

**Report and recommendations
of a review of the**

Bachelor of Teaching
&
Bachelor of Teaching (Honours)

Faculty of Education
University of Tasmania

Review conducted August 2007
Report submitted November 2007

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 2 |
| 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE | 3 |
| 2. COMPOSITION OF THE REVIEW PANEL | 4 |
| 3. THE REVIEW PROCESS | 5 |
| 4. PREFACE | 5 |
| THE TIMING OF THIS REVIEW | 5 |
| PRECURSOR: THE <i>2001 REVIEW</i> : | 6 |
| 5 GENERAL PRECONDITIONS | 9 |
| GOVERNANCE | 9 |
| CULTURE | 10 |
| 6. COMMENDATIONS AND AFFIRMATIONS | 13 |
| OVERVIEW | 13 |
| COMMENDATIONS | 13 |
| AFFIRMATIONS | 15 |
| 7 SPECIFIC CHALLENGES | 16 |
| RESOURCES/FACILITIES | 16 |
| GOVERNANCE AND COURSE CULTURE | 17 |
| LEADERSHIP | 17 |
| STAFF ON THE DEGREE | 18 |
| THE DEGREE AND THE UNIVERSITY | 19 |
| COURSE CONTENT AND OUTCOMES | 19 |
| ENTRY TO COURSE | 20 |
| RESEARCH | 20 |
| STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION OF THE PROGRAM | 21 |
| PEDAGOGY AND ASSESSMENT | 23 |
| 8. RECOMMENDATIONS | 26 |
| 9. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS | 33 |

1. Terms of Reference

- i. The purpose and objectives of the course and the extent to which the stated objectives contribute to the Faculty and University objectives as set out in their strategic plans;
- ii. the structure, content, and methods of delivery of the course, with reference to the extent to which they meet its objectives, result in the development of appropriate knowledge and skill bases, and provide appropriate preparation for employment and further study;
- iii. the structure, content, and methods of delivery of the course, with reference to the extent to which they relate to national and international best practice in teacher education;
- iv. the quality of the course, and the disciplines included in the course, in relation to the perceptions of peers in Australian and International scholarly communities;
- v. the suitability of the course in addressing teacher education for primary, middle, and secondary schooling contexts in Tasmania, nationally, and internationally;
- vi. the suitability of the course's length in relation to meeting purposes and objectives, and maintaining quality;
- vii. in relation to the course objectives, the appropriateness of teaching and learning processes, including the methods of assessment, within the course;
- viii. the quality of students entering and completing the course;
- ix. the implementation of current policy for monitoring and evaluating quality and the adequacy of current methods;
- x. student demand;
- xi. the collaborative arrangements between the course and teaching within other Schools and Faculties, other educational institutions and relevant business, industry and professional stakeholders and potential collaborators and advisors;
- xii. the articulation of the course with combined degrees with other Schools and Faculties;
- xiii. the number and qualifications of academic staff teaching the course;
- xiv. the general infrastructure and resources required for the course, including the buildings, teaching, and laboratory equipment, computing facilities, Faculty and other support services, and the library;
- xv. the Honours program and its relationship to the Bachelor of Teaching in terms of learning to teach, learning to research, research methods preparation, and coursework load;
- xvi. the Faculty's plans and procedures for improving the course; and
- xvii. any other issues.

2. Composition of the Review Panel

Chair:

Professor Peter Freebody

Faculty of Education and Social Work
The University of Sydney, New South Wales

Members:

Professor Jill Blackmore

Faculty of Education
Deakin University, Victoria

Mr Cameron Briers

Bachelor of Teaching Student Representative
University of Tasmania

Mr Nathan Duhig

Bachelor of Teaching Student Representative
University of Tasmania

Associate Professor Dominic Geraghty

University of Tasmania Representative

Dr Susan O'Donnell

Catholic & Independent Schools Sector Representative
Hobart, Tasmania

Professor Alan Reid

School of Education
University of South Australia

Mr Malcolm Wells

Tasmanian Department of Education Representative
Ulverstone, Tasmania

Associate Professor Brian Yates

University of Tasmania Representative

3. The Review Process

The Review Panel convened for four days from Monday July 27, 2007, meeting with a range of stakeholders including the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Academic Registrar, the Acting Dean of Education, Deputy Head of the School of Education, and principals and teachers from public, Catholic and independent schools, both primary and secondary. Group and some individual meetings were also held with teaching staff of the Bachelor of Teaching program and with students of the Bachelor of Teaching program. The Panel also inspected the Faculty's teaching facilities on the Hobart and Launceston campuses.

4. Preface

The timing of this Review

The Review Panel notes that there are a number of conditions that make the time right for a comprehensive review and revisitation of the Bachelor of Teaching (henceforth BTeach, noting that this designation should be taken here to refer also to the Honours component unless otherwise stated). These conditions include:

- the recent and significant turn-over in academic staff, especially senior Faculty staff and line-managers;
- recent problems that have surfaced to an extent that they call for substantial, collective Faculty responses;
- the sense abroad in the Faculty that the proliferation of casual teaching support and the apparent fragmentation of courses within the program, combined with the usual communication difficulties associated with the availability of the degree across two campuses, have led to a “tipping point” such that some decisive change now needs to be undertaken and, more importantly, *can* be undertaken; and
- the fact that it has been six years since the last comprehensive review of the program, and that some stock now needs to be taken against its recommendations.

Taken together, these, along other contingencies impacting on elements of and individuals in the BTeach, should combine to make the Faculty “change-ready”. Critical now, therefore, is the need to formulate achievable goals, to begin collaborative processes whereby strategies for directing attention and effort to those goals can begin, and to affirm the Faculty's optimism in its abilities to

prosecute those strategies effectively to achieve and perhaps surpass the goals originally formulated.

