emphasis on staff awareness and development was borne out in a later question around the significant challenges associated with implementing PoE (Table 3.88).

**Table 3.8: Most significant challenge associated with the implementation of PoE (Question 34; n=29).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical issues</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing (e.g. infrastructure and/or digital technologies)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (e.g. awareness, training, uptake, championing)</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting program/course accreditation requirements</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher registration requirements</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate employability</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those responding ‘other’ cited a combination of staff, teacher registration requirements and graduate employability; uncertainty over platform choices; student engagement and two noted ‘all of the above’.

Typical criticisms of staff and staff development included a critique of staff willingness to engage. These included:

- **Staff adjusting to use of Portfolio, in particular ongoing monitoring of progress**
• Staff believe this is administrative
• Academic inertia.

Understanding of the relationship between Portfolios of Evidence and evidencing the Graduate Teacher Standards led to comments about:
• Lack of knowledge of teacher educators
• Staff understanding and commitment to the portfolio
• Limited views among some staff about how portfolios could be used.

Comments on time/skills included:
• Lack of digital skills amongst staff
• Staff time to continue to see what can be included in the portfolios
• Some staff who don’t see the value of Portfolios of Evidence
• IT issues.

Support staff provided at different levels of the organisation were valued, with small numbers agreeing that there was generous provision, and about equal distribution between adequate and insufficient (Table 3.9).

Table 3.9: Participants assessment of the level of support staff provided to support the implementation of pre-service teachers Portfolios of Evidence (Question 30; n=30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Generous</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Grossly Inadequate</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution-level</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>37% (11)</td>
<td>30% (9)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td>17% (5)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/School-level</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>40% (12)</td>
<td>33% (10)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/course-level</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td>37% (11)</td>
<td>37% (11)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accreditation Requirements (7 statements)
Comments about the accreditation requirements also echoed the responses to Question 19 starting with “failure to understand the inevitable and predictable educational changes flowing from the establishment of the APST”.
Timing was a key feature with:

- **The only current limitation is the excessive speed with which AITSL has been directed to roll out the new GTPA.**

- **The outcomes of the trial last semester will not be able to inform any changes/modifications before the trial in semester two - or, therefore, the implementation in 2018.**

- **Implementation timelines for TPA are short and working towards a coordinated approach across the school take time.**

Some felt that they were still awaiting information and felt there was a **lack of clear guidelines from AITSL and QCT about how the descriptors and supporting artefacts and evidence can be linked**, with a concerning shrinking back from Portfolios of Evidence. One respondent said: **AITSL changes and the GTPA. We will no longer have an ePortfolio as part of our course.** A final insight may have heralded the source of some unease: **AITSL was sceptical about the value of the ePortfolio as a ‘capstone requirement’. With so little spare effort to go around it is important to select strategically from the many requirements that we have to respond to.**
Resourcing and Support (five statements)

Resourcing came up in the responses focusing on resourcing and support where *the lack of institutional investment in an appropriate platform; funding; and lack of resourcing* featured. A disconnect between the needs of the Faculty/School and the University was highlighted by some respondents who cited a *lack of University support; the software provided for the task isn’t adequate and preference for print vs digital*. However, this latter response could be aimed at immediate staff/colleagues rather than the institution.

There was also criticism of the provision of professional learning: *The lack of Faculty direction and resourcing of professional learning*; and a comment about restrictions imposed on access: *the ability to check everyone’s portfolio on a regular basis for gaps or suitability of evidence*. One respondent was concerned about the ability of students to cope because of *students’ lack of technical knowledge and confidence in their IT abilities*.

Resourcing was investigated in Question 31 where respondents were again polarised over whether the resourcing was generous or inadequate. As indicated in Table 3.10, a high number (27%) were not sure what the institution provided.

Table 3.10: Participants assessment of the level of resourcing provided to support the implementation of pre-service teachers’ Portfolios of Evidence (Question 31; n=30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Generous</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Grossly Inadequate</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution-level</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>27% (8)</td>
<td>30% (9)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td>27% (8)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/School-level</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>33% (10)</td>
<td>40% (12)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/course-level</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>41% (12)</td>
<td>35% (10)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resourcing

Most participants have experienced the transition to digital technologies *for implementing Portfolios of Evidence*. 89% report that *the format used was completely digital (63%) or mostly digital*. Only 11% reported using mostly paper-based Portfolios of Evidence within their context.
Figure 3.9).
Despite this move to digital technologies to support implementation, very few participants reported that their institution provided a platform for Portfolios of Evidence use (23%). A further 49% reported that their institution provided, supported or recommended a platform and a further 29% reported that pre-service teachers found their own platform.

Participants reported that at the level of institution, 30% felt that resourcing of Portfolios of Evidence implementation was adequate, with 3% rating it as generous and 27% describing it as adequate. 43% felt that resourcing was inadequate. 30% said insufficient and 13% rated it as grossly inadequate. A further 27% were unsure.

At the level of Faculty/School, 37% overall felt that resourcing of Portfolios of Evidence implementation was adequate, with 4% of them describing it as generous and 33% as adequate. 50% felt that resourcing was inadequate (40% describing it as insufficient and 10% as grossly Inadequate. A further 13 % were unsure.

At the level of program/course, 48% felt that resourcing of Portfolios of Evidence implementation was adequate – 7% said generous and 41% said adequate, while 41% felt that resourcing was inadequate (35% insufficient and 7% grossly inadequate). A further 10% were unsure.

Beliefs about the level of funding varied only marginally across institution, Faculty/School and program/course levels. Resourcing at the local level reported as comparatively more adequate.

Respondents’ perspectives about resourcing of PoE implementation highlighted the complexity of issues.
related to funding, including that *most universities are using public platforms for transferability* (Participant 11) *so that the ePortfolio is transportable after graduation* (Participant 17).

Participants regularly emphasised resourcing in relation to **developing the right digital technologies and platforms for implementation**. For example, Participant 8 said *there needs to be commitment and support for a stable and continuing portfolio platform*. Participant 11 identified *frustrations with technical issues [that stood in the way of] coordination of effective implementation*. Participant 4 saw the potential of *designing and developing an institutional platform [because] current commercial portfolio applications are not sufficient, [are] expensive and clunky*. Participant 20 also saw the need for *considerable time in framing the portfolio and its actual development*.

Participant 5 emphasised that *cost alone should not be the determinant as there are many platforms but many are not conducive to the outcomes that are associated with optimal implementation*. Participant 13 noted that *focusing on resources is a mistaken perspective as the focus must be on the pedagogy; the design of programs around Portfolios of Evidence and the connection of theory and practice*. Participant 22 also added that *the issue of costs is determined by the willingness of academics to engage… [and that] support is wasted if trying to fit something that has not been properly planned for, implemented or engaged with*. Along with many others (Participants 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 20, 22), Participant 22 **aligned resourcing to professional learning as key to optimal implementation**.

Forty-four percent of participants identified **staff (e.g. awareness, training, uptake, championing) as the most significant challenge associated with implementation**, followed by resourcing (17%) and meeting program accreditation requirements (17%) (Question 34; n=29).
**Recommendation:**

There is a need for more information about what platforms ITE providers use for PoE, how they select them and whether current platforms meet their course needs.

Only 18 responses were received to the question *What is the evidence for how the implementation of Portfolios of Evidence has enhanced pre-service teachers’ impact on student learning during professional experience?*” (Question 25; n=18), however each was detailed and considered. There was clearly good practice to be shared, for example:

*Feedback from pre-service teachers about their experiences of the PoE’s is very positive and supports the conclusion PoE’s have a positive impact on learning outcomes. The data collected about levels of GTS’s achieved by completion of the PoE’s further supports they have a positive impact on student learning during professional experience placements.* (Participant 3)

*In the EC units that use Portfolios of Evidence it has been effective. The students have a return to campus day during their PEx and discuss their practice and portfolios.*” (Participant 5)

*Pre-service teachers in their most recent professional experience had to undertake case studies of two students and collect evidence of impact on their learning. This contributed to their Portfolios of Evidence and was also the basis for a presentation to a group of their peers and tutors. A wide range of artefacts were presented as evidence, including unit plans, student work samples, assessment tasks, student feedback etc. Pre-service teachers had a guidelines and criteria for this presentation. There was a range of responses.* (Participant 6)

Three respondents felt that the question was either not or not yet answerable, which was well summed up by Participant 12:

*I think this is an unanswerable question: Pre-service teachers are in classrooms for limited periods of time, and in the secondary area, they will have contact with several classes. It can depend greatly on the quality of the pre-service teacher and while we can do our best to screen pre-service teachers at enrolment to get ‘good ones’, and work with pre-service
teachers to be effective teachers, we can't guarantee that they'll have an 'enhanced' impact on student learning in schools. I can't guarantee that they'll have a negative impact either. We are guided by mentor teachers' impressions which are not uniform, and by school student feedback - and these are school students, not trained evaluators. Feedback from students might very well mean that the pre-service teachers is liked rather than effective. Did the students learn something: If the pre-service teachers had a chance to assess a unit that they taught, then we could have something more definitive to report. There are way too many 'if's' in this to know if, holus bolus, a pre-service teachers 'enhanced' student learning.” (Participant 12)

There was a consistent agreement that ‘reflective practice’ was most enhanced by the use of Portfolios of Evidence (Figure 3.10).

Figure 3.10: What aspect of pre-service teachers’ learning and/or development has been MOST enhanced by the implementation of Portfolios of Evidence? (Question 26, n=30).

Most enhanced by the implementation of PoE

Of those answering ‘other’ three stated that it was too soon to tell while two wanted to indicate ‘all of the above’.

When asked about what costs, if any, are associated with optimal implementation of PoE (Question 32; n=22) some very specific responses were returned. A key one was the cost of infrastructure such as a PoE
platform (cited by seven), and staff to support it. These respondents were quick to qualify their answers stating that many ‘free’ solutions were available but that they were mindful of the pedagogic needs of students:

A suitable platform that can support pre-service teachers throughout their programs and into the profession is a cost that needs to be factored into implementation. Cost alone should not be the determinant as there are many platforms but many are not conducive to the outcomes that are associated with optimal implementation. (Participant 5)

There already have been substantial costs. This includes:
- Exploration of different digital platforms.
- Cost of digital platform provision during study and following study.
- Staff professional learning.
- Staff supporting platform integration. (Participant 6)

Similarly:

Licencing a tool that supports the pedagogy as imagined by the teaching staff. Support staff to assist with awareness raising. Time for teaching staff to become up-skilled and to share practice. Review the impact of using the resource. (Participant 14)

At least four respondents said that students could choose their own platform like Weebly at no cost to the institution. One reason given was that we use free public platforms so that the ePortfolio is transportable after graduation. One cited the high cost of exploring technical solutions and another frustration with technological issues. The variety of responses to the solutions on offer hinted at the reason: Current commercial portfolio applications are not sufficient, expensive and clunky. Where free solutions had been adopted there were integration costs “potentially through designing and developing an institutional Portfolios of Evidence platform based on freely available platforms.

A new element entering the dialogue here was the cost of communication with colleagues, the Department of Education and College of Teachers. The cost of staff professional learning was a theme in at least six replies, with the specific cost determined by the willingness of academics to engage with the tool and the pedagogy.
The time taken to moderate assessment of Portfolios of Evidence was cited by three participants: There are staff costs associated in developing and delivering mentor programs, visits to schools and assessment of Portfolios of Evidence and assessment of Portfolios of Evidence by sessional academics which is not reflected in the time allocated for payment of marking. Academic support for students was also a concern: Academic time that is not included in workload for assisting students with development of their Portfolio of Evidence.

Adaptation of the curriculum was cited by two respondents: Adaptation of course and units to integrate digital Portfolios of Evidence. One respondent noted the need to align implementation, integration, support and delivery developments at the same time – professional learning teams and IT support are wasted costs if they are wasted on trying to fit something that has not been properly planned for, implemented, and engaged with.

When asked for any other comments you would like to make about the resourcing of Portfolios of Evidence respondents’ comments emphasised a need to focus on the pedagogy; the design of programs and systemic…incl[uding] course design, unit design and assessment. This was seen partly as the responsibility of academic staff with the costs relating to time and expertise rather than the resourcing (Question 33; n=14). There was some scepticism:

If the focus is misplaced on resources...the tool, the manpower, the support teams, the professional learning sessions, then cost effectiveness is unachievable. (Participant 13)

A need to monitor repetition of tasks/evidence etc. [while developing a] clear understanding of the purpose of Portfolios of Evidence and evidence types on the right platform is essential and this means consideration of a broad range of issues in addition to the cost.

The long-term nature of Portfolios of Evidence were considered: If we get it right at HE level then we are scaffolding a profession for the future: students will rely on the portfolio for all future aspects of their professional lives. One respondent proposed that it could be linked to the Teachers Registration Board so teachers might be to have it centralised at the relevant state TRB, with a set structure.
Sixteen participants responded to an invitation to comment further under *Are there any other issues you would like to highlight in relation to the implementation of Portfolios of Evidence in ITE?* (Question 28; n=16). These have been reproduced in full below:

*Pre-service teachers need to see them as powerful learning opportunities, not just an assessment task they have to complete. Pre-service teachers value them as portfolios to support employment interviews. All staff in subject need to promote the value of Portfolios of Evidence. (Participant 1)*

*Use of Portfolios of Evidence is maximised by effective staff delivery, support and monitoring. Very effective when academics are on board, challenge is developing consistency across all academics. (Participant 2)*

*We are a bit concerned about the implementation of the GTPA. It will increase the quantum of work in the Portfolios of Evidence in the final professional experience placement without necessarily increasing the validity of the data collected. (Participant 3)*

*My personal belief is that Portfolios of Evidence are a tool that pre-service teachers can be using progressively throughout their ITE journey to help them develop reflective practices; to develop their stance about teaching and learning; as well as to demonstrate their progress towards achieving individual AITSL standards. Developing and maintaining a Portfolio of Evidence is important to help pre-service teachers develop a professional vocabulary, to demonstrate their emerging teacher identity. It also helps prepare them for the job hunting process - the process of maintaining a Portfolio of Evidence helps pre-service teachers to be able to articulate their learning and teaching stance and it is the process that is more important than the end product. To be successful, a Portfolio of Evidence need to be implemented across a program in a coordinated way, probably with an emphasis on what is done during professional experience placements but should also include evidence of achievement of standards during university assessments across different units/subjects. The reflections within Portfolios of Evidence are probably the most important element. (Participant 4)*
The issues that we have identified as possibly arising are:

- Ensuring the template is appropriate to meet the School and student needs.
- Monitoring the effectiveness of the portfolio in ITE.
- Reviewing and marking of the Portfolios of Evidence.
- Utilising the Portfolios of Evidence as part of the Teaching Performance Assessment.
- Ensuring that all stakeholders can access and navigate the chosen digital platform.
- Cost of supporting the digital Portfolios of Evidence. (Participant 5)

Just reiterating that whilst my responses have answered what we do. This will change, for the better I hope, with the start of revised newly accredited courses in 2018. (Participant 6)

The Portfolio of Evidence needs to be core business. This is the missing link that connects practicum and coursework together. (Participant 7)

Some of the above responses seem contradictory. This is simply because Portfolios of Evidence have been trialled in only some units, to date. However, work is currently being done to implement Portfolios of Evidence across all units and all programs. (Participant 8)

It really needs to be developed as part of the program overall not linked to the subjects/units. Evidence is ongoing and focussed on program aims. Marking can be difficult to moderate. Link between professional requirements for workplace.” (Participant 9)

At the moment principals don’t want ePortfolios. (Participant 10)

In a postgraduate program, students only have 2 years to develop their Portfolios of Evidence and cover GTS and now impact on student learning while they are learning to be teachers at the same time. It is challenging but a great learning experience for students who have to critical thinkers about what to include as an artefact, where to include and how to justify its inclusion to create evidence. (Participant 11)
We need to be mindful of the workload on all major actors in this process. Portfolios of Evidence should be a seamless process and perhaps some other indicators of PEX assessment can be deleted. (Participant 12)

I think it is a shame that the ePortfolio has been replaced with the GTPA. I hope to see both in the next reiteration of our course. (Participant 13)

We don’t use the university’s ePortfolio template because we want the students to use the ePortfolio after graduation in seeking employment and in upgrading to ‘proficient’ standard. (Participant 14)

It will require: Institutional support for a new platform (IT resources); Course restructuring facilitated by the ADLT and Course Coordinators; Empowering course coordinators (as opposed to emphasising lecturer autonomy) in terms of the parameters for assessment task design of units (i.e. embedding Portfolios of Evidence in units not ‘optional’); and Professional learning (pedagogical and technical) for Unit Coordinators. It would also be greatly assisted by: Buy-in from external stakeholders as part of a system for the professional development of teachers "(Teachers Registration Board, Department of Education, Catholic and Independent Schools). (Participant 15)

1. Implementation of Portfolios of Evidence as a fundamental element of ITE requires targeted program design and coordination. Any attempt to implement PoE as an add-on will fail because the disconnect between course practices and assessments and the classroom teaching will be highlighted even further. Teacher educators need to adopt a program-wide perspective that means stepping out of their pigeonhole courses/units, and must also think of new collaborative pedagogies instead of clinging desperately to traditional teaching and assessment practices that promote compliance behaviours that are diametrically opposed to best classroom practices. 2. To effectively use Portfolios of Evidence in ITE, academics MUST use Portfolios of Evidence to evidence their own teaching. Not to do so is to allow most to opt out because they are unable to accept the impact of this disruptive technology. *Do as I say will guarantee failure. It must be Do as I do, and Do it with me.* (Participant 16).
FINDINGS

It is important to consider the drivers and challenges of PoE implementation in context of the institutions participating in this study. Analysis of data appears to demonstrate greater engagement in the development and implementation of Portfolios of Evidence, particularly by using digital technologies.

What was once an individual approach to enhancing teaching and learning through the development of portfolios – for example, an academic with an interest in using portfolios as learning and teaching tool; or, pre-service teachers using self-identified platforms to start their own collection to increase employment prospects in the sector – has now become a requirement for ITE providers.

Consequently, the capacity of champions to drive implementation has become of greater interest to ITE providers as policy makers, program/course regulatory authorities (accrediting bodies), schools and school systems now pay attention to this evidence base.

Analysis of the data highlighted the following themes about the nature and extent of implementation activities associated with Portfolios of Evidence.

The Profile of ITE Staff Implementing Portfolios of Evidence

Implementation of Portfolios of Evidence is predominantly undertaken by full-time academic lecturing staff. They are often academic staff with a level of leadership/coordination and are also associated with late-stage pre-service teaching where the transition to the profession occupies attention.

These staff have concentrated roles that see them driving implementation activities, championing use, informing decision-making and leading program teams around this work. These champions are also heavily involved in the application, meaning that they are involved in the design and development of portfolios, participate in teaching and learning using portfolios and inform how assessment of Portfolios of Evidence connect to new accreditation requirements and graduates’ entry into the profession.

Program Teams as Drivers of Portfolios of Evidence Implementation

Implementation activities predominantly occur at program/course level, meaning that academic staff are implementing portfolios in a systematic way across connected units of study and Professional Experience placements. Those leading implementation within these teams emphasise the need for a shared vision for
implementation and an understanding of the outcomes being pursued through it. Simultaneously evidencing campus-based and practice-based learning (connections between theory and practice) was identified as a program/course priority enhanced by implementation activities as well as enhanced alignment between all elements of programs.

**Changing Accreditation Requirements**

Changing accreditation requirements are identified as an influential driver for positive change within initial teacher education and particularly in relation to implementation of Portfolios of Evidence. Accreditation requirements are providing the impetus for program/course review, and subsequently stimulating activity to align disparate parts to program/course priorities and outcomes directly attached to accreditation processes.

**Implementation of Portfolios of Evidence was Seen as Effective**

Participants involved in the implementation of portfolios reported that this work has been successful across a range of measures, including preparing pre-service teachers, evidencing development against the Graduate Teacher Standards, supporting program/course re-design and meeting accreditation requirements.

**Resourcing of Portfolio Implementation**

Resourcing and supporting for implementation activities extended beyond financial costs or the purchasing of digital infrastructure. Participants emphasised the importance of well-conceived drivers for implementation of Portfolios of Evidence, as well as the need for professional learning for staff beyond current implementation teams. As a result, resourcing was identified as a way of supporting pedagogical priorities and outcomes associated with implementation.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that NADPE to continue support a program of research on the use of Portfolios of Evidence to collate data on:

- how implementation activities are evolving across the sector
- how effective they are in assisting pre-service teachers to collate evidence of their professional development through to the Graduate Teacher Standard.
STUDY FOUR

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN AUSTRALIAN ITE COURSES:
Policy, Funding Arrangements and their Impact on University-School Partnerships and Practices

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Professional Experience is regarded as the single most important element of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) (Le Cornu 2015). To meet national course accreditation standards set out by the Australian Institute for Teaching and Learning Leadership (AITSL 2015) and state registration boards, ITE programs in Australia are required to provide a minimum of 60 days of supervised professional experience in schools for graduate programs and 80 days for undergraduate programs.

The landscape for the provision of professional experience placements in Initial Teacher Education is complex and reflects higher education funding provision, university-school partnerships, and staffing agreements and practices across school systems and higher education workplaces.

At any one time, over 81,000 pre-service teachers are enrolled in one of the 375 Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programs offered by 48 accredited providers in 89 metropolitan and regional locations in Australia. The initial Teacher Education Data Report (AITSL, 2017) shows that over 90% of graduating teachers from these programs rate their experience at an above average satisfaction level (AITSL 2017). Employment data demonstrate that 94% percent of teaching graduates enter full or part-time employment on completion of their ITE accredited course and this compares favourably with the overall figure of 84% for graduates from all courses.

Despite these high satisfaction ratings and employment figures, Australian universities are increasingly being asked to account for the effectiveness of their programs. There is strong interest in how well ITE providers make provision for the professional experience component of their programs and whether the conditions for placements adequately support the needs of developing teachers. Two persistent questions are:
1. Do professional experience placements adequately support the integration of the theory and practice of teaching?

2. Are graduates ready for the classes they will be employed to teach?

(Le Cornu 2015, Mayer et al 2015).

These themes were reflected in the recent Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group report released by the Department of Education and Training (2015). The TEMAG review, *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers*, concluded that professional practice was a key component of initial teacher education. The report highlighted the need for university and school partners to work together to ensure the provision of effective learning experiences for pre-service teachers and concluded:

*That the single most important action to be pursued is the integrated delivery of initial teacher education. This can be achieved through close partnerships between providers, school systems and schools, and underpins improvement to all aspects of the preparation of teachers. (p v)*

And further:

*To accomplish this, providers, working with schools, will be required to establish structured and mutually beneficial partnerships. These partnerships will set criteria for professional experience across a range of classroom situations, and include mentoring and support for pre-service teachers to continually reflect on their own practice. (p x)*

TEMAG developed three recommendations to frame future improvements in professional experience and university school partnerships. These are:

- **Recommendation 19**: Higher education providers deliver integrated and structured professional experience throughout initial teacher education programs through formalised partnership agreements with schools.

- **Recommendation 24**: School leaders actively lead the integration of pre-service teachers in the activities and culture of their school.

- **Recommendation 28**: Higher education providers and schools work together to assist pre-service teachers to develop and collect sophisticated evidence of their teaching ability and their impact on student learning for their Portfolio of Evidence.
These recommendations were intended to signal systematic changes to the provision of professional experience placements in ITE. However, the changes to course accreditation requirements that have been implemented in response to these recommendations have done little to support providers or schools to make the changes required to meet the standard of integration suggested. There has been no additional resourcing to schools or providers to engage in new partnership arrangements.

The national reform of teacher education that has been implemented by AITSL and state registration authorities following the release of the TEMAG report requires Higher Education Providers to report on partnership agreements for course accreditation. For example, with regard to Recommendation 19, providers are required to complete Partnership Template for Standard 5.1 for course accreditation to demonstrate that a formal partnership exists for the delivery of professional experience outlining clear expectations for placement experiences and the roles and responsibilities of participants. While completion and submission of the template serves to indicate that a formal partnership agreement exists, the question of the quality of the partnership activities and the availability of the resources in schools that are suggested in recommendations 24 and 28 and are not addressed. The reform program for teacher education has not considered what resource arrangements or partnership structures are needed to provide the high-quality placement programs envisioned in the TEMAG report.

The TEMAG report failed to provide a detailed analysis of the structural barriers that have in its view prevented the 'mutual and beneficial partnerships' between universities and schools to develop. The reform process that has been adopted has not created the conditions needed for schools and providers to engage in the change management processes to address the operational needs of new partnerships. For example, the reform has not considered the personnel resources or funding arrangements needed to maintain new arrangements or to evaluate and research their impact. The reform has been expected to be fully implemented without changes to revenue and expenditure. It has not considered whether the existing funding for placement activities might be used in new ways.

This exploratory study employed a mixed methods approach to review current practice for the provision of professional practice in ITE. The study was designed to investigate the structural and operational processes and activities governing the delivery of ITE placements. Issues related to funding for placements, higher education support for placements and school sector contributions to placements were examined. A
A comprehensive literature review and policy analysis was undertaken to contextualise the study and provide a reference point for the survey responses.

An online survey was developed and emailed to leading ITE academics who had responsibility for the implementation of professional experience in Australian universities. The survey was designed to obtain information and views about the delivery of professional experience in ITE courses from academic staff who were directly responsible for the development and implementation of programs.

This research project aimed to address the following questions:

1. Do existing policy and funding placements for teacher education courses provide the conditions needed for the conduct of effective university-school partnerships for professional placements?
2. How do education funding policy and practices in ITE influence university and school partnership engagement for placement provision in ITE?
3. Do the current funding policy and practices promote high quality provision of support for pre-service teachers in professional experience placements?
4. What tensions exist between policy and practice in ITE professional experience, policy, practices and programs and how might these be addressed?

AIMS OF THE PROJECT

The aims of this study have been to review the funding and partnership roles and responsibilities to identify what elements work effectively and what tensions exist. The three aspects that have been examined are:

- Funding for placement activities in ITE
- Higher education support for professional experience
- School sector roles and responsibilities for placements.

METHODS

Ethical regulations and considerations regarding the distribution of surveys and collection of results were adhered to, according to the guidelines stipulated by the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007), the Australian Code for Responsible Conduct of Research (2007), and Murdoch University policies (project number 2017/109).
This report used a mixed methods approach to investigate the operational dimensions of Professional Experience programs. Data was gleaned from an analysis of policy document ensembles and qualitative and quantitative data collected through an online survey. An online survey was designed to capture qualitative data through the inclusion of open-ended questions, and some quantitative data through the inclusion of Likert-style questions (See Appendix F).

This study was conducted in three phases.

In the first phase, there was a detailed analysis of policy documents that focused on national policy documents, AITSL policy documents, the Higher Education Act, and other related policy texts. Critical policy analysis was used as an analytical lens to examine, critique and interpret the policy text and policy directives (see for example, Ball 2015). This analysis formed the contextual framework of the study and provided a benchmark from which to compare the actual practice and programs of ITE providers in the analysis of results.

In Phase 2, the pilot study developed was based on the themes that emerged from the analysis in Phase 1. This online survey was administered to NADPE state representatives in order to reveal gaps and inconsistencies in the survey design. Based on the results from Phase 2 and discussion with key academics, amendments were subsequently made to the online survey.

Phase 3 of the study, invited key academics staff who had responsibility for the conduct of professional experience for ITE from all Australian universities to participate in the online survey. An email request was sent by an ACDE representative to all members of the NADPE as well as Deans/Heads of Faculties/Schools of Education. Participants were asked to respond to a series of questions including the demographic profile of their university, funding models, university support for placements, and school engagement in placement activities.

Each participant was asked to respond to a series of demographic questions as part of the survey, including the location of their institution. To ensure anonymity of respondents in the presentation and discussion, the results were coded with a number to indicate each provider and the state location of the university.
LIMITATIONS
This chapter reports on factors influencing the provision of professional experience in ITE programs at a time when the TEMAG reforms are being implemented. The timelines for this project and the timelines for addressing the reforms have effectively run in parallel. For these reasons, the findings of this report largely reflect partnership issues that pre-date the TEMAG reforms. However, the findings are relevant as there has been no fundamental change to provision of funding for professional experience in ITE. In addition, there have been no substantive changes to the operational practices of providers or school systems. The evidence in this chapter highlights some of the long-held tensions concerning funding of ITE placements and the workplace expectations of university mentors and school supervisory teachers.

Some of the limitations of this study are pragmatic, and others are part of the research design itself. Whilst the sample of participants (n = 20) is less than half of all ITE university providers (n = 48) in Australia, the analysis and literature review highlight recurrent issues surrounding professional experience. The findings from the primary data sources combined provide guidance for future comprehensive studies on effective funding for partnerships in ITE.

The survey results reflect the views of key university staff who are engaged in placement activities and does not report on the views of schools or pre-service teachers. The findings therefore do not represent all possible views of participants involved in ITE Professional Experience. This study is however an accurate and reasonable reflection of the views of those who participated in the survey.

Given the limited sources of data, this review is best considered as a scoping project that provides a broad overview of some of the issues relating to funding of professional experience, and the roles and responsibilities of both the higher education and school sectors in ensuring quality partnerships for the provision of professional experience in ITE.

DATA ANALYSIS
The data were analysed to identify themes related to how funding for professional placements influenced the provision of professional experience activities in ITE and how universities and schools worked across the university school partnership.

The analysis was conducted in phases:
1. National policy documents were reviewed for information on funding arrangements for professional experience in ITE programs.

2. Responses to surveys were analysed qualitatively, to identify themes related to the use of placement funding, and how higher education providers and their school partners engaged in placement activities. Percentages were calculated where appropriate.

3. The data were aligned to identify themes and issues regarding what appeared to work well and what issues that created tensions for providers.

The findings were reviewed for each of the three focus areas of the study and recommendations developed and presented for further consideration.
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study provides an account of the funding and operational practices for the provision of professional experience placements in ITE programs. The study has been designed to explore how funding and practical arrangements influence how university and school partnerships provide support to pre-service teachers as they undertake ITE professional experience placements.

The findings of this study highlights how current policy and funding arrangements constrain the capacity of university-school partnerships to create the most effective programs of support for ITE placements. The findings highlight that many of the constraints reflect long-standing expectations and practice that include the use of Commonwealth funding for placements.

The findings and recommendations suggest that; unless these issues can be addressed by governments, school systems and employers, providers will continue to be constrained in their attempts to meet the expectations to improve the quality of university and school partnerships and placements support, outlined TEMAG review recommendations.

The study and findings reported in this chapter are presented in three sections:

- Funding for placement activities in ITE
- Higher education support for professional experience
- School sector roles and responsibilities for placements.

Each section includes a brief survey of related literature, the findings and related discussion.
1. FUNDING FOR PLACEMENT IN ITE

Current Funding Arrangements for ITE in Australia

The Australian Government is the primary funder of Initial Teacher Education. The provision of funding for ITE is legislated through the *Higher Education Support Act 2003 (HESA)*. HESA provides details on government funding for teaching and learning at higher education institutions through the Commonwealth Grant Scheme (CGS) (Australian Government 2003 p. 5). Most domestic undergraduate student places and some domestic postgraduate places are Commonwealth-supported by the CGS and students occupying these places also pay a contribution (DEEWR, 2011).

Funding for higher education is allocated according to eight disciplines or *funding clusters*. The combined total funding for each discipline or *funding cluster* is designed to reflect the relative cost of teaching different disciplines (DEEWR 2011). For 2017, the combined funding for Education from the Commonwealth contribution with the student contribution is $17,044. This is close to half of the total funding allocation for the highest funded disciplines – Dentistry, Medicine, and Veterinary Science ($33,405). It is considerably less than the $20,462 provided for nursing places, but more than the lowest-funded Humanities cluster that receives $12,158.

The Commonwealth contribution for a student place in the education cluster also provides an additional amount for costs of *clinical placements and practicums* that are adjusted in line with the CPI. In 2017 this amounted to $899 per Education student place (per EFTSL) – approximately two-thirds of the clinical placement funding for Nursing students, which is $1,311 per year for 2017.

Although it has been established that supervised work placements cost more in Education than in other disciplines (DEEWR 2011), there are no data that itemise the actual funding needed for universities to engage in the range of activities involved in Professional Experience. The funds are to be used by providers for placements as they determine. However, there has been no detailed activity related costing for elements of placement activities. The range of activities that might be accounted for against this fund are might include costs associated with the administration of placements and supervision payments to teachers; the preparation of mentor teachers; visits to students while on placement; in-school work with mentors to foster collaborative approaches; supervision and assessments of pre-service students: payments to supervising teachers and placement coordinators in schools, and the cost of academic staff time in
advising and supporting pre-service teachers and school staff. Additional costs might be considered for work associated with establishing school partnerships.

The 2017 placement loading allocates $899 per EFTSL per year. For a student in a two-year postgraduate program, like a Master of Teaching, this equates to a total of $1,698 to support placement activities, or $29.90 per placement day for the 60 placement days required for accreditation. This amount does not cover the actual cost of payment to school coordinators and supervising teachers. All of the other activities listed in the paragraph above are, in effect, paid from provider teaching budget or good will.

While undergraduate degrees receive more, with $3,596 for 80 days of placement over four years, there is less than $15 per day left for providers to use to administer and manage placements after payments to supervising teachers are paid.

A point of concern for providers is that school teachers expect payment for every day of supervision of a pre-service teacher. This expectation continues despite the termination of *The Australian Higher Education Practice Supervision Award* of 1990 by Fair Work Australia in 2011. At present most providers pay a minimum of $30 per day to school teachers and school teacher coordinators for each day of supervised placement that occurs in schools. There is no money in the placement budget line for any other activity related to placements.

An additional problem is the ongoing pressure from the *Australian Education Union* (AEU) and teachers to continually review and increase payments for supervising teachers. In South Australia, payments are managed through the Department of Education and are linked to salary increases in response to CPI adjustments. In 2014, NSW teacher education providers entered into a joint agreement for a Professional Experience Framework with employers and the Board of Studies for Teaching and Education Studies (BOSTES) and a three-year agreement for supervision payments that included an increment over three years. A revised framework and payment schedule is currently being negotiated amid concerns that the reform of ITE requires greater input from schools.

The impact of rising salary costs for staff in external agencies on higher education for courses with clinical placements and work integrated learning has been highlighted in the most recent report on Higher Education teaching and learning costs. The report, prepared for the Australian Government Department of Education and Training by Deloitte Access Economics (2016), concluded that any analysis of placement
costs must be viewed as being limited to a point in time estimate only and was unlikely to be representative of future costs.

The report further noted that the delivery mode of the program has important implications for course costs and that disciplines that include supervised work placements, a relatively high number of contact hours, smaller class sizes or more resource-intensive delivery (e.g. laboratories, seminars or workshops) are likely to be more expensive to teach while disciplines or universities that teach a high proportion of students externally through online or distance education may have lower teaching and scholarship costs.

Education courses are not suited to low-cost teaching methods. Pedagogical approaches that support high quality learning in learning and teaching reflect resource intensive modes of seminars and workshops. Education courses offered in distant mode require intensive interactions in one-to-one or small group mode to ensure the integration of teaching theory to teaching practice and cannot be considered less expensive to teach. Furthermore, with regards to placement supervision, the current practice of making a daily supervision payment to a supervisory teacher does not reflect the approach or resources needed to support high quality professional practice placements in schools. Research into the placement needs of pre-service teachers has shifted the focus of learning in placements from the preparation and delivery of lessons under the guidance of a single teacher to applied professional learning models, which are supported with a community of practice (Patton and Parker, 2017). A common feature of these models is the engagement of pre-service teachers in collaborative work with several teachers in the school community and the academic community of their provider institution. Collaborative approaches such as these ensure that pre-service teacher learning is focused on attainment of teaching skills as well as building sound knowledge of aspects of professional behaviour that are reflected in the National Professional Standards for Teaching (AITSL).

This study aims to address some of the issues Faculties and Schools of Education face in balancing funds and costs in teacher education professional placement programs. The study attempts to identify the key funding issues, hidden/additional costs and financial sustainability of professional experience programs across Australian universities.

Placement Processes and Costs

This section presents themes identified from responses to the online survey that was distributed to regulators, managers and academics engaged in the delivery of ITE professional experience programs in
Australian universities. The data outline the characteristics of the participating universities and then present feedback on the funding and costs associated with the provision of placements.

**Provider Details**

*Locations*

Of the 48 providers of ITE courses across Australia, respondents from 20 institutions have responded to the survey (42%). As shown in Table 4.1, the response from each of the providers in the Northern Territory and Tasmania represented 100% of the sample for these states. The two responses from South Australia and ACT represented 50% of each state sample and the six responses from Victoria and five responses from New South Wales represented 50% and 29% respectively of providers. One provider did not identify their state and is recorded as *unknown*.