Precursor: The 2001 Review:

The report of the Review Committee of the Bachelor of Teaching Program, September 2001, described a two-year equivalent end-on program that was *'well grounded in terms of emerging practices in the field... producing graduates of a standard comparable to other teacher education programs.'* The 2001 Report spoke of the program's *'potential to be a distinctive and high quality degree serving well the needs of the School system in Tasmania and having the possibility to attract graduates from outside the State.'*

These observations were offset to a considerable degree by the 2001 committee's assessment of areas of concern. These included that the program was not *'meeting its potential'* and was *'falling behind acknowledged best practices in terms of its administration and internal university practices, in its current program content and in its inadequate integration with its professional partners'*. Seven major issues were targeted. These are summarised below.

i) Administration and organisation

Issues raised for particular attention in the 2001 Review included:

- new strategies to implement firm leadership;
- a reconstituted and stronger Course Advisory Committee;
- a clearer delineation of the roles and expectations of university staff;
- the development of a unified and clear set of course documents and procedures; and
- planned and multiple forms of ongoing monitoring feedback and evaluation.

ii) Course content

Issues raised included:

- a better coverage of the knowledge and skill needs of the beginning teacher;
- a re-balancing of the strands of the program to make effective a real partnership with schools in the preparation of teachers;
- better mentoring and communication with students;
- improvement to assessment procedures, in the assessment of teaching practice and across the program; and

- some adjustments to the Honours program.

iii) Selection procedures

Issues raised included:

- the desirability of additional teaching-related criteria to academic results; and
- improved procedures for knowledge and skills assessment at intake.

iv) Assessment of graduates

Issues raised included:

- the need for improved assessment of teaching practice in terms of clarity, and taking into account the joint responsibilities of teachers, schools and the University; and
- a revision of the Honours program to include attention to teaching practice.

v) Course structure and future directions

Issues raised included:

- the desirability of exploring 'Masters in Teaching' as the appropriate designation for this course; and
- the need to review the appropriateness of the current strands (designated stages of schooling) through which the program is offered.

vi) Relations with the profession

Issues raised included:

- the building of closer relationships with and developing future strategies in collaboration with the Department of Education and other employers and professional bodies in the state.

vii) Resource issues for the University:

Issues raised included:

- a recognition of the demands of cross-campus provision and of clinical supervision in the professional experience in funding formulas; and
- a remedy for the inadequate computing provision for the Faculty.

The 2001 Review thus proposed a wide-ranging and potentially profound reconsideration of the organisation, content, and outcomes of the BTeach. The shortfall in significant change resulting

from the 2001 Review from 2001 until 2007, therefore, has been a serious disappointment, the consequences of which constituted themes that emerged early and often in the 2007 review process. On numerous occasions the Panel was inclined to suggest that the University simply return to the 2001 report and proceed to implement its recommendations more whole-heartedly.

This point calls for some elaboration. It became rapidly clear to the Panel that one of the key problems facing the Faculty was the apparent failure to implement the recommendation of that earlier Review, in any whole-hearted way in all cases, and even in any merely token way in most. What that means is that the Faculty's ability to pursue a change agenda for the better, and its optimism that change will be faithfully and coherently pursued and supported, have both been affected. The previous Review's lack of consequentiality, both real and apparent, itself places additional ballast onto the efforts of the current Review, and the staff's sense of the seriousness of its deliberations.

To put it bluntly, the Faculty is in some ways in a weaker position now with regard to change than it was in 2001, precisely because of what happened in and after 2001. In that light, the committed, whole-hearted, enthusiastic, and thoughtful contributions of academic staff members to this Review's processes give much heart. What has not been lost, however, and what remain in the background of the concerns expressed to us are the deep questions that the 2001 Review and its follow-up raise about leadership at the Faculty level and beyond, the processes by which ongoing changes can be managed, and the accountability systems of the Faculty and the University by which important improvements may be encouraged and monitored. This is, therefore, an issue that is for bodies both within and beyond the Faculty.

One of the specific concerns of the Panel was that in many critical areas the lack of decisive action could mean that those charged with attending to some of the most urgent and pressing issues to come out of the 2007 review will face even greater challenges than those charged with this responsibility six years earlier. The support of the University and the Faculty will be even more important in this regard. The 2007 Panel nonetheless believes that a window of opportunity to respond to the challenges of change still exists, but the nature and aftermath of the 2001 Review provides a significant backdrop to the deliberations summarised here, and will affect the preconditions for change. A brief mention of these preconditions follows. Some of the more immediate issues are discussed at more length in subsequent sections of this report. Owing to the interconnectedness of the issues covered in this report, several aspects of the BTeach are revisited under more than one heading in the discussion below.

5 General Preconditions

Governance

Leadership of senior staff

There is an urgent need for those currently in leadership positions in the Faculty, especially those associated with teacher education, to exercise initiative, support, and monitoring across the full range of teacher-education related activities. Several of the discussion points and recommendations below add up to elaborations or specifications of this overall issue. There is a strong sense that the emphasis on focusing senior staff on research achievements has had, no doubt inadvertently, the effect of downgrading the intellectual and professional leadership available to the teacher education effort. Comments from academic staff pointing to this difficulty, and to the inappropriately sparse zone in the middle of the academic scale, included: “there seems nothing between the struggling Level As and Bs and the prolific research professors at the top”; “we urgently need intellectual leadership from our leaders in this program”; “we need a strategist at the top.” Clearly the Faculty needs to be *balanced in its strategic approach to enhancing its research profile without creating difficulties and leadership vacuums in the mid-management levels.*

Decision making and lines of responsibility

Staff expressed concern at the apparent lack of capacity for consultation-based decision-making within the Faculty. It seemed clear to the Panel that decisive organisational moves need to be taken to restore staff’s trust in the Faculty’s ability to change for the better. This will involve, among other initiatives discussed elsewhere in this Review, a *clear spelling out of the ‘map’ of the organisation, the decision-making responsibilities at each level, and the lines of accountability that pertain throughout the whole Faculty system.*

Workload planning and management

An ongoing topic of serious concerns related to the *apparently inequitable distribution of different kinds of work for the BTeach* – teaching, school visits, research, committees, convening courses, and so on. The Panel was unable, in the time available, to ascertain the extent to which these perceptions were warranted. In light of comments below about the lack of communication among elements of the staff on the BTeach program, it is possible that there is more consistency than commonly believed, but it is certainly the case that, if that is so, it needs to be more broadly appreciated. Perceived inequities in workload have clearly deleterious effects on staff morale, performance, and retention.

Culture

Communication

There seems to be communication problems among staff working on the BTeach. Following recent difficulties in the Faculty, including difficulties at a very senior level, staff, in the words of one of the interviewees, are “bunkered down”, managing their own responsibilities as best they can without venturing into more system-level relationships that might enhance the coherence and efficacy of the degree program. There is, therefore, a need to *provide gradual but increasing opportunities for consequential ‘safe discussion and decision places’, such that staff can come to terms with their own agency within the larger terms of the organisation’s main lines of effort.* This observation may apply across many aspects of the Faculty’s activities, but its consequences are particularly significant for a program that is as complex, high-profile, and financially important as the BTeach. Related to this is the social fabric of the Faculty. Clearly, small groups within the Faculty, focused on particular units of study, work well, and the Panel heard about and observed instances of successful collegial collaborations and evident congeniality within these groups. What seemed less evident, and is of course more difficult to maintain in such a large Faculty, is the sense of social belonging of staff in the wider setting of the Faculty as a whole. The split between campuses does not make that goal any easier to achieve, and it is not that case that such Faculty-wide belonging is the norm among Australian Faculties of Education. In this particular instance, however, in light of the recent past and of the change-ready features listed earlier in the Report, such a goal has special consequence and value for the management and efficacy of the BTeach course.