**Table 4.1: Provider sample responding to the survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No. of participants (n)</th>
<th>No. of providers across state (total)</th>
<th>Proportion of respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of Institution</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>42%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Coordinator Roles**

Table 4.2 demonstrates a wide range of positions and titles for the participants who responded to the survey and who are engaged in the coordination and delivery of professional experience placements in their institution. In this sample, 11 different positions or titles are reported. The most commonly reported
title is Director of Professional Experience (29%). The data demonstrate that the titles of personnel working within Professional Experience Offices varies considerably and no single title or position describes the personnel involved in professional experience. It is likely that differences in the roles and responsibilities and level of staffing allocated across different universities will influence costs of placement coordination and delivery. More information is needed about these roles, their responsibilities and implications for cost of delivery of placements.

Table 4.2: Survey respondents’ academic titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Position/title of respondents</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional Experience</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of Education</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Professional Experience</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of Professional Experience</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Director (Professional Practice)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of ITE</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience Coordinator</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Director</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head Higher Education</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator M Teach (Secondary)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional and Administrative staff roles**

Most participants reported that professional experience placements required substantial professional administrative staff support. Professional Experience Offices are generally managed by a Professional Staff Manager (65%). In some cases, the management of professional staff tasks may be distributed to a team that includes professional and academic staff. For instance, one provider commented:

> *We don’t have a dedicated Professional Experience Office. Ultimate responsibility for management rests with the Head of School, although operationally this is delegated to both Professional Experience Coordinator (Professional staff member) and the Coordinator of the 4th year BTeach/1st year MTeach & Professional Experience (Academic staff member) (19, SA).*
As indicated in Table 4.3, approximately half of the respondents reported that *three to five staff* were employed in their Professional Experience Office and approximately 30% of respondents from larger institutions reported that *10+ staff* were employed in the Professional Experience office.
Table 4.3: Professional staff leadership roles for placement activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional staff roles</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff manager</td>
<td>13 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Director/Manager</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of professional staff employed in Professional Experience Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of professional staff employed</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 2</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office roles and structures vary according to size and whether the provider operates from multiple campuses. In general, larger providers employ a professional staff manager to oversee the placement office. Smaller providers tend to link this activity to an academic role. Three respondents from large campuses in Victoria employed a Professional Experience Manager and/or Senior Coordinator (15 VIC; 13 VIC, 10 VIC), the provider in Tasmania employed an administrative manager [who] manages a team of 2 full-time placement officers and one finance officer (22, TAS). One provider in NSW that arranges approximately 1,800 – 2,000 placements per year, reported a centralised unit that manages all placements across 5 campuses (16, NSW).

The distinction between the role of placement coordination and placements liaison was highlighted by one large institution in Victoria. This provider, which offers 2,000+ placements per year, and reported annual running costs of approximately $2.1- $2.5m for placements reported that placement activities are managed by two separate teams, each with a manager, where one team places students and the other team supports students, mentors and schools (10, VIC).

**Academic Staff Roles**

The majority of participants (74%) reported that university academics are involved in Professional Experience through teaching roles and responsibilities. For example, an *Appointed Unit Coordinator* has academic leadership for curriculum development and course design. This includes determination of content, teaching, learning and assessment procedures and ongoing evaluation and research regarding
quality and impact. The emphasis of this work is to promote integration of teaching practice with knowledge of teaching, as noted by the comments from one respondent that these academic activities are responsible for *establishing integrative connections with research, teaching, projects and observations* (27, WA). As indicated in Table 4.4, academic activities include student supervision and collaboration with schools. Supervision activities include direct observation of pre-service teaching but also extend to mentoring supervising teachers, overseeing assessment processes, and moderating issues when placement difficulties arise.

### Table 4.4: Academic activities related to professional experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic activity</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Coordinator for placement units or embedded units</td>
<td>14 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated supervision of pre-service teachers in placements</td>
<td>12 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with schools on placement activities</td>
<td>11 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct research on professional experience models</td>
<td>7  (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion of academic staff who are directly involved in placement activities varies across providers and may reflect differences in size and organisation of Faculties and Schools of Education. Figure 4.1 reports the percentage of academic staff directly involved in Professional Experience activities. For approximately one third of participants (n = 6) staff involvement in Professional Experience was within a range of 31-40%. A smaller proportion of participants reported that their staff involvement was between 81-90% and 91-100% (n = 2); however, most participants reported a lower percentage of staff involvement, ranging from 0 to 30% (n = 10). Academic workloads broadly comprise the three domains of teaching, research and service. The differences reported here are likely to reflect the different allocations of tasks within institutions. Larger and research-intensive institutions are likely to have more staff engaged in research and other service activities.
Respondents were asked for details of the allocation of academic activities in workloads for staff and how these were negotiated. As indicated in Table 4.5 there are considerable differences among providers in the allocation of workload hours. Full details are not provided in each case, but the data as provided indicate that there are differences in the level of academic staff allocated to tasks, the tasks required and how much time is allocated for particular activities.

Table 4.5: Academic workload allocations for Professional Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Roles and associated allocation (where provided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic supervision of pre-service teachers</td>
<td>Liaison with participants involved in the placement, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pre-service teachers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• supervising teachers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• mentor teachers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• school practice coordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring of supervising teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and mentoring of pre-service teachers on placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff development: a leadership role is acknowledged within workload for a lead academic to mentor up to 10 staff in activities for induction, orientation, and management of at-risk pre-service teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placement management: Tasks include; interviews and reference checking of new supervisors, training supervisors, managing checks, payments to schools and supervisors, budget, updating guidelines for each Professional Experience

Allocated workloads for placement activities

- Load is provided for each professional experience unit.
- Director and Assistant Director are allocated workload for leadership
- Workload adjusted according to the amount of pre-service teacher support provided
- One hour allocated for each pre-service teacher visit (normally 3-4 pre-service teachers per visit to a school)
- 30 hours workload allocated per student supervision
- 42 hours of service for school partner liaison involving a group of schools making up a Teaching Academy that provide placements to a cohort of students
- Up to 60 hours can be negotiated by staff for placement supervision activities
- 20 hours/semester allocated to staff involved in professional experience intervention and support
- Academic staff are allocated 2-4 per students per Teaching allocation, e.g. an academic staff member carrying a teaching allocation of 6 (roughly equivalent to a 40% Teaching Load) would supervise between 12 and 24 pre-service teacher placements. This entails visiting the student on placement, as well as pre- and post-supervision contact
- Teaching load adjustment of one less unit per year for management of placement activities.

As indicated in Table 4.5, academic work activities related to placements involve all elements of liaison with schools, mentors and pre-service teachers, mentoring of pre-service teachers and school supervisors, supervision of pre-service teachers, administrative management of placement activities and the leadership
and staff development of the academic teaching team involved in supporting placements. In some instances, respondents indicated that the workload allocations for professional experience are under review.

Allocations of workload for the implementation and maintenance of placement activities vary considerably. While the details are not clear, in each case there seems to be no specific activity-based allocation for any of the activities listed. In some cases, it appears the load is part of a teaching allocation and in other instances it appears to be a leadership or service-type activity. One respondent also indicated that special provision for workload enabled the development of a new initiative for placements. In this instance the introduction of a cohort of placements in line with the *Network of Exceptional Teachers for Disadvantaged Schools* (NETDS) (Lambert & Burnett, 2017) provided 0.5 EFT each for two academics to develop and support curriculum change, identify suitable high performing pre-service teachers, negotiate associated placements with a group of high needs schools, liaise with schools and supervisors to support a group of 30 pre-service teachers in placements in high needs schools.

**Course Design and Integration of Theory and Practice of Teaching**

Academic staff engagement in placements is influenced by course design. In some cases, university study units (subjects) have *embedded* placement days, in other cases units for placement are *stand-alone*. Embedded placements are adopted as a pedagogical response to integrate theory and practice of teaching.

Table 4.6 shows the prevalence of *stand-alone* and *embedded* Professional Experience units in undergraduate and postgraduate ITE courses. As can be expected, undergraduate BEd programs include a greater total number of ITE units (16-46 units per degree program) over four years than two-year postgraduate MTeach programs (12-25 units per degree program).

**Table 4.6: Number of units in ITE programs and numbers of units that are stand-alone or have embedded professional experience.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>TOTAL number of units (Per course)</th>
<th>STAND ALONE Professional Experience units</th>
<th>EMBEDDED Professional Experience units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NADPE REPORT: PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>BEd (ECE, Primary, Secondary, Combined)</th>
<th>MTeach (ECE, Primary, Secondary, Combined)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>16 – 46 units</td>
<td>12 – 25 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – 15 units</td>
<td>2 – 4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – 20 units</td>
<td>5 – 7 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate programs include both *Stand-Alone* (two to 15 units) and *Embedded Professional Experience Units* (five to 20 units) and there are wide variations in numbers of both types of units offered by providers. Similar differences are reported for postgraduate MTeach programs with two to four units being *Stand-Alone* and five to seven units being *Embedded*. It is not possible to tell whether any of these differences reflect a trend or more simply the pedagogical design of particular programs.

**Range of ITE Programs**

Placements are tailored to meet the needs of different graduate and undergraduate ITE programs. Variations in the types and distribution of courses offered by providers in this sample are shown in Figure 4.2. The range of programs offered by providers is determined by several factors related to the structure of the institution, staff expertise and market success of courses. These data highlight another aspect of placements that must be organised and negotiated between universities and schools. For example, the requirements of a placement in a four-year undergraduate degree and a final-year Master of Teaching degree will require different supervision standards and assessment.

**Figure 4.2: Number of different types of ITE programs offered across institutions**
The profile of ITE programs in this sample of programs is consistent with the shift from the Graduate Diploma programs to the Master of Teaching programs that have occurred in response to changing accreditation requirements for postgraduate pre-service teacher preparation and the continuing demand for undergraduate Bachelor and combined degree programs. These issues highlight some of the need for active ongoing dialogue between providers and schools to ensure teachers are aware of the expectations for each pre-service teacher they supervise.

**Locations of Placements**

The location of placements has implications for academic workloads and for the effective support of partnerships and supervision processes required. Placements occur across a wide range of locations. Figure 4.3 shows the proportion of urban, rural, interstate and overseas student placements reported by this sample of respondents. The majority of participants (n = 13) reported that 61+% of placements were in urban locations. A smaller number of placements (0-5% of placements) were reported to be interstate, overseas and rural. Respondents commented on the difficulty of attracting pre-service teachers to complete rural placements. The cost to students while on these placements was thought to be a major impediment.
Figure 4.3: Location of student placements (%)

Variation in Number of Days of Placement in ITE Programs

All providers are required to include a minimum of 60 or 80 days of supervised placements respectively for graduate or undergraduate programs. Table 4.7 demonstrates that there is considerable variation among providers in the number of days of placement required for pre-service teachers. Some providers adhere to the required days, others offer more days. From the data provided it appears that providers in ACT, Victoria and South Australia tend to offer a lower number of days than WA. The table presents a summary of four providers across four states for comparison.

Table 4.7: Number of days pre-service teachers spend on placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEd (ECE)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Primary)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd (Secondary/combined)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHPE</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTeach (ECE, Primary, Secondary)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Dip program</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTeach Dual Primary/EC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTeach Dual Primary/Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placement numbers

The survey requested information about the number of placements needed by each institution to provide an overview of the size of the task for each institution in supporting placements. As shown in Figure 4.4, this sample of providers reported that they were responsible for placement numbers in the order of 24,000 per year. Five of the respondents reported they arrange over 2,000 pre-service teacher placements a year, 8 providers place between 1,800 – 2,000+ pre-service teachers per year, while 5 providers place 500-799 pre-service teachers per year and one provider indicated that it arranges between 100 – 299 placements annually. Given that the placement of each pre-service teacher requires negotiation with a school and school supervising teachers these figures help highlight the number of interactions that occur between providers and schools to support placement activity each year.

Figure 4.4: Number of Annual Pre-service Teacher Placements

This section has reported on the delivery of placements in ITE and has highlighted a number of issues regarding the management and organisation of placements. Responses from this sample of 20 provider demonstrates diverse responses to:
• Staff roles and responsibilities for placements; including a range of academic and professional staff roles

• Employment and workload allocations for a range of activities for academic and professional staff that include:
  ▪ School liaison
  ▪ Pre-service teacher support, before, during and after placement
  ▪ Mentoring, both academic staff and school teacher supervisors
  ▪ Leadership and coordination
  ▪ Administration and management

• Workload allocations; including wide variations in hours allocated for task, personnel and levels of staffing to undertake tasks.

A range of factors contribute to the diverse responses of institutions. These include the program emphasis and aspects of course design issues such as whether:

• Courses are 4-year undergraduate or two-year postgraduate
• Placement units are stand-alone or embedded practicum units
• Schools are nearby in urban areas or in rural or overseas locations
• The number of placement days meet or are offered above the required 60 days for postgraduate or 80 days for undergraduate courses.

Another issue is the size of the task the institution is organising. The number of courses and the number of students requiring placements in these institutions varies considerably. The size of the professional experience operation influences the way in which placement activities and processes are staffed and organised.

**Placement Costs**

To gain more insight into the organisation and management of professional experience placement the respondents were asked about the annual cost of placements for their institution.
An interesting outcome of this part of the survey, shown in Table 4.8, was that over half the respondents (60%) reported that they had ‘no idea’ of the annual costs of running professional experience placements at their institution. As one respondent commented:

*I have never seen a 'Professional Experience Budget'. Faculty Executive oversees all financial matters. This includes the Dean, Associate Deans and Heads of School, not just general staff managers. That said, I am aware of the rate of pay for Supervising Teachers and of the formula used to pay University-based Tertiary Supervisors. I would hazard a guess that these costs fall into the upper end of the $600k-$1.0m category. (8, NSW)*
Table 4.8: Estimates of placement costs for institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated annual cost for placements</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $200 000</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 000 - $500 000</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600 000 - $1 000 000</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 100 000 - $1 500 000</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 600 000 - $2 000 000</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2 100 000 - $2 500 000</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2 500 000</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants (65%) reported that they were not responsible for managing the finances of Professional Experience Offices. This activity was managed by the Faculty or School Finance Manager or equivalent. One respondent commented that their university had recently developed an activity-based costing model that would report exactly how much each placement cost (27, WA).

**Supervision Payments**

A factor of concern for all Faculties/Schools of Education is the budget allocation for placement supervision. School-based coordinators and supervising teachers are all paid a daily rate. There may be additional payments for visiting associates who are employed by providers to help manage the number of site visits they need to take to ensure pre-service teachers have access to university support while they are in the school. Table 4.9 lists the various personnel and payments they receive for in-school supervision and support of pre-service teachers during placements.

Table 4.9: Personnel, payments and themes concerning payments for pre-service teacher placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel titles</th>
<th>Rates of Pay reported</th>
<th>Themes raised in comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School based supervisors</td>
<td>$21.40 - $31.50 per day</td>
<td>Payments are made to teachers even though there is no award.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rate paid to teachers was negotiated through the AEU and continues to be made.

Practicum funding allocation per EFTSL does not fully support payments made to teachers or schools for supervision.

Supervisors are pressing for a higher daily payment money for supervision but are not prepared to take more responsibility.

Some schools require payments to be made to the school rather than to individual school staff.

Some providers pay more and put pressure on other providers to match these payments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site-based coordinator or site director</td>
<td>$1.30 - $2 per day per pre-service teacher</td>
<td>Payment dates back to old award and is for a lead teacher to coordinate placements in the school and to assist with support for pre-service teachers. $75 flat rate for each placement block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External supervisors or moderators</td>
<td>$40 - $45 per hour</td>
<td>Moderators are casual staff members who visit schools and observe pre-service teachers. The payment includes travel. Moderators are employed by providers to assist with visits due to relatively the high volume of visits required to pre-service teachers. One provider allocates 1.5 hours per placement, per pre-service teacher another provider allocates 3 visits for each pre-service teacher for 3 hours at $45 per hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$150 - $200 per student plus travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are three key issues of concern regarding the cost of practicum placements. The first is the expectation for providers to make a payment to teachers or schools for each placement day for each pre-service teacher to ensure placement availability. While there is no award for such a payment and providers are not obligated to make payments at any particular rate. The past practice of a payment of $21.40 per day for supervision and $1.30 per day for coordination determined by the 1990 Australian Higher Education Practice Supervision Award and terminated by Fair Work Australia in 2011, has set a base level that teachers expect to have paid.

The AEU has been an active supporter for payments to teachers and has pursued providers to increase payments since 1990. The threat to providers is that teachers will not make placements available if providers do not continue to pay the daily rate for supervision. Providers pay so they can meet their obligation to ensure that pre-service teachers can complete their teacher education course without disruption. Over time, providers have increased payments in response to teachers and AEU objections to the daily payment rate not including any consideration for rises in the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

A second issue concerns the total cost of supervision payments exceeding the income received through the practicum funding allocation per EFTSL, which impacts other elements of the pre-service program delivery. The costs of these payments represent a substantial budget component. Larger providers report total costs for placement payments of $1.5-2.5m. The outcome from these payments is the assurance that placements are made available. There are no funds left for any other practicum-related purpose. One respondent commenting on the lost opportunity this represents for teacher education said: If I could spend 1.2 - 1.5 million on professional development for schools then we could be meeting school requirements and doing it cost effectively (25, NSW).

Lack of government regulation over the use of the practicum funding allocation or payment rates for supervisors is also creating pressures for providers.
We pay $28.50 per day for supervising teachers per pre-service teacher per day and $1.50 per day for school coordinators. These rates increased in 2016 from $21.40 per day due to pressure from other institutions paying more. The School pays this rate for all students regardless of the placement model. The AEU started a campaign in Victoria in 2015 as all providers were only paying a total of $24 per day for supervision and coordination and this was less than payments that had been agreed to in NSW (28, VIC).

Most providers in Victoria are now paying at least $30 per day for supervision and coordination.

The third issue is the additional workload associated with the delivery of placements and the substantial hidden costs to providers and their staff.

**Hidden Costs for Placements**

Providers outline how role in the provision of professional experience involves a number of activities not accounted for staff salaries. The hidden costs identified are summarised in Table 4.10. The underlying issues leading to these hidden costs are *inadequate time* allocated in academic workload to build relationships with schools. Comments included: *time is a huge hidden cost* (9, QLD), and *time [is needed] to build the relationships and maintain them* (21, NSW).