Induction and mentoring

Staff reported a lack of induction into the workings of the Faculty. This was conveyed to the Panel as a particularly significant issue for casual staff teaching on the BTeach. They reported unnecessary difficulties in developing an awareness of the material and human resources available to them in the Faculty to support their teaching, and a sense that they were ‘important but invisible’ in the Faculty. Given the reliance of the BTeach on casual staff, this matter requires some urgent attention.

It is important to note that induction programs need to have both generic and specific components. That is, it is not enough, at least in the case of casual staff on the BTeach, to have induction into the general workings of the University; as well, *it is important for casual and new staff to be made aware quickly of the range of responsibilities and resources that apply to their positions.* Since the BTeach entails complex on-campus and cross-campus teaching, as well as off-campus practicum

sessions, with often complex but critical relations among those elements, some detailed documentation accompanied by face-to-face induction is all the more necessary.

Lack of research culture

The Faculty's efforts in managing the student loads in its flagship teaching programs have presented ongoing challenges to its research profile. Resources have been directed to the appointment of very senior academics whose responsibilities have been almost entirely focused on the building and maintenance of research profile for the Faculty. The Panel agrees that it is important to sustain collaborative efforts that operate at the high-market end through such strategic appointments, although not all of them need to be at the highest level. However the Panel also observes that it is also important to *create settings for the research development of those colleagues who have not yet established productive lines of research activity*. This process needs to begin in simple and practical ways, perhaps initially through the strategic distribution of research expertise into team settings with common interests, and the gradual and patient growth of a capacity to share professional, methodological, and grant-getting expertise. This latter goal requires effort and supportive day-to-day management rather than high level expenditure or overly ambitious 'quick-fixes'. A financially manageable medium-term plan to enhance and maintain a research culture among Faculty members should be developed immediately.

A second point regarding the research culture of the Faculty concerns the presence of a research-informed ethos with the BTeach itself. Much has been made recently of narrowly-conceived notions of 'evidence-based' teaching and teacher education. Putting aside debates about 'evidence-determined', 'evidence-based', and 'evidence-aware' practice in education, the Panel notes that a concentrated effort on supporting research activity along the lines mentioned in the paragraph above will have as one of its bi-products a more pervasive and appropriately nuanced use of research in the Faculty's major course offerings, including the BTeach. Further, the recommendation is that *one of the Faculty's senior research appointments should be in the area of teacher education, with the successful candidate having a track record both as a teacher educator and as a researcher of teacher education*. The Faculty is well-placed to develop a high-profile research contribution to the teacher education area, given the small but complex educational setting in Tasmania generally, and the potential for whole-system developmental work in close relationships with systems and policy makers. Such efforts would provide a framework for some of the initiatives around research and teaching collaboration outlined in other sections of this Report.

Casualisation

It is clear that the Faculty's reliance on casual staff for the management and delivery of the BTeach degree presents some distinctive challenges to the transparency of the organisation and management of the degree, and to the maintenance of coherence and quality of its content. One such challenge is the fragmentation of content – different theoretical perspective, attitudes to teaching and learning, sense of pathways, scope of destination trajectories of graduates (Tasmanian schools, schooling anywhere in Australia, schooling beyond Australia), the particular mix of theory and practice, and the degree of integration of the practicum experience into on-campus studies, and so on. All of these were pointed to as potential zones of fragmentation by both students and academic staff.

Similarly, the working conditions of casual staff and the sense of potential pathways into the academy were issues that were raised. Some aspects of these are discussed elsewhere in this Report, but it worth noting here that more than one casual teaching staff member of the Faculty indicated to us that they had taken the work partly as a way of transitioning to an academic position, but that they had abandoned that aspiration soon after they began the work. This was in part due to the apparent lack of organisational support offered to them and their non-casual colleagues on the degree (resulting in an organisational and administrative setting that was described variously to us as 'appalling', 'messy', 'distressing', and 'dysfunctional'), and partly because they had experienced no collegial setting in which they could discuss their aspirations and make practical plans. *Integrating these casually employed colleagues into the intellectual, professional, and managerial aspects of the BTeach – its planning, aims, macro-design, content, and modes of delivery – is an important and urgent task for the Faculty* that will have ramifications for the quality and coherence of the degree, the succession planning for the Faculty more broadly, the professional ethos of the Faculty, and the public perception of the degree and the Faculty among members of the local profession.

Internationalisation

There are three aspects of the Panel's findings that relate to the general idea of internationalisation in the BTeach: i) The first is that current debates, movements, and trends in teacher education around the world need to be taken into account in the design and implementation of the BTeach; this means some systematic scanning of the research and development literature, and the examination of apparently high-quality programs offered in comparable cultural and economic settings; ii) there is value to be accrued from the discipline of targeting some overseas teacher education markets and attempting to recruit both staff and students from those sources; this means systematic study of those markets and sources, some development of at least informal business

plans and risk analyses, and face-to-face contact with key system stakeholders in those source settings; iii) in planning the BTeach as a set of pre-professional experience, the Faculty, most probably through the Advisory Committee, should explicitly plan to provide knowledge, skills, and dispositions that prepare graduates to teach anywhere in the world; this means having a sense of both the ‘basic training’ called for, and the ‘burning issues’ facing educators in possible destination countries, a clear sense of the relationship between these and the current set of graduate attributes as set forth in policy documents, and attention to planning for such characteristics as ‘an international orientation’, ‘adaptability’, and ‘flexibility of learning’ among graduates.

6. Commendations and Affirmations

Overview

An initial prefatory point is that it is apparent from the overall feedback from staff and students participating in the Review that the BTeach provided by the University of Tasmania is generally regarded as a rewarding experience that prepares professional educators for employment in Tasmanian schools and beyond. The course content was, in general, described to the Panel as relevant, stimulating, adequate for entry to the profession, and providing a potential platform for further development. A factor contributing to this overall satisfaction with the degree is the quality of the students who commit themselves to the program. Their willingness and eagerness to learn, combined with the maturity gained through a wide range of career and study pathways and their determination to become excellent teachers, are foundations for a positive student culture focused on maximising opportunities for learning and development. But, as described below, there are clearly exceptions to this generalisation and shortfalls relative to potential.