**Table 4.10: ‘Hidden costs’ in operationalising Professional Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate time allocation</td>
<td>Relational work of professional experience is not recognised; not enough time to build relationships; time taken to build working relationships not factored into workload Time taken for travel and student support not factored into workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funding</td>
<td>Additional assistance needed for certain students not accounted for in operational costs Inadequate payment to ECE centers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotional costs  Stress of securing placements  Stress of dealing with failing or at-risk students

These hidden costs are seen as a source of stress for academic staff. A particular problem is the allocation of workload to academic staff to establish and maintain relationships with schools and centres and to provide support to students.

The relational work of Professional Experience is not recognised within workload models of financial modelling. The capacity to work with early learning centres/schools/colleges relies on a presence within and relationship with site staffs and this is not the work that is recognised within the performativity of the current context. As a result, the formalised performance measures remain in addition to the sizeable workload of professional experience. Additionally, professional experience is such a complex space that incorporates so many complex issues (legal, health, etc.) and each individual issue is incredibly hard to resolve. The allocation of staffing never adequately meets these pressures (22, TAS).

Academics also provide considerable support to pre-service teachers. As one respondent explains:

\[\text{[The] time school based staff give to supporting pre-service teachers generally exceeds those claimable . . . [This reflects] time taken away from teaching, supervision and administration responsibilities to ensure good working relationships with host schools are maintained (19, SA).}\]

Providers also rely on a great deal of goodwill from schools and supervising teachers, none of which is taken into consideration in current funding arrangements for professional experience:

\[\text{There is a massive component of goodwill on the part of schools and individual classroom teachers that is not accounted for in any financial sense with reference to the school-based element of professional experience. Many university-based supervisors also go beyond the 'call of duty' in the routine sense of the term. The distress for school-based and university-based staff associated with poorly-performing students in general and with failing students}\]
in particular also has no financial cost attached to it. There is also a considerable cost associated with student withdrawals and appeals associated with failing students that is not accounted for (8, NSW).

Other participants comment on other hidden costs, stating that finding placements is expensive (25, NSW), and stressful (6, WA) as it may take many requests to secure a placement. These difficulties in securing placements along with the time taken to establish relationships and support students all add up. Emotional costs become magnified when problems arise with failing or at-risk students (7, DNA).

The issue is that money is not being used to best advantage. New models of placements require new roles and responsibilities. Teachers will not permit students to enter their classrooms without the daily supervision rate. The hidden cost is the limits on the placement model as there is little scope for sustainable innovation while the base level payment is required. Everything providers do is paid for on top of the supervision payment – despite the fact that the model is becoming more school-based and involves other teachers etc. It is more about where the money goes and what it is used for than how much there is (28, VIC).

**State Government Collaboration**

Respondents were also asked whether there was any engagement by the state Department of Education in costs or activities related to the provision and support of professional experience in schools. Table 4.11 demonstrates that approximately a third of ITE providers are unsure or report that they do not know of any state level engagement in placement provision. Most participants report that they do not have a state-wide model for placements (54%). A third report they do have a state-wide model (31%) and some (15%) are unsure.

A number of participants report that they do have state-wide initiatives targeting professional experience (44%), although a larger number report that they do not (38%) or are unsure (19%).

**Table 4.11: State system engagement in funding arrangements for Professional Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-wide funding model for</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional experience</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 (36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments from respondents in Victoria and NSW indicated that state-wide placement initiatives are directed toward improving partnership activities for placement support. The approach in Victoria reflects a collaborative program of action-based research while NSW is working to improve training and skill development. For example:

- The Victorian Department of Education provides funding for the trial of a Teaching Academies model to support close working relationships between schools and providers. One provider reports that this initiative provided a two-year seeding grant for the development of a number of school university partnerships. Funding was provided for 2015 and 2016, but was cut back substantially for 2017 and 2018 (15, VIC). The provider is attempting to continue to offer the model without additional financial support.

- In NSW payment for supervising teachers is determined by the NSW Teachers' Federation. In 2015 a state-wide professional experience agreement called the Partnership Arrangements was developed with assistance of the NSW Department of Education. It set the payment rate over three years with annual increments in 2016 and 2017. The agreement also set out the expectations for supervisors to provide experiences for pre-service teachers that align with the National Professional Standards for the Teaching Profession. The NSW Department of Education is also working to implement mandatory training as a pre-requisite for supervising pre-service teachers in schools. (8, NSW).

These findings indicate at least two Australian state Departments of Education are directly engaged in professional preparation of pre-service teachers. These examples suggest there is more scope for Departments to collaborate with providers to assist in improving operational aspects of placements between universities and schools.
A short set of questions were asked as an overall health check for the professional experience component of pre-service teaching. As indicated by the ratings in Table 4.12, there is a general consensus that there is insufficient funding for professional experience (45%), there are mixed views about whether supervising teachers are paid adequately (40%) or not (30%) for their contribution and also for whether academic workloads are appropriate (total of 48% A/ SA, while 42% D/ SD) for the work related to professional experience. Most providers (80% A/SA) agree that the model for professional experience employed at their institution works well.
### Table 4.12: Attitudes to funding models of Professional Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Frequencies (% of response)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional experience programs are adequately funded to provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high quality practicum experiences for students</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising teachers are adequately paid for their contributions to pre-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service teachers’ professional experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics are assigned adequate workload to complete the range of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasks related to professional experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (37%)</td>
<td>6 (32%)</td>
<td>3 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The model of professional experience used at our university is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working well</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>4 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and Conclusion

Funding arrangements for the provision of professional experience in ITE courses requires further review. While there is provision for placements through the Commonwealth contribution for clinical placements and practicums the amount paid does not cover the cost of delivery of placements in ITE courses. The study demonstrates that, in effect, the full amount of the Commonwealth contribution for clinical placements and practicum is distributed directly as payments to teachers for coordination and supervision.

Schools do not receive direct funding for placements. Payments from universities for in-school support of professional experience placements are made as taxable payments directly to the School Coordinators and Supervising teachers.

The removal of the Australian Higher Education Practice Supervision Award of 1990 by Fair Work Australia in 2011 has left a legacy whereby providers continue to be expected to pay a daily rate to teachers for placements. In this study, the current daily rates for supervision payments varied from $21.40 to $31.50 and coordination rates are in the order of $1.30 to 2.00 per day.

University staff who have responsibilities for the provision of placement activities have very little knowledge about how the funding is provided to the university or how the cost structures operate. Financial management occurs at the Faculty/School budget level. Costs for the support of the administrative and academic contributions for placements is also handled at the Faculty/School budget level and are taken from the core teaching budget. University staff report that many academic support activities for placements are under-costed and rely on goodwill or are not adequately supported. Inadequate funding support exists for rural and remote placements.

Providers are constrained in their use of the Commonwealth contribution for clinical placements and practicums as it is committed to payments to School Coordinators and Supervisory teachers. Any costs associated with new innovations in placement models or support therefore requires universities to use teaching budget monies or find additional external funding sources.

The findings presented in this section demonstrate that providers are limited in their capacity to limit provider capacity to make wholesale changes to placement conditions. One example from Victorian providers indicated that engagement with the state Department of Education has created space to trial a...
Teaching Academy/School Alliance model for placements. However, there is some doubt about the sustainability of this model as funding support has been reduced and is unlikely to continue. It is hard to see how sustainable changes to university-school partnerships and innovation in professional experience can be implemented under these circumstances.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that ACDE and NADPE hold a workshop(s) to support Heads/Deans of Education to understand placement costs and funding structures for placements in ITE programs.

### 2. HIGHER EDUCATION SUPPORT FOR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

There is strong agreement that high quality of university-school partnerships are essential to improving the quality of pre-service teacher preparation. TEMAG concluded that existing university-school partnerships are inadequate and fail to provide the conditions necessary for pre-service teachers to integrate course work theory with teaching practice, or, to acquire sufficient practical expertise to ensure they were capable and effective teachers (TEMAG 2015, Le Cornu 2015).

The release of the TEMAG report prompted AITSL to develop new guidelines for partnership agreements for course accreditation. AITSL states that, *the development of a formal partnership is an opportunity for prospective partner institutions and sites to explore the purpose and scope of their joint activity and the ways in which they intend to work together* (AITSL 2017c p. 1).

Course accreditation requirements now require evidence that formal partnerships, agreed in writing, are developed and used by providers and schools/sites/systems to facilitate the delivery of programs, particularly professional experience for pre-service teachers. Formal partnerships exist for every professional experience school/site. They clearly specify components of placements and planned experiences, identified roles and responsibilities for both parties and responsible contacts for day-to-day administration of the arrangement (AITSL 2017c p. 1).

However, it should be noted that this expectation does not recognise that school placement processes have a long-established history, which frames the expectations and practices of schools. While providers and schools might sign agreements, the powers that can be determined by these agreements are limited.
Schools have no obligation to providers in regard to course accreditation, and providers do not have the power to direct the work of teachers in schools. Unless school systems and employers address the needs of the partnership activity as a work requirement for teachers, providers have very limited capacity to make changes to school processes to improve placement quality. Additionally, if providers have no additional resources to bring to the partnership they are unlikely to be able to make significant changes to the role they play in the partnership.

Kruger (2009) notes that effective university-school partnerships can only exist when there is active engagement by all members of the partnership team and that this work cannot be generated by individuals working in isolation. Effective partnership programs have been reported when there has been additional support for schools and providers to work together and where there have been opportunities for members of the partnership to have shared goals. The National Partnership funding provided to schools and universities in 2009-2015 is one example of the type of partnership support that is needed to address these concerns. The short time period for the availability of these funds to schools largely resulted in short-term, localised and ad hoc changes rather than systemic improvements in partnership programs for professional experience.

TEMAG concluded that the conditions for pre-service teachers to learn how to integrate theory and practice requires providers and schools to establish structured and mutually beneficial partnerships. Effective partnerships that act collaboratively to set criteria for professional experience across a range of classroom situations and include mentoring and support for pre-service teachers to continually reflect on their own practice (TEMAG 2015 p. xi).

The process of identifying suitable teachers to supervise and mentor pre-service teachers in placements is regarded as the perennial problem for providers as they have limited capacity to determine which teachers will undertake this role. Providers are challenged to finding enough placements or to have the time and opportunity needed to match pre-service teachers with the most appropriate supervising teachers (Parliament of Australia 2007 p. 72). This often results in pre-service teachers being placed with teachers who are not well suited to the tasks of mentoring and supervision (Ure, Newton and Gough 2009, Cohen et al 2013).
In essence, the professional experience placement is a key point of vulnerability for teacher education. Research demonstrates that the quality of the interactions between pre-service teachers and supporting school staff during placements has greatest impact on pre-service teacher learning (Grossman 2010). Unfortunately, research findings also show that many placements are characterised “by tension and conflicts ensuing from different interests, educational philosophies, and status differences” (Cohen et al 2013 p. 345).

This study examines the partnerships the 20 providers who responded to the survey have developed with schools to support their professional experience placement programs and reports on features of the supervision and mentor programs. The study is interested in whether providers feel the partnerships they have with schools provide the conditions needed for successful placements and, if not, what might be done to help improve conditions for pre-service teachers’ engagement and learning in their professional experience placements.
**Professional Partnerships: Current Models and Practices**

*Staffing Placement-related Activities*

Table 4.13 lists the number of different participants in schools and universities, who are engaged in the conduct of professional practice placements.

**Table 4.13: Nomenclature used for key personnel in Professional Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-based Personnel</th>
<th>University-based Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Coordinator</td>
<td>University Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Teacher</td>
<td>Pre-service Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Student Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>University Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Casual employee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Director

Teacher employed by university as a 'Boundary crosser' to work with pre-service teachers and their supervisors or mentors in a group of co-located schools.

*School-based coordinators* are located in schools and are the key contact person for providers for in-school arrangements for teachers and numbers of students are normally negotiated with these teachers by the university placement office. *Supervisory* teachers may also be known as Supervisors or *Mentor teachers*. These people oversee the day-to-day in-school experiences of the pre-service teachers.

*University Coordinators* are academic or professional staff who oversee the placement arrangements with the school and make visits to the school. *University Academics* also conduct placement visits. Universities also employ a number of casual staff as *External Supervisors*, to cover the logistics of visiting all students across a number of locations. Some providers identified the additional role of a *Site Director* and indicated that this was a relatively new role. One provider described this position as one to be staffed by teacher who is employed as a university staff member to work with the supervising teachers and pre-service teachers in a group of schools. In this case the Site Director was regarded as a *boundary-crosser*, whose role was to create links between the teaching practice experience and university course work (28, VIC).
When asked to describe the model of supervision implemented in their school partnership model most providers report that their pre-service teachers are placed with a school-based supervising or mentor teacher and visiting university staff. Almost half of these placements are supported by a *University Coordinator*. The remaining placements are supported by a university-employed external supervisor who conducts visits to the school on behalf of the university. Approximately a fifth of placements are supported using a combination of models that involved support from a *University Coordinator* and a *site-based supervisor*, in addition to a supervising teacher.

Thus, in most instances pre-service teachers are placed in school under conditions that could be described as a traditional placement model. They experience a period of time in a school working closely under the supervision or mentorship of a classroom teacher and visits are made from time to time by a university representative, who may be a regular academic or a casual appointee for the placement activity. Some alternative placement models are emerging. These models attempt to build stronger links between the university and school staff who support the pre-service teachers. They are also designed to build stronger links between the theory and practice of teaching.

*Education Sectors and Placements*

Table 4.14 shows that the majority of providers engage equally with all education sectors (Department, Catholic, and Independent) for pre-service teacher placements.

**Table 4.14: Placements across education sectors (Department, Catholic, Independent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placements</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placements are allocated equally across education sectors</td>
<td>12 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placements are not allocated equally across education sectors</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key factors in this are the need for high numbers of placements and opportunities to provide diverse learning experiences for pre-service teachers. One respondent notes:

*We need all the placement opportunities we can get and we want students to have a range of experiences across their placements* (19, SA).
We are mostly reliant on State schools for our places. That said, we place a significant chunk of our M Teach (Secondary) students in Catholic and Independent schools. This is less the case with reference to places in primary schools, although given the mounting difficulties associated with placing students in State schools we are doing more of this (8, NSW).

Approximately one-third of participants (33%) note that their placements are not spread equally among the sectors and are mostly in Department schools (23, VIC; 7, DNA). One respondent reports that in their experience Independent schools take very few pre-service teachers (6, WA).

**Challenges for Providers**

Table 4.15 lists the key challenges identified by providers in the conduct of professional experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of the university</td>
<td>Unclear expectations and purpose of visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td>Travel time to schools not accounted for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate staff to visit and monitor pre-service teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of mentor teacher</td>
<td>Unclear expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of mentor teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing failing or at-risk</td>
<td>Extra time required to meet special needs not accounted for in workloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of alternative</td>
<td>Payment for any additional activity must be on top of the daily supervision rate paid to teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnership models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providers using more traditional supervision models indicate that a common difficulty and challenge concerns the respective roles of the *University Coordinator* and the role of the supervising/mentor teacher. As one respondent explains:

> Our challenge is working out the role of the university academic (who has traditionally made some visits to practicum sites) and the role of the teacher mentor. Our policies and
practices are not clear as to who does what and why. For example, what is the purpose of academic visits? Is it to support the pre-service teacher? If so how does this align with the support offered by the teacher mentor? Is it to visit the partnership? (15, VIC).

Comments about the difficulty of ‘ensuring quality mentoring’ (5, VIC), also point to the variability in the quality of support provided by some supervising or mentor teachers. For example, ‘some mentors lack ability to be good mentors’ (6, WA). Providers have little capacity to influence this as the selection of the supervising teachers relies on schools. Requests for supervisors are made via email or are organised by the School Coordinator and/or principal (8, NSW; 6, WA). Respondents say the process of acquiring supervisors is problematic, and generally they are ‘happy to take what [Principals and Site coordinators] are willing to provide’ (13, VIC) or take teachers ‘based on recommendation from partnership school principals’ (15, VIC).

This contrasts with selection and employment of External Supervisors, which is largely a university-led process. In this case, the sourcing of suitable candidates may include school recommendations or applications that are invited through Professional Associations and networks (9, QLD; 7, DNA; 8, NSW). Applicants submit a CV and attend an interview and must provide evidence of currency in teacher education. Credentials are required (21, NSW).

Applicants must have RAN, DCSI Clearance (i.e. mandatory certification before they can work in any capacity in schools). Must have experience teaching and supervising teaching staff. Must have required interpersonal, mentoring, problem solving and critical thinking capabilities, plus track record of ongoing professional learning and commitment to enhancing the profession CV and interview to determine suitability (19, SA).

A further factor that creates difficulties for placements is the need to make adjustments to accommodate pre-service teachers who present with additional needs. These needs can be intermittent like mental or physical health concerns, or they can be persistent, like learning issues or other disabilities. These issues can create a point of stress for the management of school placements and they can interfere with the normal progress of school students in the classes where affected pre-service teachers are placed. These issues are highlighted quite forcefully by one respondent.
The over-emphasis on the 'rights' of so-called 'Special Needs' students undertaking Teacher Education degrees is to the detriment of the children they will teach, their school-based Supervising Teachers and University-based Tertiary Supervisors. It is a blight on the profession and causes untold damage to the image of both the University as well as those schools unfortunate enough to have incompetent graduates find their way to schools as staff (8, NSW).

The ratio of academic staff to numbers of pre-service teachers in placements and the distances covered in making visits creates a serious concern for providers. Comments referring to the number of academics available for professional experience programs indicate that they are 'inadequate to visit and monitor pre-service teachers' (9, QLD) and that access to a limited number of external supervisors makes it difficult to visit all students across Australia (25, NSW).

One provider from Victoria comments on the impact of the financial cost of making the daily supervision payment to supervising teachers reducing the capacity of universities to trial and implement new models of professional experience placements. This respondent has implemented a new model with Site Director support to schools for placements. The cost for the Site Director is additional to all normal costs for supervisory support in the school. The sustainability and ongoing affordability of this model are a concern and required much negotiation with the university CFO (28, VIC).

Professional Experience Partnership Issues

This chapter demonstrates that providers are overall concerned with the management of partnerships and related activities for professional experience. For example, 89% of respondents disagree/strongly disagree with the statement that establishing partnerships with schools is unproblematic. Similarly, 78% disagree/strongly disagree with the statement that it is easy to find suitable mentors for pre-service teachers on placement. There is a mixed response to the question about whether the number of placement visits made by University Coordinators are adequate; 44% agree/strongly agree, while 33% disagree and 22% are unsure.