A second prefatory observation that we stress is that a diversity of views was put before us in discussions of the terms of reference of the Review. The issues that matter most were often the most contentious, and, while this Report aims to present an actionable program of change, and a coherent warrant for that program, it is important that inappropriate levels of consensus not be read into its findings and recommendations. We combined what we regarded as a majority view with our own experiences, necessarily imported from elsewhere in many cases, and our own practical, professional, and academic areas of expertise to formulate a narrative that could sustain some productive ways forward.

Commendations

The review process has highlighted a number of areas within the degree that are worthy of particular commendation:

- The dedication of many academic staff, especially those in casual or sessional roles, is commended, especially in light of many critical and, to date, unresolved issues that have contributed to an often difficult and challenging context. Staff members have demonstrated quality professional practice in terms of student support, course development, and willingness to undertake demanding workloads. It is clear that they have done so because of their commitment to the ongoing needs of their students.
- Some curriculum and course areas have been enhanced by the ability of some staff to self-initiate collegial and collaborative practices. In such circumstances, the outcomes have been positive both in terms of the overall improved quality of provision and in the satisfaction that staff have gained from their work.
- There is currently a renewed energy among staff around the prospect of change. A collective desire for improvement has created a groundswell that can harness skills and talents that will benefit short-, medium-, and long-term strategic planning and goal-setting.
- Academic staff have also shown an ability to initiate change and improvement, and to recognise and respond to needs in a timely manner, in spite of many having been in acting roles or only very recently appointed.
- The clarity of critical thinking and grasp of some urgent issues are a credit to the professionalism of academic staff and have been instrumental in improvements to date.
- The level of practical support that academic staff have provided for students, particularly those who have undertaken the challenge of Honours, is noteworthy. Almost all students spoke to the Panel of their appreciation for the professionalism, approachability, and expertise of staff, holding them in high regard.
- Several specialist curriculum areas are highly valued for the quality of the program content. There is, in these areas, an appropriate and balanced approach to theoretical learning and its relevance for practice and pedagogy.
- Many students and staff perceive Professional Experience opportunities as high points of student learning and empowerment. The duration and balance of the four Professional Experience opportunities provide a workable framework for meeting individual students' developmental needs, enhanced by the valuable contributions of high-calibre colleague teachers and the quality of follow-up reflection. The School University Partnership program was singled out as a successful and stimulating initial step into the realities of school life for students, by academic staff, colleague teachers, school leaders, and current and past

students. School personnel have reported satisfaction with and appreciation of the quality of students, specifically their maturity, commitment to the profession and willingness to learn.

Affirmations

The Panel was impressed with the spirit and generosity displayed by participants. It is worth noting that there was a high level of collective honesty and optimistic commitment to the overall good of the University and the further development of the degree to enhance students' professional futures. This was evident in the reflective and critical nature of the self-evaluation reports and relates to both the mainstream and Honours strands of the BTeach.

A number of recent and current initiatives are affirmed as timely and appropriate steps toward change and improvement:

- i. While recognising that ongoing work needs to be undertaken in relation to making appropriate internal program and cross-disciplinary links, nevertheless, the four core components of the degree (Curriculum and Method Studies; Professional Studies; Multi-Literacies and School Experience) are regarded as structurally sound.
- ii. The preparation of students for their Professional Experience and the overall positive relationships with schools that have been sustained constitute a firm foundation for student learning in pedagogy and practice. In particular, the revised policy for Professional Experience and the user-friendly nature of the assessment rubric are positive improvements that have been welcomed by those involved.
- iii. Establishing improved organisational structures to maximise change management and increasing efficiencies are two current signs of early progress. Initiatives to improve Performance Management systems are an example. This work has contributed to a growing hope and expectation amongst staff that healthy change is both possible and achievable.
- iv. The introduction of a number of focused Task Groups has been productive, stimulating energy for improvement and empowerment of staff. In addition, the introduction of regular meetings in some curriculum areas, focused on improvement as well as management issues, is clearly an important initiative for developing collegial and collaborative practices both within the degree and with other degrees offered by the Faculty.

- v. The selection of high quality professionals for a wide range of new appointments is identified as essential for improvement and organisational growth. The creation of several new senior positions is perceived as providing a critical opportunity for implementing new strategic directions.
- vi. The mapping exercise undertaken by the course coordinator to address issues surrounding overall course planning and assessment scheduling is a positive step in developing improved levels of staff collegiality and rationalization of program delivery.
- vii. Initiatives to clarify further the appropriate focus for ICT, while still in process, are positive steps toward a balance between skill development and pedagogical elements. In addition, the introduction of a competency assessment process to address ongoing issues regarding ICT literacy amongst students has some potential for better meeting the needs of a diverse range of students.
- viii. The inclusion of school practitioners as guest speakers and the practice-based contributions of sessional staff in various aspects of the course are highly valued by students and staff and regarded as an important source of experience and professional wisdom relevant to the needs of pre-service teachers.
- ix. The timely and appropriate response to students' practical needs is critical, and is exemplified in the provision of a bus to minimise difficulties relating to travel between campuses.

Many of the challenges and recommendations discussed in the remainder of this Report represent the need for extensions and further developments of these promising aspects of the Faculty's work on the BTeach.

7 Specific Challenges

The background to the recommendations that follow is expressed here as a number of specific challenges that present the Faculty with possibilities for focused and, in some cases, relatively rapid change. These can be taken to represent a distillation of the discussions and observations conducted by the Panel over the course of its visit.

Resources/Facilities

- The state of resources and facilities at the Hobart Campus is unacceptable. Here we refer in particular to inappropriate or inadequate teaching and office spaces, and some of the systems for managing them (e.g., timetabling and booking procedures) that were cumbersome to the

point that students themselves were clearly aware of the difficulties. These can combine to create unnecessary delays and frustrations for staff and students. They also give ‘the wrong signals’ to both staff and students about how well the institution values their programs.

- There is a general need for specialist facilities on both campuses, including, in some cases, equipment and technology used by the schools in which students are being prepared to work (e.g., interactive white boards, resources for artworks, and so on). This aspect of the change process is a priority because it bears directly on how well students are ready to deal with the increasingly complex and expensive resources they will be expected to manage productively in classrooms, laboratories, sports fields, and so on.

Governance and course culture

- There seems a lack of cohesion and coherence across the program. Staff in different parts of the program often work in isolation. There is a sense of disconnection especially between professional studies and curriculum subjects.
- There appeared to the Panel to be a lack of cohesive and collegial decision-making structures, and an associated lack of streamlined and effective communication processes.
- The Course Advisory Committee has not met, and urgently needs to do so, and to continue to do so regularly. This relates to the range of necessary inputs into the organisation, content, and outcomes of the BTeach.
- There is a need for clear, accessible, and visibly effective links between professional associations and the Faculty. The effects on staff and student confidence in the content and processes of the degree, of a stronger and more visible set of professional associations, with formal mechanisms for input, would be considerable. It would also give the Faculty a set of ‘sounding boards’ as the change process proceeds.

Leadership

- There is a need for the senior academic staff of the Faculty to be deeply involved in decisions about and implementations of the content and processes of the degree.
- The role and authority of the degree coordinator needs to be clarified and consolidated, and its significance recognised via the appointment of a senior academic staff member, preferably with some academic track-record in teacher education or one curricular component of it, to the post.

- There is a need for transparent, explicitly-managed, and consequential performance management systems to be applied to the degree and those who plan and implement it. The central criteria to be applied in this regard need to be developed after broad consultation throughout the academic staff of the Faculty, student representatives, the Course Advisory Group, and, less formally, through discussion with an appropriate selection of colleagues working in schools.
- The Panel notes with concern the number of acting positions in the Faculty, in particular those affecting the BTeach. Sometimes these are unavoidable, and sometimes they reflect rapid periods of human resource transitions and turn-over, but in this case it seems that i) there are too many, ii) they are in positions that are too central to the operation of the degree, and iii) at the time of the Review at least, some colleagues had been in such positions, ‘acting’ for too long without a sense of ownership or a notion of how long they have to mature into the position.

Staff on the degree

- There is an unacceptable level of tension around the matter of appropriate and equitable workloads in the Faculty and among those responsible for the academic content and processes of the BTeach.
- There appear to be too many casual staff teaching on the BTeach, posing serious challenges to how well and how often they can communicate meaningfully, and thus how coherently the elements of the program can be co-ordinated.
- Further, casual staff reported to the Faculty that, while they enjoy the teaching on the program and, in some cases, feel privileged to be offered the opportunity, they do not feel particularly highly valued by the Faculty or the university more broadly.
- Many of the teaching staff on the program reported to the Panel that they felt that their workloads were too high relative to expectation and other demands, and that they operated in unacceptably isolated conditions. They pointed out to us the various negative consequences of this sense of isolation that can impact on the quality and coherence of the degree, and on their own motivation to remain in their positions.
- Some full-time academic staff teaching on the degree expressed anxiety about the effects of their teaching loads on their ability to develop and sustain productive levels of involvement in their professional communities in schools and in other universities. They were concerned that their ability to make the BTeach more effective through their awareness of

developments in schools and other faculties of Education had suffered accordingly. Some benchmarking of teaching workloads against other faculties, including faculties of Education on other universities may be called for to develop some sense of comparabilities on this count.

- There seems a clear need for induction and mentoring of academic staff teaching on the degree, especially new staff and those working on a casual basis. The development of an academically and professionally effective community in the Faculty at large depends to a considerable extent on the communal functioning of teachers on its most professionally prominent programs, of which the BTeach is an important instance. Attached to this and managing for high performance should be a supportive staff performance management process, including for secondees. That is, the Faculty as a whole needs to pay more special attention to supporting the wellbeing, community, and professional learning of the academic staff teaching on the BTeach. This ‘preferential treatment’ of staff on the degree is based on a sound appreciation of the special composition of the teaching staff and the complexity of their functions – their status, the diversity of their professional roles within the degree, the visibility of the degree in the profession and the community at large, and the uncertainty many of them feel as valued and ongoing contributors to the Faculty’s operation.

The degree and the University

- There is a need for a stronger connection with the University’s Strategic Plan. This has two aspects: i) the need to articulate the relationship between the structure and goals of the BTeach and the specific concepts and expressions in the University’s Strategic Plan, and ii) the need to examine more closely the content, sequence, and scope of the BTeach to ensure that it embodies meaningfully the expectations of the Plan.

Course Content and Outcomes

- There appeared to the Panel to be no adequate quality assurance processes regularly and consequentially applied to the content and processes and outcomes of the BTeach.
- The need was often expressed to benchmark with a comparable course in a similarly positioned Education faculty. This process could be undertaken with an Australian and/or overseas institution, and would be a further way in which staff and leaders in the Faculty could be more directly acquainted with national and international trends, opportunities, and challenges.

- The Student Evaluation data (SETLs) appears not to be systematically discussed or put to use by staff in any systematic or visible way. It is clear that some staff pay attention to this data base and some make program modifications accordingly, but equally there seems not to be a culture of drawing on SETLs data, individually, in course team grouping, across contributors to the planning and implementation of the degree, or in the Faculty otherwise.
- Similarly, the components of the BTeach seem not to be calibrated against data relating to graduate evaluations or destinations. There is a sense among some school-based colleagues who discussed this issue with the Panel that graduates from this course find their way into a variety of career paths associated with the profession of education, including careers outside of Tasmania, or Australia, or outside the classroom. Again, however, formal mechanisms for finding and disseminating this information, or for collecting ways in which the degree's content or processes might be rethought in light of such data, seem not to be part of the Faculty's operating activities.

Entry to course

- There is a need to consider processes whereby students are selected into the BTeach and the standards used in that selection process. The Advisory Group should begin a transparent consultative process whereby the academic and non-academic entry requirements are reviewed, and, if appropriate, revised, with a full rationale provided for each component, not just new or modified components. Participants in this Review drew attention to the need for students to have high entry levels in literacy and numeracy, and to hold, at least, 'an international driver's license' in Information and Communication Technologies. Participants, especially school principals, pointed to the need for Faculty leaders to engage in some serious market planning with regard to the workforce-planning needs of Tasmanian school systems, but also to have some sense of broader educational and neighbouring fronts and large- and smaller-scale educational labour markets. Information arising from these scans should be made available regularly to staff, enrolled students, and applicants.

Research

- There seemed to the Panel not to be a strong research culture in the course: the content of the program did not draw heavily on up to date research work, and there seemed little sense that current research on teacher education had been productively drawn upon in the design and implementation features of the course.

- Further, academic staff did not seem to be organised around clear research interests, be they topical, sub-disciplinary, or methodological.