Overall providers believe that partnerships work through a collegial learning relationship. Of the 18 respondents who answered this question, 73% agree/strongly agree, while a total of 11% disagreed and 17% indicated they were unsure.
Table 4.16: Issues concerning professional experience partnership activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing partnerships with schools for professional experience placements is unproblematic</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>14 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to find suitable mentors for pre-service teachers on placement</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>12 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of visits by university supervisors during pre-service teacher placements are adequate and sustainable</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In professional experience placements there is evidence of collegial learning communities between pre-service teachers, the supervising teacher and university supervisor</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>8 (45%)</td>
<td>5 (28%)</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difficulties in Placement Partnerships**

As indicated in Table 4.17, a number of factors influence provider capacity to arrange placements with schools. The most commonly reported difficulty for providers for the provision of professional experience in their courses is the availability of *numbers of placements* in meet their needs. This, and the reported *communication delays* (18, ACT), *lack of response from busy school personnel* (17, SA), and *delayed responses to communication i.e. emails, phone calls* (16, NSW), create difficulty in organising placements in a timely manner. Providers are aware of the *busy-ness of teachers and school leaders* (7, DNA) and that this hinders the development of more productive working relationships between universities and schools.

One provider states that *Schools are busy and Universities are not a high priority* (6, WA).
Table 4.17: Factors creating difficulties for placement arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding placements in required numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in communication with schools – delayed communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in personnel at school or university can disrupt partnerships and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of placements to match student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Exclusive’ arrangements between university and school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service teachers who attempt to arrange their own placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time commitment needed to build and maintain partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-service teachers can complicate partnership relationships, particularly when they strike out on their own to negotiate placements. This can be a considerable problem if the pre-service teacher also requires significant additional support or has characteristics that are unsuited to teaching. These issues can lead to schools withdrawing from the partnership.

Political and legislative structures may also constrain and dictate how universities are able to establish and maintain connections with schools. One NSW provider highlights the complex situation that operates in that state:

_We are at the mercy of two NSW DOE edicts. (1) Although DOE claims to have made it clear to schools that so-called 'Partnerships' are non-exclusive, many schools have chosen to interpret these as exclusive and therefore refuse to take our students. (2) DOE's edict that only teachers who have undertaken accredited Mentorship/Supervisor training can take students on placement has led to many schools refusing our students on the grounds that they have no teachers on staff qualified to do so (8, NSW)._
University Role in Making Placements Work

**Setting up Partnerships**

As indicated in Table 4.18, connections with schools are established and maintained through the School Coordinator in 95% cases and/or through direct contact with the Principal in 50% of cases. Seventy-eight percent of providers report that they rely on long standing partnership schools for the provision of placements, 61% use a database of schools and 22% use sector nominations to locate suitable schools. A small number of schools are selected as examples of ‘best practice’ schools. In some cases, the direction and strength of partnerships is also influenced by the strategic commitment of the university. For example, one provider says:

*Our commitment to access and equity and the location of our university drive strong connections to schools located in disadvantaged and high growth corridors (28, VIC).*

**Table 4.18: Selecting and Preparing Schools and Supervising teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecting with schools</td>
<td>School Experience Coordinator</td>
<td>17 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>9 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designated university staff member</td>
<td>8 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor teachers</td>
<td>7 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying supervising teachers</td>
<td>Nomination from School Coordinator</td>
<td>18 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nomination from Education sector</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations from academic staff</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-nomination by mentors</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying suitable schools</td>
<td>Long standing partnership schools</td>
<td>14 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database of schools</td>
<td>11 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector nominations</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once it has been agreed that the school will accept placements a *nomination from a School Coordinator* normally identifies suitable supervising teachers. *Nominations from the Education sector or recommendations from academic staff* also influence the selection of a small number of (17% respectively). Self-nomination occurs infrequently.

**Supporting quality school supervision**

Providers are proactive in improving the quality of the experience of pre-service teachers in schools through the provision of mentor programs for supervising teachers. Figure 4.5 demonstrates the range of support programs offered. As indicated, the most frequently reported professional learning opportunities provided to mentors is *in-school professional learning* (61%) and *on-campus professional learning* (56%). Participants also report that *postgraduate courses* (45%) and *AITSL online modules* (39%) are used to provide school-based staff with professional learning opportunities. Some providers (10%) offer mini-conference type workshops to improve teacher mentoring skills. As indicated by the percentages many providers offer more than one option to school staff.
Figure 4.5: Professional Learning Opportunities for Supervising/Mentor Teachers

Preparing Pre-service Teachers for Placement

As indicated in Table 4.19, providers link the pre-service coursework directly to placements through units of study that are referred to as *embedded in-placement units* (76%) and through study that is focused on *designated instructional strategies* (71%). In addition, induction to each placement is conducted through workshops, seminars and online briefing programs. These induction processes are linked to the particular placement and stage of development of the pre-service teachers and the expected assessment requirements for teaching. Consideration of aspects of the professional standards, ethical behaviour and professional engagement with the broader school community will also normally be included in these induction sessions.

Table 4.19: Preparing pre-service teachers for placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparing pre-service teachers for placement</th>
<th>Embedded in-Placement unit</th>
<th>13 (76%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designated instructional strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online induction or briefing</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initiatives to improve professional experience

Table 4.20 summarises the many approaches reported by providers to improve the overall model, or elements of the professional experience program offered. Examples of approaches include preparing pre-
service teachers for placements; targeting learning experiences to improve pre-service capability in placements; improvements to the integration of the on-campus/in-school components of program; enriched placement experiences and extended placements.
### Table 4.20: Aspects of Professional Experience that are unique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service teacher capability</td>
<td>Teachlive preparation model (Virtual reality environment to prepare for first placement – microteaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online demonstration of best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ePortfolio – for self-reflection and self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated on-campus/in-school support</td>
<td>Alliance model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Exception Teaching for Disadvantaged Schools (NETDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School based tutors and coaches who work more closely with supervising and pre-service teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Schools Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinically based model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of placement</td>
<td>Internship Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriched placement experiences</td>
<td>International placement program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspire program coordinated by pre-service teachers to bring on to campus school students from communities identified as low attenders at university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate teaching program for BHPE students to have and extended placement and to be paid coaches during final year of placement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One approach for improving the preparation of pre-service teachers for placements is an innovative *Online Demonstrations* with *videos of best practice to replace and enhance observation of lessons* (25, NSW). Another provider employs a *mixed reality learning environment* of avatars to help prepare pre-service teachers for their first placement (Micro-teaching 2.0). Students prepare, deliver and critique lessons taught to synchronous avatars. The purpose of this model to help pre-service teachers strengthen areas of individual need prior to placement and to identify pre-service teachers who are likely to be at risk and (27, WA).

Providers also use *ePortfolios*, to improve pre-service teacher capability for self-reflection and self-evaluation. During placements, these self-assessments are augmented with further moderation and assessment from the University Coordinator and with the teaching performance assessment that is provided by the school based supervisor. All assessments, including the ePortfolio and mentor reports are assessed against 37 Focus Areas identified in the National Professional Standards for Teaching (19, SA).

A number of approaches being adopted to improve the practice of learning to teach focus on strengthening the integration of campus and school-based work. One provider achieves this through the combined work of *school-based tutors and school-based coaches*. Specialist coaches and tutors are employed to teach and coach students in preparation and during placements in specialist (selected) partner schools. As explained: *In this coaching model, the students are taught on campus for the first five weeks, where they develop their STEP goals (a goal for students, teaching, planning and eLearning). When on site in partner schools for the next 4 weeks, they work alongside their coach to implement their goals in the specific context*’ (15, VIC).

In a similar vein, another provider reports the use of a clinically-based model also involves employment of full-time professional staff who have sole responsibility to support students and mentors during their professional placements (10, VIC).

One provider from Victoria reports working on changing multiple aspects of the placement process using the *Alliance Model*. This model has been developed in collaboration with the Victorian Department of Education.
We are trialing the Alliance model and have been working on this for the past 3 years. We accept that this model will only be affordable for approximately 20% of our placements (of which there are close to 7,000 per year). However, the Alliance model provides us with a deep relationship with schools and is building our research and innovation for placements (28, VIC).

This program is focused on supporting deep professional preparation of pre-service teachers in both graduate and undergraduate programs. Assessment in these schools involves Assessment Circles, where pre-service teachers' present evidence of their performance against the professional standard to a group that comprises teachers and senior staff such as the principal, peers, and a site director. The program is costly and the Department has cut back funding to the point that this program can only continue with substantial funding from the University.

This provider has also joined a consortium from Queensland and Victoria to offer the National Exceptional Teaching for Disadvantaged Schools, which has been developed for undergraduate programs and offers a modified placement program and supported curriculum that focuses on developing teaching skills suited to managing learning in high needs classrooms. This program is costly as it is implemented with additional academic support in schools. For this reason, pre-service teachers are selected into a specialist stream where they work closely with designated academic support staff (28, VIC).

Enriched placements included international placements, internships, a paid coaching position and extended placement program for Health and Physical Education pre-service teachers in their final year (28, VIC). A Teaching School Model program that employs a paired-placement two-days per week in the final year has been adapted by different providers. (11 NT, 13 VIC).

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The TEMAG review recommendations for universities to create formal partnership agreements with schools for school experience partnership delivery does not account for the way in which schools and school systems engage in the delivery of placements in their schools. Higher Education institutions have little capacity to influence the operational aspects of schools, teacher’s roles and responsibilities or teacher expectations for payments.
The delivery of professional experience requires staff in higher education institutions to negotiate with schools to employ teachers for roles and responsibilities that fall outside their professional workplace agreements. Providers find there are considerable variations in expectations for payment for placements and that they are unable to directly influence teacher work to assure the quality of placement support provided to pre-service students in schools.

Selection of teachers for the in-school support of placements is largely based on teacher willingness to engage in these roles. School Coordinators and supervising teachers are not required to have formal professional training to engage in professional placement related activities.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that ACDE and NADPE work with school systems, state and territory governments and AITSL to improve the quality of in-school support provided to pre-service teachers during placements through improved selection of supervising teachers and improved training and support for teachers who have responsibilities for placement related activities.

**3. SCHOOL SECTOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO PLACEMENTS**

Effective in-school coordination of placements and in-school supervisory teachers are essential to the success of the professional experience placements. AITSL expects that supervisory teachers will support pre-service teachers through *coaching, assessment, professional communication and the provision of feedback based on evidence* (2015 p. 4). Teachers are expected to engage pre-service teachers in *meaningful conversations*, whilst assessing their progress, and while supporting their successes and challenges (p. 4). In effect, effective supervisory teachers are responsible for developing a learning environment that encourages pre-service teachers to *engage, reflect and collaborate* (AITSL 2015a p. 4).

Research by Jaipal (2009) adds to this view and notes that the close working relationship between supervisor and pre-service teacher requires the supervisor to take on multiple roles to create the desired learning environment for learning to teach. These roles require the supervising teacher to be a role model, a friend, encouraging, like a counsellor, a nurturer and an evaluator, as well as being an expert who models specific teaching practices in subject matter areas (Jaipal 2009 p. 258).
The importance of supervision in creating the conditions for cognitive coaching was highlighted in the work of Koster, Korthagen and Wubbles (1998). Effective supervisory teachers were found to adopt a developmental approach to supervision that focuses on building trust as well as creating an intellectual environment that enables pre-service teachers to reflect on their learning about teaching and students. Erbligin (2014) stresses that teachers need to be experts who guide pre-service teachers to develop cognitive autonomy.

An issue that is not raised in the research, or by AITSL, is how supervisory teachers are prepared to be expert in-school teacher educator mentors for pre-service teaching. Teachers who undertake supervisory and coordination roles for ITE have little opportunity to become trained experts. There is no further education and training for them to develop the specific skills needed to work with pre-service teachers. In addition, there is no formal professional recognition for them in this role. Supervising and coordinating teachers normally accept these roles on top of all their other teaching duties. Supervisory teachers in particular, are expected to accommodate pre-service teachers and their associated needs into their work. There is no time release or additional support for them in the school to attend to the many expectations that have been defined by outlined AITSL for effective or research findings on how they should work to be effective in this complex role.

Le Cornu (2015) confirms that selection of supervising teachers is based on length teaching service, rather than expertise or qualifications for supervision. Supervising teachers report they have inadequate time to devote to this role. AITSL’s own report in 2005 documented that supervising teachers do not have the time they need to provide effective feedback to pre-service teachers.

This issue has been documented previously (see Parliament of Australia 2007 p. 70). Allocations for workload or professional progression linked to coordination and supervision for ITE are not made explicit by employers. Legislation governing teacher training does not explicitly address or define tasks for supervisory teachers. Professional experience is not mentioned in the School Education Act (1999) or the School Education Legislation (2000). At state level roles and responsibilities for professional experience and supervision is either omitted (e.g. NSW Department of Education, 2017) or it is mentioned as a leadership activity, but not defined (Victoria State Government, 2016). The only place where this role counts for any form of professional recognition is within a teacher’s documented portfolio of evidence that is submitted to teacher registration authorities for advancement in teacher registration status from
Proficient to Highly Accomplished levels. While this advancement designates teacher capability and status, it has no impact on employment status or pay scales (AITSL 2015, 2017b).

As noted previously in this Chapter supervisory teachers are not recognised with substantive monetary or other rewards, and most continue to be paid a taxable, daily rate for supervision in the order of $30 per day. There are no provisions for supervisors to have time to attend to university-related tasks for supervision. Schools do not receive remuneration for teacher time and are unable to support supervisor time to attend university information sessions for placements or engage in online training programs for mentoring or supervision practices.

The lack of formal or informal recognition and the general lack of provision for supervision, in legislation and employment agreements, supports the view that the profession expects supervising teachers to fulfil this task on the basis of their general commitment to the professional or out of their professional 'goodwill' (Ledger 2015).

The complex tasks required of supervisory teachers, coupled with ambiguity in the way in which supervisors are recognised, was documented in the ACDE submission for the TEMAG consultation that was conducted in 2014. ACDE stated that there is a need to ‘modernise the notion of Professional Experience, away from an old-style voluntary/goodwill or ‘extra burden’ view to one which values the engagement of pre-service teachers in the active work of teaching to enhance student learning’ (ACDE 2014 p. 16). It seems that there is a need for more action at this time to professionalise supervisory teacher work in teacher education.

The remaining section of this Chapter presents findings on provider expectations of supervising teachers and the forms recognition they are accorded by Australian providers.

Provider Expectations and Acknowledgement of School-based Supervisors

As indicated in Figure 4.6, of the 18 respondents who replied to this section of the survey, supervising teachers were mentioned in Partnership documentation (78%). Some providers included mention in workload allocations (50%), School of Education strategic plan document (45%) and in certificates (17%).
In addition to the daily payment for supervision, providers also recognised the efforts of these teachers through the provision of professional learning opportunities (69%), certificates (44%), research opportunities (37%), award nominations (31%) and postgraduate entry (25%) [shown in Figure 4.7].
Table 4.21: Provider perceptions of the role of supervisory teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (% of response)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The supervising teacher is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequately recognised for their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution to professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>9 (50%)</td>
<td>8 (45%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supervising teacher understands that their role in professional experience is mandated as a part of a teacher’s job description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>10 (56%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A supervising teacher is motivated by their own professionalism to supervise pre-service teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
<td>6 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (22%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providers are generally divided over the level of recognition that is given to supervising teachers. As indicated in Table 4.21, approximately half of the respondents disagree and 45% agree with the statement that supervising teachers are adequately recognised for their contribution to professional experience. Most respondents do not think that teachers are required to contribute to supervising student teachers. For example, 62% disagree/strongly disagree with the statement that supervising teachers understand that their role in professional experience is mandated as a part of a teacher’s job description, and 17% are unsure whether this is an expectation of teachers. On the other hand, two-thirds of providers believe that most teachers are professionally motivated to become a supervisor for professional experience. The proportion of respondents who agree/strongly agree with this statement is 66%, although 22% are unsure.
Improving Professional Experience

Table 4.22 lists respondent’s comments on what, in their view, is needed to create the ‘ideal’ Professional Experience program. As indicated, the key themes for improving the professional experience component of teacher education programs are:

- Increased time for pre-service teachers in schools
- Improved partnerships
- Greater collaboration between universities and pre-service teachers
- Improved professional learning opportunities for school and university staff engaged in placements
- More appropriate payments to teachers for the work they do
- More appropriate workload recognition for academic staff who support professional experience placements.

Table 4.22: The ‘Ideal’ ITE Professional Experience Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More time for pre-service teachers in schools</td>
<td>Increased placement opportunities in schools within all programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longer placements - 120 days for each undergraduate course and 80 days across each postgraduate course all years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved partnerships between universities and schools</td>
<td>Two-way partnerships between university and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More collaboration between university and pre-service teachers</td>
<td>Embedded, site-based professional experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration between university and pre-service teachers in the design and delivery of professional experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training, workshops and professional learning for mentor teachers, site coordinators and university academics</td>
<td>Annual workshops with current and potential mentor teachers, site coordinators and university liaison staff to debrief and to undertake further training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AITSL online mentoring course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provision of mentors with free professional learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Better Pay</th>
<th>Supervising teachers paid commensurate with actual work involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time allocation for academics and supervisors</td>
<td>More visits to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors should have time allocated within their workload, not payment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision teacher release time should be allocated to provide supervisors the time needed to guide and provide feedback to pre-service teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academics provided with time release to adequately support schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In essence, providers want deeper and more extended placement activities with time to accomplish tasks. This should be done with recognition of workloads for both academic and school staff and for pre-service teachers to undertake sufficient placement activities to achieve the high levels of teaching knowledge and the ways to execute this knowledge in practice.

Higher levels of professional expertise are needed by both school and university participants. Shared professional development is required to improve collective understanding of what pre-service teachers need to learn and how this is best learned in placement time. Shared understanding of the mentor support that best supports particular stages of learning teaching is also essential.

Remuneration and recognition of the important work of preparing the next generation of teachers cannot be done effectively unless there are adequate academic, and school teaching resources to support the growth and development of pre-service teachers.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Consistent with reported research (Le Cornu 2015, Ure, Gough and Newton, 2009) providers report that the commitment of schools and supervising teachers to professional practice is variable. Teachers typically
self-nominate to undertake supervisor roles yet there is little professional recognition for their work. As a result, the quality of support for pre-service teachers during placements varies considerably.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that:

- ACDE and NADPE work with AITSL to collate data on professional experience agreements and their impact on the organisation, support provided to supervisory teachers and the quality of placement experiences provided to pre-service teachers.
- ACDE, NADPE and AITSL work with school systems and state and territory governments to raise the status and recognition for the importance of ITE placements in the professional preparation of teachers.