Structure and organisation of the program

There are a number of highly specific issues that were raised that require some decisive resolution as soon as is practicable in light of the need for consultation. These are listed below, generally with some comments and, in some instances, with a recommendation from the Panel. It needs to be noted, however, that many of these issues are interdependent, and themselves directly related to more far-reaching recommendations that follow in this report. It is also noted that these specific issues must be taken in light of the Panel's recommendations concerning the urgent recruitment of senior staff with particular responsibility for Teacher Education and the BTeach. Those staff should be convening planning groups with clear lines for consultation on these matters. The Panel's recommendations should be taken as guidelines that can help clarify some starting points for these consultations. That is, we do not intend suggestions appearing in this section to have the same status or force as the recommendations presented in Section 8.

- Concern was expressed over a number of related issues that could be collected under the question: "What exactly *is* this degree?" These issues included the name of the degree, its optimal length (two years versus 18-months), its relation to other possibilities such as a graduate diploma, or Masters degree, and the possibility of a variety of combined degrees (e.g., Bachelor of Information Technology/Bachelor of Teaching). Several staff, students, and other participants weighed up in different ways the pluses and minuses of a variety of these options. The Panel felt that, at this time and in light of other urgent changes that need to be effected in the short term, these features of the course should remain for the time being, until the necessary human and material resources are in place to sustain the broad frame of the degree as it now stands. Such issues should, however, be revisited regularly, the first occasion being toward the end of academic year 2009.
- In addition to the recommendations concerning the management of quality in the mainstream BTeach program articulated elsewhere in this Report the Panel believes that the Faculty should act on the recommendations in the 2001 Review document (and in other Faculty documents, according to some staff) aimed at restructuring the Honours strand. There was considerable concern expressed over the content, structure, and outcomes of the Honours program within the BTeach, most emphatically by those directly involved in its provision. Specifically, some participants teaching on or assisting with the Honours program felt strongly that it was too rushed and cluttered, and that the result was "students doing too

much in nowhere near enough depth.” This point was made with particular focus on issues of research methodology, the claim being that the shortfall in this regard made the program not comparable with other university Honours programs. This led one academic staff member involved in the program to recommend its abolition or at least its suspension until appropriate structural modifications could be made.

Honours students we interviewed, however, presented a range of views and were generally more positive in their estimates of the value and manageability of the program. Several expressed considerable excitement at having the opportunity to do research and to work closely with a supervisor on an extensive inquiry into a topic of their own choice. Clearly an experience with these features is engaging these students and leading them to extend their own capabilities and professional horizons. Most of the enrolled students with whom the Panel discussed this issue indicated that high on their list of motives for taking the Honours component in the first place was the perception of enhanced employability as teachers. Staff and colleagues working in schools confirmed that this was a perception, and probably, so far, an accurate one. What that means is that the traditional conception of Honours as at least potentially opening up the prospect of a research-oriented career in Education is not central to the concerns of potential enrollees. Their expectations and evaluations of the program would be expected to reflect this, rendering it appropriate for them that the Honours be regarded as a sign of high academic achievement, rather than a qualitatively different kind of achievement.

Having said that, the issue of the degree’s award as an Honours degree, and the relation of that issue to aspects of research training – conceptual, methodological, and professional – need to be seriously weighed up in considering the future of the Honours strand. In the view of the Panel, the Honours program needs to be reconsidered, possibly withdrawn from offer until clarification and consensus are reached about i) its genuine status as a research-based Honours program, ii) its articulation with other aspects of the pass program, including the practicum components, iii) its intended benefit and targets for graduates’ career development, and v) potential articulation of the Honours program with postgraduate pathways.

- There were a number of miscellaneous issues concerning the structure and organisation of the program that arose from time to time in discussions with staff, students, and colleagues in schools that the Panel felt were worth mentioning, and that should be put in front of the Advisory Committee and the Faculty leadership for serious consideration and/or revisitation. These are simply listed here, the intention being that each be considered as a general

concern that may trigger some productive short-, medium-, or long-term planning consonant with the other major recommendations summarised in the final section of the Report.

- The flexibility and adaptability of graduates of the BTeach program would be enhanced by considering the inclusion of overlapping / mixtures of pathways from the degree, for example, early childhood and junior primary strands combined, or junior primary and primary, primary and middle, and so on.
- The semesterisation issue was raised, especially as it operates in the second year of the program. A number of scenarios should be mapped out, beginning with a plan aimed at a full return to University calendar structure, to see which scenario most adequately fulfills the key recommendations provided in this Review.

Pedagogy and assessment

Many issues were covered by the participants relating to the matter of curriculum – materials pedagogies, and assessment practices. In this section we outline some of the more frequently raised matters and summarise the prevailing views. Occasionally some commentary is provided. It should be stressed, as above, that differences of opinion, along with some clear differences even in participants' descriptions of current practices, were often put before the Panel. The list provided in this sub-section should not be read as implying convergences of opinion unless otherwise indicated. Nor should this list be taken to suggest that these issues were all of equal significance to participants or to members of the Panel. Rather, the issues summarised here, and any commentary provided by the Panel, are meant to convey some general guidelines to the Faculty in its subsequent deliberations – more like issues to be keenly aware of, and potential difficulties that can arise from a simplistic belief in quick, simple solutions to complex problems that have taken some time to develop.

Modeling good pedagogical practice

Some participants, including a majority of students, indicated that they felt that Faculty members teaching on the BTeach often failed to 'practice what they preached' on the matter of pedagogy. Approaches to teaching, use of materials, and assessment strategies used in the BTeach were often contrasted with the kinds of teaching recommendations provided within the course on these same matters. Sometimes this contrast was expressed in terms of the advocacy of active, apprenticeship-oriented approaches versus the lecturing approach in the course; sometimes the advocacy of an emphasis on collaborative learning was not reflected anywhere in the course; and the need to

develop a strong relationship with learners and a sense of their personal needs and learning styles was contrasted with the ‘arm’s-length’ that some students reported from their lecturers. The Faculty clearly needs to review the more evident ways in which such contrasts appear in the BTeach, and consider ways in which more direct modeling of preferred school-practices might be reflected in the course itself.