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Funding for Placement Activities in ITE**

Funding arrangements for the provision of professional experience in ITE courses requires further review. While there is provision for placements through the Commonwealth contribution for clinical placements and practica, the amount paid does not cover the cost of delivery of placements in ITE courses. This study demonstrates that, in effect, the full amount of the Commonwealth contribution for clinical placements and practicum is distributed directly as payments to teachers for coordination and supervision.

Schools do not receive direct funding for placements. Payments from universities for in-school support of professional experience placements are made as taxable payments directly to the School Coordinators and Supervising teachers.

The removal of the Australian Higher Education Practice Supervision Award of 1990 by Fair Work Australia in 2011 has left a legacy whereby providers continue to be expected to pay a daily rate to teachers for placements. In this study, the current daily rates for supervision payments were found to vary from $21.40 to $31.50 and coordination rates are in the order of $1.30 to $2.00 per day.
University staff who have responsibilities for the provision of placement activities have very little knowledge about how the funding is provided to the university or how the cost structures operate. Financial management occurs at the Faculty/School budget level. Costs for the support of the administrative and academic contributions for placements is also handled at the Faculty/School budget level and are taken from the core teaching budget. University staff report that many academic support activities for placements are under-costed and rely on goodwill or are not adequately supported. Moreover, inadequate funding support exists for cost effective and sustainable rural and remote placements. The hidden costs of implementing ITE compulsory placements need addressing.

Providers are constrained in their use of the Commonwealth contribution for clinical placements and practicums as it is committed historically to payments to School Coordinators and Supervisory teachers. Any costs associated with new innovations in placement models or support therefore requires universities to use funds from their teaching budget or find additional external resources.

The findings presented in this section demonstrate that providers are limited in their capacity to make wholesale changes to placement conditions. There is an unresolved question about how schools or teachers should be remunerated for this work.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that ACDE and NADPE hold a workshop(s) to support Heads/Deans of Education to understand placement costs and funding structures for placements in ITE programs.
**Higher Education Support for Professional Experience**

The TEMAG review recommendations for universities to create formal partnership agreements with schools for school experience partnership delivery does not account for the way in which schools and school systems engage in the delivery of placements in their schools. Higher Education institutions have little capacity to influence the operational aspects of schools, teachers’ roles and responsibilities or teacher expectations for payments.

The delivery of professional experience requires staff in higher education institutions to negotiate with schools to employ teachers for roles and responsibilities that fall outside their professional workplace agreements. Providers find considerable variations in expectations for payment for placements. Providers are unable to directly influence teacher work to assure the quality of placement support provided to pre-service students in schools.

Selection of teachers for the in-school support of placements is largely based on teacher willingness to engage in these roles. School Coordinators and supervising teachers are not required to have formal professional training to engage in professional placement related activities.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that ACDE and NADPE work with school systems, state and territory governments and AITSL to improve the quality of in-school support provided to pre-service teachers during placements through improved selection of supervising teachers and improved training and support for teachers who have responsibilities for placement related activities.

**School Sector Engagement**

Consistent with reported research (Le Cornu 2015, Ure, Gough and Newton 2009) providers report that the commitment of schools and supervising teachers to professional practice is variable. Teachers typically self-nominate to undertake supervisor roles and there is little professional recognition for their work. As a result, the quality of support for pre-service teachers during placements varies considerably.

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that:
• ACDE and NADPE work with AITSL to collate data on professional experience agreements and their impact on the organisation, support provided to supervisory teachers and the quality of placement experiences provided to pre-service teachers.
• ACDE, NADPE and AITSL work with school systems and state and territory governments to raise the status and recognition for the importance of ITE placements in the professional preparation of teachers.
STUDY FIVE

INDIGENOUS CONTEXTS, ITE AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
Australia is signatory to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2008) (UNDRIPS this document provides a foundational framework that addresses the individual and collective rights of First Nations peoples to amongst others’ rights to health and rights to education. With a Rights Based framework as the foundation Anderson, Rennie and White (2017) have stated “theoretically the remote placement is underpinned by the responsibility to the Indigenous learners (Anderson, Rennie, White and Darling 2017, p. 10). Whilst their project was focused on Remote practicum we know that statistically the Majority of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people reside in metropolitan and region areas, therefore still theoretically pertinent. It is also worthwhile to note that Universities Australia has recognized that universities have “Responsibilities to Australia’s Indigenous people” by responding to the UNDRIPs in its Indigenous Strategy 2017-2020 A positive way forward to ensure that the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australian’s are being met is through Initial Teacher Education programs. National Initial Teacher Education course accreditation requirements regarding Indigenous Education require providers to ensure pre-service teacher graduates have the knowledge and skills defined by Standards 1.4 and 2.4. These two standards require providers to ensure that pre-service teachers are able to address the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australian peoples in all contexts. The Standards are:

**Standard 1.4: Strategies for Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students**
Graduates must: *demonstrate broad knowledge and understanding of the impact of culture, cultural identity and linguistic background on the education of students from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds.*

**Standard 2.4: Understand and respect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to promote reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians**
Graduates must: *demonstrate broad knowledge of, understanding of and respect for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories, cultures and languages.*
These professional standards for teaching are consistent with the Indigenous Cultural Competency (ICC) Reform in Australian Universities project (DEEWR 2011) that was implemented to ensure all Australian graduates are equipped with the knowledge and skills needed to be culturally competent in their conduct with Indigenous communities.

The DEEWR project report urged ITE providers to prepare graduate teachers with *knowledge and understanding of Indigenous Australian cultures, histories and contemporary realities and awareness of Indigenous protocols, combined with the proficiency to engage and work effectively in Indigenous contexts congruent to the expectations of Indigenous Australian peoples* (DEEWR, 2011, p. 3).

The year 2011 also marked the introduction of the More Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Teachers Initiatives (MATSITI) project that represented the first national response to teacher workforce development needs for Indigenous Education. The project was funded by the Australian Government and developed under the leadership of Professor Peter Buckskin, Director, MATSITI at the University of South Australia. A consortium with ACDE and the University of Queensland assisted in the national delivery of the project.

The MATSITI project addressed three priorities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education:

(i) To provide data and evidence on workforce needs
(ii) To review and provide guidelines for effective school workforce practices
(iii) To promote teaching as a career of choice.

The MATSITI project was funded to be delivered over four years, which concluded in June 2016. The MATSITI project report and website outline its success in raising awareness of each of the project priorities. There has been a marked increase in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ interest in a teaching career. However, there is still a long way to go before we can be certain that the geographical, educational and cultural issues that influence the delivery of ITE are effectively addressed. The number of providers, ITE courses, pre-service teachers and the range of schools where professional experience placements occur creates a complex set of circumstances to turn around on a large scale. The MATSITI report highlights structural and cultural barriers, which are likely to continue impeding the progress of Indigenous pre-service teachers unless they are systematically addressed by ITE providers, schools and
employers. Related issues are the quality of program delivery and support for Indigenous pre-service teachers undertaking distance mode studies in remote communities, and the retention of pre-service teachers who undertake their studies on campus at universities away from their communities. The quality of professional experience in school concerns both ITE and school culture and has a large impact on the outcomes for Indigenous pre-service teachers. Examples of these issues are provided here.

**ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER PRE-SERVICE TEACHER PREPARATION**

(i) **Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander pre-service teachers who undertake their studies in remote communities**

While Indigenous students benefit from opportunities to learn from highly qualified Indigenous teachers, remote communities have difficulty in attracting and sustaining teachers in their schools. High staff turnover and attrition are a challenge for remote schools (Warren and Quine 2013). Long distances from regional and urban higher education institutions adds to the difficulty of attracting and supporting local Indigenous pre-service teachers and in supporting and negotiating placements in remote area schools.

In reporting for the MATSITI project, Blair (2015), and Moran (2015) in the supporting literature review, identified the types of problems Indigenous pre-service teachers experience while studying ITE and undertaking professional experience placements in regional and remote community schools. These were:

- Community perspectives on the quality of the program being studied. For example, an ITE program of study that is located on country with professional experience in a remote school may be regarded as less rigorous than a university-located program
- The breadth of experience available to pre-service teachers in remote schools is likely to be more limited. Lack of availability of diverse school experiences and schools with low numbers may provide pre-service teachers with a restricted range of teaching experiences. Many primary classrooms in remote locations may have children from a wide range of ages, rather than grades at different levels
- Lack of qualified and experienced Indigenous teacher supervisors to support pre-service teachers in professional experience placements. Pre-service teachers often plan and teach alongside Aboriginal Education Workers who are employed as classroom assistants
- Limited cultural preparation of university academic and support staff who advise and support students in distant mode learning contexts.
Whilst the numbers of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people undertaking placements appears in remote locations appear to be small, (Anderson, Rennie, White and Darling 2017) these issues need to be considered by providers attempting to increase participation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in ITE through remote programs.
(ii) Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander pre-service teachers who study on-campus

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander pre-service teachers who leave their community to undertake teacher preparation are often extremely challenged by the experience of relocation away from family, friends and cultural support, combined with the learning environment on large university campuses.

Indigenous students who undertake ITE on-campus are very likely to experience difficulties from the start of their studies. Patton et al (2012) identified the first year as a walking point when these pre-service teachers are most likely to withdraw from their ITE course. An early placement in an urban school added significantly to this challenge and created another very poignant walking point.

The response of Indigenous pre-service teachers to their ITE program in largely non-Indigenous regional and urban locations is impacted by the lack of cultural inclusiveness they experience when they undertake placements in schools that have low numbers of Indigenous students and teachers. Blair (2015) concludes that:

*In the course of becoming a teacher, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, are sadly required to negotiate power structures and spaces that do not make them feel safe and, at times, can threaten their confidence and teacher identity (p35).*

Blair identified the need for comprehensive preparation of all participants who engage in the placement of Indigenous pre-service teachers, to ensure that the placement creates a culturally safe experience. ITE providers need to ensure that:

- School professional experience coordinators and supervisors and supporting academic staff complete cultural awareness training
- Pre-service teachers are given sufficient preparation to ensure they are confident in approaching their placement
- That the model of support for the placement is based on a Community of Practice model to ensure that pre-service teachers are welcomed into the team and are actively supported in their learning
- The assessment strategies in the placement employ summative approaches that are designed to build teacher competence and understanding.
It is envisioned that placements for Indigenous pre-service teachers involve extensive support visits from the provider and that this requires additional staffing resources.

**NON-INDIGENOUS PRE-SERVICE TEACHER PREPARATION**

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander content or specialist in depth units in Initial Teacher has been identified by Moreton-Robinson Et al. (2012) as starkly absent in the ITE curriculum. Directly correlating to findings by Ma Rhea, Anderson and Atikson (2012) who found that teachers in service were not confident in teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander content with in depth. Standards 1.4 and 2.4 now require that all pre-service teachers graduate with cultural capability to teach Indigenous students across a range of contexts and have knowledge for teaching Aboriginal studies across a range of curriculum areas. The ITE curriculum should therefore raise awareness of the diversity of the Australian Indigenous communities, including demographic information, language groups and Indigenous networks. It should prepare pre-service teachers with knowledge of the history of Australia Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and non-Indigenous Australians. Anderson and Atkinson (2013) have found that by using these standards as focus areas of learning in Indigenous Education on Curriculum (1.4) and Pedagogy (2.4), non-Indigenous pre-service teachers are better able to conceptually develop an understanding of the area, therefore teaching confidently.

The realisation of these goals requires providers to ensure that Indigenous interests are addressed for all pre-service teachers in all possible contexts. The combination of Indigenous and non-Indigenous pre-service teachers and the diverse communities in which they undertake placements creates a complex matrix for placements: with each one reflecting a different set of challenges. As has been outlined, the experience of Indigenous pre-service teachers undertaking placements in schools in remote communities is profoundly different from their experience in regional and urban non-Indigenous schools. Non-Indigenous pre-service teachers also experience placements in each of these settings in manifestly different ways, but for different reasons.

Professional experience is conducted across the range of Australian school sizes and types. Schools with high to very high Indigenous student numbers create a learning context very different to regional and urban schools that may or may not have Indigenous students. The demographics of Australian school communities based on Bureau of Statistics 2013 figures show that NSW is the state with the largest proportion of Indigenous students (31.5 %). Queensland accounts for 29.7% and the ACT has 0.9%. Most
indigenous students (84.4%) attend government schools, while approximately 10.2% and 5.4% attend Catholic schools and Independent schools respectively. State variations add to the complex mix of school communities in which professional experience placements take place. For example, Victoria (VAEAI, 2017) had 12,313 Indigenous students enrolled in 1,259 schools in 2016. Of these schools, there were 75 with more than 30 Indigenous students, 146 with 15-30 students, 484 with five to 14, and 554 with between one and four Indigenous students. A further 263 schools had no Indigenous students. This variability in school communities, and the added layer of urban, regional and remote locations of schools is a challenge for ITE providers who are attempting to prepare all pre-service teachers for all contexts.

Research on these issues, including that from the MATSITI project suggest more needs to be done to ensure that the learning experiences in placements address the professional development non-Indigenous pre-service teachers in Australian schools.

(i) **Non-Indigenous pre-service teachers who undertake placements in remote Indigenous schools**

Pre-service teachers need to have insight to enable them to see how their perceptions of Aboriginality and Indigenous history and culture might influence their teaching and capacity to respond to Indigenous communities. Auld, Dyer and Charles (2016) illustrate the problems that arise when non-Indigenous pre-service teachers who lack knowledge and insight undertake placements in remote Indigenous communities. Their report provides stark examples of the perspectives of non-Indigenous pre-service teachers on placements. These researchers observed that pre-service teachers expressed judgments of communities that reflected a continuation of colonial views and practices and, in some cases, they showed evidence of experiencing reverse-culture shock. The study suggested that non-Indigenous pre-service teachers need guidance from inter-cultural allies to improve their preparation for placements and to support and assist them to engage in deep listening to community as they negotiate cultural thinking and practices throughout the course of their placement.

Anderson, Rennie, White and Darling (2017) reporting on the OLT-seed project website for the PREE: Partnering for Remote Education Experience suggest that remote placement of non-Indigenous pre-service teachers requires a comprehensive program of preparation, in placement and post placement program support. While the full project report is pending, the website resources include a series of video clips that detail five phases for creating conditions for effective placement experiences. The phases are establishing placement, selection of students, preparing for the journey, mentoring and support, and
maintaining and sustaining relationships post-placement. The site also contains details of a *capstone professionalexperience unit* with:

- A set of key curriculum guidelines
- Partnership protocols
- Illustrations of practice with videos of exemplary practices of teaching

The development of this new resource highlights the need for providers to have and use culturally specific resources to assist them to prepare non-Indigenous pre-service teachers for professional experience in Indigenous schools and communities.

**(ii) Non-Indigenous pre-service teachers and non-Indigenous school placements**

ITE course accreditation processes provide an assurance that courses meet the professional Standards 1.4 and 2.4 and that the course content will include consideration of the Australian Curriculum to include information about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories, culture and languages. Furthermore, the delivery needs to be free from cultural bias and be presented in a way in which the local Indigenous community is respected. Professional experience ITE units and handbooks must provide guidance for pre-service teachers so that an authentic enacted delivery of lessons is presented.

However, there are systemic issues that raise questions about how effective the exposure and preparation of non-Indigenous pre-service teachers for Indigenous histories, culture, languages and approaches to teaching might be. Examples include the non-Indigenous pre-service teacher reaction to placements in remote Indigenous schools reported by Auld, Dyer and Charles (2016), and the issue of Indigenous pre-service teachers being excluded from professional discussions in non-Indigenous schools as reported by Blair (2015). Both indicate that more needs to be done to cross the racial divide in school placements. Initial evidence from Deakin University (Ure 2017) suggests that in many non-Indigenous schools, pre-service teachers are not required to consider Indigenous matters. Initial information that has been collated on the Standards that supervising classroom teachers discuss with pre-service teachers indicates that Standards 1.4 and 2.4 are rarely, if ever, raised in discussions during professional experience placements. Collectively, the evidence suggests that much more needs to be achieved for Indigenous Education and teacher preparation if we are to be confident that all graduating teachers have the cultural awareness, responsiveness and competencies they need to be able to address the knowledge required in the Australian Professional Standards for Teaching.
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This brief review of research and practice in the preparation of teachers for Indigenous Education shows that there remains much to learn about how best to meet the needs of Indigenous students across all Australian schools. The placement experiences of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous pre-service teachers suggest that many schools continue to struggle with Indigenous cultural knowledge and diversity. While the national response to these issues is fragmented the research indicates that this aspect of ITE is a specialist area that requires further research and development.

An outcome of the MATSITI project has been the development of a stronger relationship between the ACDE and the Indigenous academic community. This led to the formation of the Australian Indigenous Lecturers in Initial Teacher Education Association (AILITEA) group in 2016 as a specialist ACDE working group. AILITEA is a forum for Indigenous teacher education academics to come together to explore issues in Education and pre-service teacher preparation. It represents the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander academics working in Faculties or Schools of Education at a national level and has a membership of 20 - 30 committed academics.

Accurate figures on the numbers of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australian academics in Faculties and Schools of Education are not available, as in many instances university Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander academics are located in centralised specialist Indigenous units that separate them from Faculties and Schools. More information is needed on how many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander teacher education academics exist in Australian higher education institutions, how Faculties and Schools of Education employ and engage with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander academic staff and who these staff teach and support in ITE programs. More research on these issues would assist development of a national response to the issue of preparing all teachers for Indigenous student populations.

The AILITEA group has the potential to develop into a specialist research group of Indigenous Education Academics who could contribute to a national forum on Indigenous issues in teacher education. There is a need to continue the work that has been seeded by the MATSITI project if the goals of this project are to be fully recognised.

While the MATSITI project has created an awareness of many of the issues that have been discussed, the project has concluded at a time when systemic measure need to be put in place to address the learning needs of both non-Indigenous and Indigenous pre-service teachers. This aspect of pre-service teacher
preparation needs to be identified as a specialist area for further support and development. Importantly, the MATSITI project has brought together a specialist group of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander teacher education academics within ACDE. The formation of the AILITEA group presents an opportunity to continue the work of the MATSITI project to more fully embed Indigenous knowledge, cultural awareness into the professional placement experiences in ITE.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

It is recommended that:

- The work of the MATSITI project in raising awareness of ITE providers of some of the issues and the importance of the need to address Standards 1.4 and 2.4 in ITE coursework and professional experience placements be acknowledged.
- Indigenous education issues in ITE be recognised as a specialist area of study in Education and ITE.
- The ACDE AILITEA group be recognised as the key advisory group for Indigenous education and ITE and that this group report to the ACDE on these matters.
- Avenues for resourcing for AILITEA be explored to enable this group to build and support future work.
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Iain has extensive experience as a senior public servant in both the Queensland and NSW Departments of Education, where he was responsible for developing policy, programs and procedure in student welfare/wellbeing and support. He has also served on a number of inter-governmental advisory groups to develop the NSW Government Youth Policy. Iain has also been responsible for policy development and program management in Indigenous education; gender and equity; support services; and education facilities research. Iain has over 20 years of experience teaching in early childhood, primary and middle school settings in state schools, Catholic schools and independent private schools. He has extensive experience as a professional development and adult educator. Iain’s teaching and research interests are inter-related – they sit within the domains of adult education, professional development and learning, student experience and success, student welfare/wellbeing, leadership theory, policy and practice, education settings and environments. Iain employs a student-centred and research-based teaching approach. He is committed to equity and social justice in education. Iain is a member of the Australian College of Educators and is a registered teacher with the Queensland College of Teachers. Iain was Associate Professor and Director, Professional Development and Practice-Based Education at the University of Canberra. He is now the Director of Professional Learning and Engagement in the Department of Educational Studies at Macquarie University.

Dr Susan Ledger

Susan is Associate Dean of Engagement and School Partnerships in the School of Education at Murdoch University. Susan is collaborative by nature and enjoys connecting people, places and projects. Her research fields highlight her passionate for policy, practices and issues related to teaching and learning to teach and live in diverse school settings including international, rural and remote, and virtual contexts.
**Dr Jennifer Masters**

Jennifer is Senior Academic eLearning Pedagogue at University of Tasmania. Before working in the tertiary sector, Jennifer taught in educational settings at both early childhood and primary levels. She completed her Graduate Diploma in Computer Education and worked as a lecturer in the Faculty of Education at Queensland University of Technology, where she completed a Master's by Research and a PhD focusing on using computers effectively and creatively in education. She also played an integral role in creative course design at QUT before moving to La Trobe University at the Bendigo campus for an 'Innovation in Education' position. In this role she specialised in e-Learning, Blended Learning, e-Portfolios and First Year in Education design. She also developed and implemented an Early Childhood program at La Trobe University, with two courses specialising in Early Childhood Education.

**Dr Chad Morrison**

Chad is Academic Director of Professional Experience at University of Tasmania. His research focuses on the transition from pre-service to early career teaching and the contexts in which this teaching occurs. He focuses on teacher professional identity work, resilience and wellbeing when researching early career teaching and brings to the project expertise in the area preparing pre-service teachers for career entry through Professional Experience. Issues of teacher retention and attrition reflect the multiplicity of challenges faced by graduate teachers often working within unfamiliar contexts and in complex roles. Preparing graduate teachers to be ‘classroom ready’ for these dynamic and varied teaching contexts of their early careers is an ever-present driver within his work. This teaching/research focus intersects with the types of evidence ITE providers and others use and value to credential graduate teachers and to explain the outcomes associated with ITE.

**Ms Linda Page**

Linda is Executive Officer – Education Programs at the University of Tasmania and as Project Manager for the project was a liaison between the dispersed research team, ACDE and research support services. Linda’s role in the Faculty of Education is to manage research projects, events and programs and to support researchers and Higher Degree by Research candidates. She is a sessional tutor and research assistant in Arts and HASS units for the Bachelor of Education course and is a postgraduate candidate in International and Community Development at Deakin University. She is the former manager of meenah mienne, an Aboriginal youth mentoring and cultural literacy centre, Cultural Development Manager for
Devonport City Council, Artist Development and International Advisor for the Arts Council of Mongolia and Project Manager for the Global Schools Partnership Program for the British Council (Scotland).

**Professor Megan Quentin-Baxter**

**Megan** is Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) at University of Tasmania. As Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching Megan is responsible, on behalf of the Dean, for overseeing the provision of education in the Faculty of Education (from January 2017). She retains her Professor of Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching title from when she joined the Faculty of Health and the Tasmanian Institute for Learning and Teaching in 2014. A Principal Fellow of the Higher Education Academy, Fellow of the Academy of Medical Educators and SCORE Fellow, Megan champions excellent learning and teaching pedagogy and modernising curricula. She is an advocate for a 'whole of course' approach to scaffolding student learning and supporting teaching teams. She advocates for technology enhancements that provide additional opportunities including novel ways of accessing education. They also enable innovation in teaching methods through new tools, learning support systems and environments. Technology is subject to rapid change and can discriminate in favour of 'digital natives'.

**Dr Cassandra Saunders**

**Cassie** is Lecturer within Learning and Teaching and Survey Team Lead for the Curriculum and Quality team at the University of Tasmania. Cassandra’s primary role is the coordination of University surveys, data collection and analysis and reports related to teaching and curriculum quality. Cassandra’s role also incorporates leadership of interventions and initiatives in response to triggers for review from survey data and provision of support for University of Tasmania staff and course teams related to access and interpretation of data related to teaching and curriculum. Cassandra also co-coordinates ELT502 Enhancing Professional Practice in University Learning and Teaching, a core unit in the Graduate Certificate in University Learning and Teaching.

**Dr Trudy-Ann Sweeney**

**Trudy-Ann** is a senior lecturer of Digital Media in the College of Education, Psychology and Social Work at Flinders University. Her teaching and research interests include technology-enhanced assessment and the use of educational technologies to transform student learning outcomes. Through this work, she aims to support pre-service teachers connect research, policy and evidence-based practice. Prior to her move to initial teacher education, Trudy worked for the Department of Education and Children’s Services for 17
years as a primary school teacher, ICT Coordinator, Assistant Principal (Teaching and Learning), and Educational Consultant and Leadership and ICT Project Coordinator at the Technology School of the Future. Trudy’s doctoral research focused on understanding teachers' work in a context of global and local school reform. Her research investigated issues related to local school management and organisational change. Trudy was previously the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) and the Director of Initial Teacher Education.

Ms Anne Szadura

Anne is Manager, Projects, Policy and Networks for the Australian Council of Education (ACDE). In this role Anne provides executive support to the ACDE’s five Networks, including the Network of Academic Directors of Professional Experience (NADPE). In addition to this project, Anne has managed several other ACDE projects including the Teachers Matter project undertaken collaboratively with Social Ventures Australia (SVA) and the Selection into Initial Teacher Education Project commissioned by DET. Anne has worked in the tertiary sector for over two decades across several universities and disciplines.
APPENDIX B: INTRODUCTORY EMAIL TO DEANS OF EDUCATION

Subject Title: NADPE National Research Project: Pre-service Teachers’ Portfolios of Evidence in ITE

Dear Dean of Education,

RE: NADPE National Steering Committee request for your support: Pre-service teachers’ portfolios of evidence: a national snapshot of the collection and assessment of evidence of practice within Australian initial teacher education (ITE).

On behalf of Dr Chad Morrison (Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania) and the Network of Academic Directors of Professional Experience (NADPE) National Steering Committee, our research team is investigating how ITE providers are collecting and assessing pre-service teachers’ (PSTs) Portfolios of Evidence (PoE). This will provide a national snapshot of how PoE help PSTs to demonstrate evidence of meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards.

We are using Survey Monkey to collect data about your priorities for implementing PoE and the outcomes associated with implementation. We also wish to report the extent to which portfolios have been utilised, and any opportunities and challenges that your faculty/school has faced (such as infrastructure, resourcing, pedagogic alignment, etc.).

The project’s Information Sheet (attached) provides relevant information for you and your staff. Data collection will involve surveying academic and professional staff. All data will be fully anonymised prior to any dissemination of findings.

We would appreciate your permission to approach your staff through your Academic Director of Professional Experience (NADPE member) in order to fulfil this research commitment. The survey, including copies of the project’s Information Sheet and Consent Statement, can be found at https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Pre-serviceTeachersPoESurvey.

If you have any questions or comments about your site’s participation please contact Linda.Page@utas.edu.au.

This study has been approved by the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number H0016625).

Thanking you in anticipation of your participation.

With kind regards,

Anne

Anne Szadura
Manager, Projects, Policy and Networks
ACDE
Ph: +61 3 9587 5796 Mobile: 0434 891 891
Email: projectmanager@acde.edu.au
www.acde.edu.au
APPENDIX C: INFORMATION SHEET FOR DEANS OF EDUCATION

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
FOR
DEANS OF EDUCATION

Pre-service teachers' portfolios of evidence: a national snapshot of the collection and assessment of evidence of practice within Australian initial teacher education (ITE).

Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (reference number *).

RESEARCH TEAM
For a list of research team members please see below.

DESCRIPTION
Pre-service teachers' portfolios of evidence: a national snapshot of the collection and assessment of evidence of practice within Australian initial teacher education (ITE).

The purpose of this project is to capture, on behalf of the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE), a national snapshot of how the implementation of pre-service teachers (PSTs) portfolios of evidence (PoE) is currently responding to drivers for change while also re-imagining initial teacher education (ITE) curriculum and pedagogy. Please review the information enclosed, and encourage participation from your institution.

Changes to national accreditation requirements have emphasised Professional Experience as a central component of ITE, and the need to capture the development and practice of PSTs in valid and consistent ways, to demonstrate evidence of their achievement against the Graduate Teacher Standards of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. The need to produce evidence of practice and make this evidence available to audiences beyond the institution has highlighted the need for ITE providers to collect and assess PSTs’ achievement in innovative ways. The implementation of PSTs’ portfolios of evidence (PoE) of their practice within ITE has been a response to these drivers for change. This implementation has also been responsible for re-imagining ITE pedagogy and curriculum.

This study seeks to explore the following research questions:
- How are pre-service teachers’ (PSTs) portfolios of evidence (PoE) of their practice being collected and assessed within initial teacher education (ITE)?
- How are PoE supporting PSTs to demonstrate evidence of meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards?
- Where is innovation occurring through the use of PoE?
- How are PoE influencing pedagogical delivery of ITE?
- How are institutions re-aligning resources, personnel and infrastructure to support implementation?
- What challenges are ITE providers encountering through implementation and how are they responding to them (including issues related to data ownership, management, storage and confidentiality)?
DATA COLLECTION
The survey seeks to gather a wide range of perspectives. Data collection will occur through a survey distributed by the Network of Academic Directors of Professional Experience (NADPE) via email to all Academic Directors of Professional Experience representatives (with a request that NADPE representatives forward it to all academic and professional staff). Survey items will focus on answering the research questions above.

Data collected through the survey will be fully anonymised (through amalgamation and abstraction) prior to any dissemination of findings.

DISSEMINATION
The final report will also be distributed to your NADPE representative and all Australian Deans of Education.

PARTICIPATION
Please participate in the following ways:
1. Read this Information Sheet and make contact with a member of the project team if you have questions about participation.
2. Request your Academic Director of Professional Experience to engage with the research, noting any preferences you may have for internal distribution of the survey in your faculty/school.
3. Request any staff attending the NADPE national forum in Sydney in November 2017 engage with the researchers to gain a better understanding of the findings.

OPTING OUT
Participation of your faculty/school in this project is entirely voluntary. Additionally, your staff will have the capacity to ignore this request and therefore opt-out without explanation or penalty.

EXPECTED BENEFITS
The participation of your faculty/school in this project will contribute to NADPE’s and the wider sector’s understanding of the role of PoE in ITE by:
- Documenting a snapshot of current Australian practice around the use of PSTs’ PoE of their practice in meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards;
- Highlighting the innovation and the drivers for change in ITE pedagogy, curriculum and assessment using PoE;
- Recording examples of challenges, barriers and risks associated with implementing PoE;
- Identifying the infrastructure needs associated with PoE;
- Building capacity within NADPE and Australian ITE through dissemination of knowledge and innovative practice.

RISKS
We believe there are minimal risks with your faculty/school’s participation which you should consider:
- Your staff may feel obliged to participate if the faculty/school endorses the project.
  Mitigation: The decision of your staff to participate or opt-out will remain private. No information about staff participation will be available to faculties/schools.
- There is a risk of inconveniencing your staff.
  Mitigation: We respectfully request of your staff and have ensured that the survey instrument is as concise as possible.
- Your staff may identify themselves or share information that is unique to their faculty/school.
  Mitigation: All information shared will be fully anonymised by the research team prior to distribution. All identifying information is strictly confidential and no identifying information will be reported as part of this project or for any other purpose.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE
Consent to participate in this study will be provided by participating staff when they enter the survey, read the embedded Information Sheet, complete the entire survey and submit their responses as the final process of the survey.

QUESTIONS / FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROJECT
If you have any questions or require further information please contact one of the research team members below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Investigator</td>
<td>Dr Chad Morrison</td>
<td>Academic Director of Professional Experience 61 3 6324 3525 <a href="mailto:Chad.Morrison@utas.edu.au">Chad.Morrison@utas.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Investigator</td>
<td>Dr Jennifer Masters</td>
<td>Senior Academic eLearning Pedagogue 61 3 6324 3022 <a href="mailto:Jennifer.Masters@utas.edu.au">Jennifer.Masters@utas.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Investigator</td>
<td>Dr Jenny Buckworth</td>
<td>Director of Professional Experience 61 8 8946 6298 <a href="mailto:jenny.buckworth@cdu.edu.au">jenny.buckworth@cdu.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Investigator</td>
<td>Dr Iain Hay</td>
<td>Director of Professional Learning and Engagement 61 2 98508056 <a href="mailto:iain.hay@mq.edu.au">iain.hay@mq.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Ms Linda Page</td>
<td>Executive Officer Education Programs 61 3 6324 3005 <a href="mailto:Linda.Page@utas.edu.au">Linda.Page@utas.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Investigator</td>
<td>Dr Cassandra Saunders</td>
<td>Lecturer, Learning and Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Investigator</td>
<td>Prof Megan Quentin-Baxter</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching 61 3 6324 3253 <a href="mailto:Megan.Quentin-Baxter@utas.edu.au">Megan.Quentin-Baxter@utas.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCERNS / COMPLAINTS REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF THE PROJECT
The University of Tasmania is committed to research integrity and the ethical conduct of research projects. However, if you do have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the project you may contact the Executive Officer of the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee. The Executive Officer is the person nominated to receive enquiries and complaints from research participants. The Executive Officer is not connected with the research project and can facilitate a resolution to your concern in an impartial manner. The Executive Officer can be contacted on (03) 6226 6254 or email human.ethics@utas.edu.au (quote this reference number: H0016625).

Thank you for helping with this research project. Please keep this sheet for your information.
APPENDIX D: INTRODUCTORY EMAIL TO ACADEMIC DIRECTORS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Subject Title: NADPE National Research Project: Pre-service Teachers’ Portfolios of Evidence in ITE

Dear Academic Director of Professional Experience

RE: NADPE National Steering Group invitation: Pre-service teachers’ portfolios of evidence: a national snapshot of the collection and assessment of evidence of practice within Australian initial teacher education

On behalf of Dr Chad Morrison (Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania) and the Network of Academic Directors of Professional Experience (NADPE) National Steering Committee, our research team is investigating how ITE providers are collecting and assessing pre-service teachers’ (PSTs) portfolios of evidence (PoE). This will provide a national snapshot of how PoE help PSTs to demonstrate evidence of meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards.

We are using Survey Monkey to collect data about your priorities for implementing PoE and the outcomes associated with implementation. We also wish to report the extent to which portfolios have been utilised, and any opportunities and challenges that your faculty/school has faced (such as infrastructure, resourcing, pedagogic alignment, etc.).

The project’s Information Sheet (attached) provides relevant information for you and your staff. Data collection will involve surveying academic and professional staff. All data will be fully anonymised prior to any dissemination of findings.

A final report will be produced at the conclusion of the project which will be made available to you and your faculty/school through the NADPE forum in November 2017.

We would appreciate your assistance to disseminate the Information Sheet and survey link to your academic and professional colleagues within your faculty/school, including five (5) staff that you know have been directly involved in PoE. The survey, including copies of the project’s Information Sheet and Consent Statement, can be found at https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Pre-serviceTeachersPoESurvey.

The survey will remain open until 14 July 2017. A reminder will be sent.

If you have any questions or comments about your site’s participation please contact Linda.Page@utas.edu.au.

This study has been approved by the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (approval number: H0016625).

Thanking you in anticipation of your participation.

With kind regards,

Anne

Anne Szadura
Manager, Projects, Policy and Networks
ACDE
Ph: +61 3 9587 5796  Mobile: 0434 891 891
Email: projectmanager@acde.edu.au
www.acde.edu.au

NADPE REPORT: PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE IN INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION
APPENDIX E: INFORMATION SHEET FOR FACULTY/SCHOOL STAFF

Pre-service teachers’ portfolios of evidence: a national snapshot of the collection and assessment of evidence of practice within Australian initial teacher education (ITE).

Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (reference number *).

DESCRIPTION

Pre-service teachers’ portfolios of evidence: a national snapshot of the collection and assessment of evidence of practice within Australian initial teacher education (ITE).

The purpose of this project is to capture, on behalf of the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE), a national snapshot of how the implementation of pre-service teachers (PSTs) portfolios of evidence (PoE) is currently responding to drivers for change while also re-imagining initial teacher education (ITE) curriculum and pedagogy. Please review the information enclosed, and encourage participation from your institution.

Changes to national accreditation requirements have emphasised Professional Experience as a central component of ITE, and the need to capture the development and practice of PSTs in valid and consistent ways, to demonstrate evidence of their achievement against the Graduate Teacher Standards of the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. The need to produce evidence of practice and make this evidence available to audiences beyond the institution has highlighted the need for ITE providers to collect and assess PSTs’ achievement in innovative ways. The implementation of PSTs’ portfolios of evidence (PoE) of their practice within ITE has been a response to these drivers for change. This implementation has also been responsible for re-imagining ITE pedagogy and curriculum.

This study seeks to explore the following research questions:

- How are pre-service teachers’ (PSTs) portfolios of evidence (PoE) of their practice being collected and assessed within initial teacher education (ITE)?
- How are PoE supporting PSTs to demonstrate evidence of meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards?
- Where is innovation occurring through the use of PoE?
- How are PoE influencing pedagogical delivery of ITE?
- How are institutions re-aligning resources, personnel and infrastructure to support implementation?
- What challenges are ITE providers encountering through implementation and how are they responding to them (including issues related to data ownership, management, storage and confidentiality)?