Having said that, the university is not a school, and operating assumptions about how young adults might learn in university are not replicated in the target settings toward which pre-service education students are headed. A number of staff and some of the teachers to whom the Panel spoke stressed the role of university learning in breaking free from cycles of reproducing conventional practices, through exposure of students to course content and wider reading. In time of rapid change – cultural, economic, technological, and social – the BTeach has an important role to play allowing students to in build and explore a variety of scenarios that can project them as valuable and versatile practitioners who can prepare young people for life and work in future work, domestic, and civic spaces. Aiming to model pedagogical practices conventionally regarded as ‘good’ in schools and faculties of Education is not enough to pursue such agenda. Accompanying attention to apprenticing ‘good’ practice needs to be a critical backdrop of scholarship in the notion of ‘good practice’, and the treatment of it as an object of historical and sociological attention, to provide students with a setting for their own professional evolution as their careers develop in changing times. This is the ‘academic’ element of the program traditionally understood, and is thus finally the responsibility of the community of academics working with the program.

Need for greater consistency in assessment

Several students pointed to considerable variations in the forms of assessment in the BTeach and characterised it as a problem for their learning. Both staff and students acknowledged that, in light of the variability in backgrounds of entering students, some more explicit guidance should accompany assessment exercises. It is also the case nonetheless that elements of the program call for different kinds of knowledge, are drawn from differing disciplinary traditions with their varieties of preferred genres, and are focused on greater or lesser degrees on conceptual analysis, application of theory to practice, or practical, procedural issues. The Panel’s view is that the issue seems not so much consistency of assessment procedures or formats across the BTeach but rather the implicitness of expectations in each assessment process. This calls for academic staff to provide more explicit guidance and modeling of the kinds of work that will count as a display of mastery in the particular element of the course at hand.

Overall curriculum elements and principles

It is important for Faculty members, and University leaders to keep in mind that teacher education is a highly contested field of academic endeavour and training world-wide. The optimal balances between content and pedagogic knowledge, on-campus study versus in-school experience, discipline-based versus problem-based learning, exposure to the historical and sociological framing of the profession versus procedural training in the management of day-to-day curriculum, pedagogic and assessment challenges, and the emphases on the preparation for the social, regulative versus the intellectual, moral, and ideological challenges facing teachers – all of these continue to be objects of debate in professional, policy, and community arenas in most systems comparable to Tasmania's. This is to say that simple, definitive solutions are not available to the challenges posed by evaluating a teacher education program. However, a number of principles arise from international scans of the literature and from current approaches to the changing nature of schooling and contemporary approaches to learning. Some of the more relevant of these can be stated as guiding principles:

- aim for learning that is vertical, cumulative, integrated from unit to unit rather than having a course that comprises horizontal, fragmented, collections of units (Bernstein, Martin)
- aim for learning that is also preparation for future learning in new and potentially very different settings as well as for learning that assumes the direct application of previous learning (Bransford & Schwartz)
- provide regular, explicit, cross-unit attention to teaching that is attuned to diversity and inclusion, and equity of provision in the nature, tempo, and sequencing of materials and the selection of pedagogical strategies;
- provide well-theorised, in-time provision of units on behaviour management and assessment;
- embed digital information and communication technologies in curriculum and pedagogical units of study, rather than providing only stand-alone, how-to units in that area;
- with regard to the practicum, the following are offered for careful consideration:
 - The relation between theory and practice is actually the main topic at hand – the object of inquiry – in the provision of practicum in teacher preparation programs; it is a topic for discussion between staff, students and teacher colleagues, rather than a background presumption of a program.

- New models based on professional inquiry need to be piloted, monitored, and implemented in the BTeach.
- More practicum-based assignments, where appropriate, could be included in the BTeach, with a special focus on the student’s growing understanding of the relationship between theory, professional inquiry, and practice. The notion of students working on particular lines of inquiry while on their practicum experience has the appeal of focusing attention on specific conceptual matters in a setting in which many student teachers are faced with logistic and organisational challenges, especially in the earlier practicum blocks.
- The respective roles, rights, and responsibilities of academic staff and colleague teachers need to be spelled out both in formal documents articulating the ‘contract’ between the University and schools, and in documents for students.
- It is worth exploring the possibilities for reconfiguring the academic and colleague teacher roles such that there is more coherence and mutual understanding of the different roles. These ways may include having teachers as co-supervisors, academic staff conducting critical reflections at University to which teachers are invite, and so on. The aim here is not to force some kind of inappropriate consensus on either group, but rather to have differences and debates articulated in collegial environments for the benefit of students.

8. Recommendations

The panel noted the lack of a coherent sense of identity and focus within the Faculty generally, and within the BTeach program specifically. There was no clear sense in the interviews or documentation of how the Faculty members align their work itself with the University Strategic Plan and priorities or of how this alignment is articulated throughout its programs, staffing, or organisation. Nor was there any evidence of a clear, shared Faculty position with regard to the local community, and national or international educational settings.

Recommendations

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | That the Faculty undertake a review of its strategic plan to focus more clearly its local, national, and international profile. |
| 2 | That the Faculty undertake a comprehensive benchmarking exercise with a comparably positioned education faculty or school in Australia. |

The BTeach needs to have a more coherent and consistent philosophical rationale that links its various core and elective components. The content of Professional Studies should frame the overall BTeach Program, but the philosophy and content of the program appear to be determined by individual staff disciplinary expertise, rather than undertaken by a program team that draws together objectives, content, and pedagogy linked to outcomes. There is no clear articulation between the Professional Studies and curriculum courses. Linked to this is the need to identify the knowledge, expertise and dispositions a good teacher graduate should possess in alignment with employer expectations, University policies on graduate attributes, professional standards, and wider notions of professionalism. These should take into account those laid down by the Tasmanian institute of education and also Teaching Australia.

The lack of clear and transparent decision-making processes within the BTeach has led to reactive and *ad hoc* rather than proactive approach to planning. The planning capacity of the BTeach program is also hindered by the lack of systematically developed empirical data at the university level with regard to demand for, and graduate destinations associated with the BTeach. This is explained by the *ad hoc* approach to decision-making and planning generally within the Faculty. Communication around planning and quality assurance are particularly difficult in multi-campus universities and faculties. The lack of a coherent approach across the BTeach is evident, for example with regard to the tendency for over-assessment across the program.

Recommendations

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | That the Faculty refine organisational structures to chart its planning and decision making processes and to encourage fuller involvement of participant staff in each program. |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| 4 | That the Faculty expand the current review of Professional Studies into a review of the overall program objectives, including an audit of all curriculum with regard to content, pedagogy, and assessment. |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| 5 | That the Dean of the Faculty take direct management of and responsibility for implementing the recommendations of this review and put in place a monitoring process that ensures they are implemented within the next five years. |
|---|---|

While, at the time of the Review, this issue of coherence in the BTeach program was being addressed by the current coordinator, a major concern is the lack of middle-level leadership within the Faculty. Within the BTeach program there are high proportions of new teaching staff at levels A and B. A level A academic is responsible for the Program and also for the supervision of casual staff. While there is a need to have school-based expertise embedded within the program, the balance between senior/junior and permanent casual staff is inappropriately skewed.