DATA COLLECTION

The survey seeks to gather a wide range of perspectives. Data collection will occur through a survey distributed by the Network of Academic Directors of Professional Experience (NADPE) via email to all
Academic Directors of Professional Experience representatives (with a request that NADPE representatives forward it to all academic and professional staff). Survey items will focus on answering the research questions above.

Data collected through the survey will be fully anonymised (through amalgamation and abstraction) prior to any dissemination of findings.

**DISSEMINATION**
The final report will also be distributed to you via the NADPE Forum in November 2017 and to all Australian Deans of Education.

**PARTICIPATION**
If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey, estimated to take approximately 20 minutes.

- Read this Information Sheet and make contact with a member of the project team if you have questions about participation.
- If appropriate, discuss distribution to colleagues in your faculty/school with your Dean of Education (who has been advised of the research).
- Complete the survey at [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Pre-serviceTeachersPoESurvey](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Pre-serviceTeachersPoESurvey).
- Forward a copy of the survey at [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Pre-serviceTeachersPoESurvey](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Pre-serviceTeachersPoESurvey) AND this Information Sheet to all academic and professional staff in your faculty/school.

**OPTING OUT**
Participation of your faculty/school in this project is entirely voluntary. You have the capacity to ignore this request and therefore opt-out without explanation or penalty.

**EXPECTED BENEFITS**
The participation of your faculty/school in this project will contribute to NADPE’s and the wider sector’s understanding of the role of PoE in ITE by:

- Documenting a snapshot of current Australian practice around the use of PSTs’ PoE of their practice in meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards;
- Highlighting the innovation and the drivers for change in ITE pedagogy, curriculum and assessment using PoE;
- Recording examples of challenges, barriers and risks associated with implementing PoE;
- Identifying the infrastructure needs associated with PoE;
- Building capacity within NADPE and Australian ITE through dissemination of knowledge and innovative practice.

**RISKS**
We believe there are minimal risks with your faculty/school’s participation which you should consider:

- You may feel obliged to participate if the faculty/school endorses the project.
  Mitigation: The decision to participate or opt-out will remain private. No information about staff participation will be available to faculties/schools and all results will be fully anonymised.
- There is a risk of inconveniencing you.
  Mitigation: We respectfully request your participation, and have ensured that the survey instrument is as concise as possible.
- You may identify yourself or share information that is unique to your faculty/school.
  Mitigation: All information shared will be fully anonymised by the research team prior to dissemination.
distribution. All identifying information is strictly confidential and no identifying information will be reported as part of this project or for any other purpose.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE
Consent to participate in this study will be provided by participating staff when they enter the survey, read the embedded Information Sheet, complete the entire survey and submit their responses as the final process of the survey.

QUESTIONS / FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROJECT
If you have any questions or require further information please contact one of the research team members below.

| Chief Investigator: | Dr Chad Morrison | Academic Director of Professional Experience  
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Co-Investigator:    | Dr Jennifer Masters | Senior Academic eLearning Pedagogue  
|                     |                  | +61 3 6324 3022 Jennifer.Masters@utas.edu.au                                    |
| Co-Investigator:    | Dr Jenny Buckworth | Director of Professional Experience  
|                     |                  | +61 8 8946 6298 jenny.buckworth@cdu.edu.au                                      |
| Co-Investigator:    | Dr Iain Hay       | Director of Professional Learning and Engagement  
|                     |                  | +61 2 98508056 iain.hay@mq.edu.au                                              |
| Project Manager:    | Ms Linda Page     | Executive Officer Education Programs  
|                     |                  | +61 3 6324 3005 Linda.Page@utas.edu.au                                         |
| Co-Investigator:    | Dr Cassandra Saunders | Lecturer, Learning and Teaching | Curriculum and Quality, Academic Division  
|                     |                  | +61 3 6324 3153 Cassandra.Saunders@utas.edu.au                                 |
| Co-Investigator:    | Prof Megan Quentin-Baxter | Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching  
|                     |                  | +61 3 6324 3253 Megan.Quentin-Baxter@utas.edu.au                              |

CONCERNS/COMPLAINTS REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF THE PROJECT
The University of Tasmania is committed to research integrity and the ethical conduct of research projects. However, if you do have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the project you may contact the Executive Officer of the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee. The Executive Officer is the person nominated to receive enquiries and complaints from research participants. The Executive Officer is not connected with the research project and can facilitate a resolution to your concern in an impartial manner. The Executive Officer can be contacted on (03) 6226 6254 or email human.ethics@utas.edu.au (quote this reference number: H0016625).

Thank you for helping with this research project
APPENDIX F: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

INFORMATION SHEET

PROJECT TITLE
Pre-service teachers’ portfolios of evidence: a national snapshot of the collection and assessment of evidence of practice within Australian initial teacher education (ITE).

Introduction

The purpose of this project is to capture, on behalf of the Network of Academic Directors of Professional Experience (NADPE) within the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE), a national snapshot of how the implementation of pre-service teachers (PSTs) portfolios of evidence (PoE) is currently responding to drivers for change, while also re-imagining initial teacher education (ITE) curriculum and pedagogy.

This survey seeks to explore how PSTs PoE are being collected and assessed to demonstrate evidence of meeting the Graduate Teacher Standards, where innovation is occurring, how PoE are influencing pedagogical delivery of ITE and what are the challenges of PoE implementation. Your responses are entirely anonymous and no results will be reported in a way that can identify individuals. The results of the survey will be made available to you through the NADPE Forum in November 2017 and to all Australian Deans of Education.

The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete and will be open for three weeks. Should you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact the Project Manager, Ms Linda Page: Linda.Page@utas.edu.au

PROCEED TO NEXT SECTION

SECTION 1: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Questions in this section ask you to provide information about you, your role and your site.

1. Where is your initial teacher education (ITE) institution situated?
   a) Australian Capital Territory
   b) Northern Territory
   c) New South Wales
   d) Queensland
   e) South Australia
   f) Tasmania
   g) Victoria
   h) Western Australia
2. What is the name of your institution [drop-down list]?
   a) Prefer not to say
   b) ACU
   c) Adelaide
d) Alphacrucis College

e) ANU

f) Australian College of Physical Education

g) Avondale College of Higher Education

h) Bond

i) Canberra

j) Christian Heritage College

k) CQU

l) CDU

m) CSU

n) Curtin

o) Deakin

p) ECU

q) Eastern College Australia

r) Excelsia College

s) FedUni

t) Flinders

u) Griffith

v) Holmesglen

w) JCU

x) LaTrobe

y) Macquarie

z) Melbourne

aa) Melbourne Polytechnic

bb) Monash

cc) Montessori World Educational Institute

dd) Morling College

ee) Murdoch

ff) Newcastle

gg) QUT

hh) RMIT

ii) SCU

jj) Swinburne

kk) Sydney

ll) Tabor Adelaide

mm) Torrens

nn) UNDA

oo) UNE

pp) UniSA

qq) UNSW

rr) UOW

ss) UQ
3. Which of the following BEST describe your MAIN role(s) at your institution? [Select all that apply]
   Tutor
   Lecturer
   Subject/Unit Coordinator
   Program/Course Coordinator
   eLearning Support
   Technology Support
   Academic Developer
   Academic Support Officer
   Liaison or Mentor (visiting academic)
   Placement Officer
   Professional Experience Coordinator
   Director of Professional Experience
   Associate Head/Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching)
   Head of School/Dean of Education
   Other (please specify)

4. Are you employed in an academic or professional staff capacity?
   a) Academic
   b) Professional

4.b Which of the following BEST describes your appointment level at the time of your involvement with the implementation of Portfolios of Evidence (PoE)?
   a) Tutor
   b) Lecturer
   c) Senior lecturer
   d) Associate professor
   e) Professor
   f) Other (please list: _____________)

5. Was your appointment:
   a) casual
   b) part-time
   c) full-time
   d) other (please specify)

6. Where you have ever been involved in the implementation and use of PoE [Select all that apply].
   a) Design of PoE tasks
b) Content development to support the PoE

c) Teaching about developing the PoE

d) Assessment/marking of PoE tasks

e) Moderation of PoE tasks

f) Administration of PoE activities and assessment

g) I haven’t been involved with implementing the PoE

7. How familiar are you with the implementation of the PoE in your institution?

a) I have a leading role in the implementation of the PoE

b) I am actively engaging in implementing the PoE in my area

c) The subjects/units/programs I work with incorporate PoE activities [proceed to Q7 then final question and finish survey]

d) I am aware that the pre-service teachers we work with need a PoE [proceed to Q7 then final question and finish survey]

e) I am not really sure about the PoE in my institution [proceed to Q7 then final question and finish survey]

[All respondents who answered Q6. a) or b) proceed to Q7 and all remaining questions]

[Respondents who answered question 6. c) d) or e) proceed to Q7 and then to last question, provide consent by submitting responses and exit survey]

PROCEED TO NEXT SECTION

SECTION 2: IMPLEMENTATION OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' PORTFOLIOS OF EVIDENCE OF THEIR PRACTICE

Questions in this section ask you to provide information about the current implementation of pre-service teachers’ (PSTs) portfolios of evidence (PoE) within your Faculty/School.

8. How are PoE MAINLY implemented in your faculty/school?

a) In subjects or units [proceed to Q9]

b) Aligned with practical experience [proceed to Q9]

c) In both teaching and practical experience [proceed to Q10]

d) PSTs initiate and manage PoE by themselves [proceed to Q10]

e) PoE are not yet implemented in my Faculty/School [proceed to Q10]

9. What format are PoE in your faculty/school?

a) Completely digital [proceed to Q10]

b) Mostly digital [proceed to Q10]

c) Mostly paper-based [proceed to Q11]

d) Don’t know [proceed to Q11]

10. Does your institution support, or provide software for PoE purposes?

a) My institution provides a portfolio platform for portfolio use [proceed to Q11]

b) My institution provides, recommends and/or supports a range of software options for portfolio use [proceed to Q12]

c) Students find their own software for portfolio use [proceed to Q12]

d) PoE are paper-based (Proced to Q12)

11. The MAIN digital portfolio platform provided by my institution is:
12. What ITE programs have PSTs' PoE been, or plan to be, implemented (select all relevant responses):
   a) Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood)
   b) Bachelor of Education (Primary)
   c) Bachelor of Education (Secondary)
   d) Bachelor of Education (Specialisation/Combination)
   e) Master of Teaching (Early Childhood)
   f) Master of Teaching (Primary)
   g) Master of Teaching (Secondary)
   h) Master of Teaching (Specialisation/Combination)
   i) Graduate Certificate/Diploma of Teaching (Early Childhood)
   j) Graduate Certificate/Diploma of Teaching (Primary)
   k) Graduate Certificate/Diploma of Teaching (Secondary)
   l) Graduate Certificate/Diploma of Teaching (Specialisation/Combination)
   m) Combined Degree (Specialisation/Combination, please list: ________________)
      If you selected ‘Specialisation/Combination’ and/or ‘Other’ above, please specify.

PROCEED TO NEXT SECTION
SECTION 3: ROLL OUT AND IMPACT OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' PORTFOLIOS OF EVIDENCE

13. What decision-making processes have MOST influenced how PoE have been implemented within your faculty/school [select all that apply]
   a) Faculty/school-led
   b) Program/course team
   c) Unit/subject team
   d) Individual team
   e) Individual staff
   f) PSTs have initiated PoE for themselves

14. What has been the MAIN driver for implementation of PSTs' PoE within your faculty/school [select all that apply].
   a) Institution
   b) Faculty/school
   c) Program/course teams
   d) Unit/subject teams
   e) Individual(s)
f) Pre-service teachers
g) External bodies

15. Who do you see as the MOST influential role within your faculty/school for shaping the implementation of PSTs' PoE? Why is that?

[Text response]: ________________

16. How have PSTs' PoE MOSTLY been introduced within your faculty/school [Select all that apply].
   a) Simultaneously across all courses
   b) At program/course level in coordinated/ successive roll-out
   c) At individual program/course level in isolation
   d) At unit/subject level in a coordinated/ successive roll-out
   e) At unit/subject level in isolation
   f) As a resource for PST self-management

17. Implementation of PSTs' PoE has been MOST shaped by [Select all that apply].
   a) Pedagogy
   b) Resourcing (e.g. infrastructure and/or digital technologies)
   c) Staffing
   d) Program/course accreditation
   e) Teacher registration
   f) Graduate employability
   g) Other (please specify: ________________)

18. What is likely to have the MOST influence over how portfolios of evidence are used within your Faculty/School over the next two years?

[Text response]: ________________

19. Implementation of PSTs' portfolios of evidence within your Faculty/School has generally been successful:
   a) Strongly agree [proceed to Q20]
   b) Agree [proceed to Q20]
   c) Disagree [proceed to Q21]
   d) Strongly disagree [proceed to Q21]
   e) Unsure [proceed to Q22]
   f) Not applicable [proceed to Q22]

20. What has supported this success?

[Text response]: __________________________

21. What has inhibited this success?

[Text response]: __________________________

22. Implementation of PoE within your Faculty/School has enhanced PSTs’ learning and development:
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   d) Strongly disagree
   e) Unsure
   f) Not applicable
22.b) The implementation of PoE has supported your graduates to be ‘classroom ready’
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   d) Strongly disagree
   e) Unsure
   f) Not applicable

23. What aspect of PSTs’ learning and/or development has been MOST enhanced by the implementation of PSTs’ PoE?
   a) Expert Content knowledge
   b) Pedagogical content knowledge
   c) Teaching practice
   d) Reflective practice
   e) Professional engagement
   f) Other (please list: ________________)

24. The implementation of PoE has enhanced your PSTs’ impact on student learning during Professional Experience:
   a) Strongly agree [proceed to Q25]
   b) Agree [proceed to Q25]
   c) Disagree [proceed to Q26]
   d) Strongly disagree [proceed to Q26]
   e) Unsure [proceed to Q26]
   f) Not applicable [proceed to Q26]

25. How has the implementation of PoE enhanced PSTs impact on student learning during Professional Experience (i.e. what is the evidence of this)?
   [Text response]: __________________________

26. Implementation of PoE has supported your graduates to be classroom ready.
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   d) Strongly disagree
   e) Unsure
   f) Not applicable

27. Focusing on just one program/course within your faculty/school where portfolios have been implemented, indicate how this has occurred:
   Name of program/course (please list): _________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded within unit/subject documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded within unit/subject weekly teaching and learning arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Embedded within faculty/school learning management systems
Embedded within unit/subject assessment items
Part of formative assessment practices
Part of summative assessment practices
Involves tasks performed during Professional Experience placements
Is viewed/assessed in part by supervising teachers/others during Professional Experience placements

28. Please describe any other issues not raised in relation to implementation of PoE in ITE:
[Text response]: __________________________

PROCEED TO NEXT SECTION
SECTION 4: RESOURCING AND FUNDING
Questions in this section ask you to provide information about how the implementation of PSTs’ PoE has been resourced and funded within your faculty/school.

29. Describe the level of DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES/INFRASTRUCTURE to support implementation of PSTs’ PoE at the:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Generous</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Grossly inadequate</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Describe the level of STAFFING to support implementation of PSTs’ PoE at the:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Generous</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Grossly inadequate</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Describe the level of RESOURCING to implement PSTs’ PoE at the:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Generous</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Grossly inadequate</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. What costs, if any, are associated with optimal implementation of PoE?
[Text response]: __________________________

33. Any other information about the resourcing of implementation of PoE, not previously covered:
[Text response]: __________________________
34. What has been your MOST significant challenge associated with the implementation of PoE?
   a) Pedagogical issues
   b) Resourcing (for example, infrastructure and/or digital technologies)
   c) Staffing
   d) Meeting program/course accreditation requirements
   e) Teacher registration requirements
   f) Graduate employability
   g) Other (please list: __________________)

35. What risks do you see impacting on implementing PSTs’ PoE in the future?
   [Text response]: __________________________

36. When creating, developing, organising and sharing PoE, PSTs are aware of how to use digital technologies ethically, safely and responsibly:
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   d) Strongly disagree
   e) Unsure
   f) Not applicable

37. My faculty/school has appropriate/adequate processes in place for responding to issues relating to the use of PoE:
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   d) Strongly disagree
   e) Unsure
   f) Not applicable

38. I think my institution is addressing the challenge of developing PoE effectively.
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Disagree
   d) Strongly disagree
   e) Unsure
   f) Not applicable

39. Consent:
Thank you for completing this survey.
Clicking ‘Submit’ implies your consent for the anonymous information you have provided to be used in this research.
Submit
APPENDIX G: ONLINE SURVEY

Information and Consent

Nature and Purpose of the Study
Australian Universities are increasingly being asked to give account for the effectiveness of their Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programs (Mayer et al., 2015). As part of a national push towards greater accountability in Education, the Australian Council of Deans in Education (ACDE) aims to systematically review all elements of teacher education, and has commissioned its subsidiary group, the Network of Academic Directors of Professional Experience (NADPE) with the task of evaluating ITE Professional Experience.

Professional Experience provided as part of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programs around Australia all meet national accreditation and mandated requirements, yet the individual programs offered by providers all differ in focus and orientation. The aim of this survey is to capture insights into the operational aspects of Professional Experience programs across Australian universities. Specifically, this study aims to identify issues related to three components of ITE Professional Experience; namely, the funding models, mentoring models, and the role and recognition of supervisory teachers.

We invite you to participate in this research study that aims to examine issues related to ITE Professional Experience programs as part of the ACDE’s comprehensive review of teacher education. This study is part of ongoing research conducted by Dr Susan Ledger and Dr Madeline Burgess at Murdoch University on behalf of the ACDE’s subsidiary group, the NETWORK OF ACADEMIC DIRECTORS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (NADPE).

The findings from this study aim to develop recommendations for the ACDE that may contribute to the future reform of ITE Professional Experience.

If you consent to take part in this research study, it is important that you understand the purpose of the study and the online survey you will be asked to participate in. Please make sure that you email us with any questions you may have, and that all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction before you agree to participate.

What the Study will Involve
If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete an online survey, estimated to take approximately 10-15 minutes.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. All information is treated as confidential and no details that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research.

Benefits of the Study
Participants will have the opportunity to discuss and reflect on the funding models, mentorship models and recognition of the supervisory teacher in ITE Professional Experience, as well as offer advice and suggestions for future Professional Experience programs. While there is no guarantee