Recommendation

| | |
|---|---|
| 6 | That one of the new Chairs be specifically dedicated to Teacher Education with responsibility for the BTeach program and that middle level leadership be addressed through systematic and targeted recruitment and promotion. |
|---|---|

The lack of connection between the Faculty and University planning is evident with regard to accountability. The Panel identified weak quality assurance processes within the Faculty and the BTeach program. This was most evident with regard to comparability of content and assessment practices across campuses within the BTeach program. For example, there was regular mention in interviews of, for instance, the need to change assessment tasks annually, the issue of plagiarism and so on. Such matters were identified in the Review of the Masters of Education Program in 2005 but have not been addressed at this time.

Recommendation

| | |
|---|--|
| 7 | That teaching teams be established in the Faculty, and that these and existing teams meet regularly (face to face and online) for each curriculum course to oversee the content, pedagogy, and assessment, taking into account outcomes of this Review and of other assessment audits. |
|---|--|

The overall lack of direction within the program, quality assurance and feedback can also be linked to the absence of the Course Advisory Committee established in 1997. This again indicates poor connections with the wider community of stakeholders, for example the state department and Catholic Education Office, and with industry. These stakeholders could significantly assist in identifying demand, inform the program with regard to the expectations of stakeholders and students, and provide feedback as to the program's effectiveness.

Recommendation

| | |
|---|---|
| 8 | That the Faculty immediately re-establish the Course Advisory Committee and ensure that it has a wide base of representation from students, community, education authorities, and industry. |
|---|---|

The Multi-literacies course, while seeking to integrate the use of ICTs seems to the Panel to have lost sight of its original purpose. As one of the submissions indicated from those teaching in the course, our understanding about and practices in the uses of ICTs have changed over time, and pre-service education courses need to evolve accordingly. There seems to be an assumption operating in this course that functional computer literacies (i.e., technical aspects) are a prerequisite for university courses, and that these can be delivered in short bridging courses. Contemporary trends are how to use multi-literacies and ICT pedagogically embedded in the practices of all curriculum areas, rather than as a separate strand. To do so requires the Faculty to model how this might be done, thinking creatively about the uses of online pedagogies that can support pre-service teachers in schools.

Recommendation

| | |
|---|--|
| 9 | That the Faculty review the role of the Multiliteracies unit, considering how strategies for the integration of ICT into all courses will be developed and the processes and professional learning required for them to be taken up in meaningful ways in all courses, and monitored carefully in its early phases of development. |
|---|--|

The lack of connection between the Faculty and its various stakeholders is most visible in the Professional Experience component. With regard to Professional Experience, there is some confusion regarding the expectations and respective roles of academic staff, colleague teachers, and BTeach students. While there is little doubt that the BTeach students are well received in schools due to their quality, enthusiasm, and the commitment of individual academic staff to their preparation, there is an obvious need to rebuild relations systematically with individual schools and education systems. Accompanying this should be clear guidelines for supervisors, colleague teachers, and student teachers as to how professional experience can be optimally organised. There is also a need to coordinate the practicum better across the various undergraduate programs to avoid confusion over placements and roles.

A related issue is the apparent tension between theory and practice articulated by students and colleague teachers, a tension often constructed as a binary rather than a synergy. This is not

compatible with research or current approaches to good practice that suggest that the relationship between the university and schools be a partnership premised upon learning communities, systematic inquiry, and problem solving across the curriculum. Teacher education programs need to work in partnership with schools to help create professional learning communities for both in-service and pre-service teachers. While the synergy between theory and practice is well articulated in some units, it does not seem to be an overall driving principle or a notion embedded in the assessment practices across the program, allowing it to become problem-focused and integrated across the curriculum. There are a number of exemplary teacher education programs undertaking this work that could be examined and adapted.

Recommendation

| | |
|----|---|
| 10 | That the Faculty consider how the BTeach program may adopt different approaches to developing its relationship with schools and education systems by drawing on contemporary theory and practice around teachers as researchers, teacher leadership, and team-based and problem-solving approaches to Professional Experience in schools. |
|----|---|

There are significant shifts occurring in schools to meet the demands of more culturally diverse student populations with multiple needs as they are educated to participate in knowledge-based economies. Schools now employ welfare staff, nurses, and youth workers, and collaborate with a range of agencies. Some Tasmanian schools, as indicated in the interviews, are already addressing the needs of ‘at risk students’ through case management between school, police, health and welfare professionals. Youth, community, welfare, and health workers require some educational background in their training, although not necessarily formal teacher registration. Schools are also becoming more community-oriented with the emergence of industry-school partnerships and a post-compulsory sector that provides pathways into TAFEs and universities.

Recommendation

| | |
|----|---|
| 11 | That the Faculty consider how the structures, program, and content of the BTeach might better meet emerging labour-market needs in the post-compulsory education and training and non school sectors, with the possibility of a Graduate Diploma in Education (without the practicum) which covers core curriculum areas and current educational studies. |
|----|---|

The BTeach claims to prepare students for teaching in other systems – as ‘global’ educators. Yet there is little evidence in the program, as articulated by staff, as to how the notion of ‘global’ is undertaken in terms of content or pedagogy. Internationalisation may take the form of making the curriculum inclusive for international students or of developing a global imaginary with which student teachers can consider not only whom and how they teach, but also where.

Students made reference to how the BTeach was closely linked to the Essential Learning program during 2005-6. When state curriculum policy was revised at short notice, it left students feeling ill-prepared or out of step for the next wave of curriculum reforms. While it is to be expected that the Faculty embed current Tasmanian policies in its program, it also suggests the need for a more generalist approach to curriculum and assessment within Professional Studies that provides the conceptual and theoretical frameworks linked to curriculum specialisations. Such a unit would encourage students to understand the broad principles of curriculum and assessment that would be of value in any sector or teaching position, as well as better prepare them to teach in education systems nationally and internationally.

An additional imperative for this broadening of perspective is the shrinking local labour market and the rapidly expanding international labour market for teachers. Teacher education programs need to be internationalised in the sense of providing both cultural inclusivity for international students within the program and in the sense of expanding the cultural awareness of Australian students who may seek to work in international contexts.

Recommendations

| | |
|----|--|
| 12 | That the Faculty consider international exchange programs and international student placements for practicum, examining comparable programs elsewhere, and mapping a variety of possibilities for their viability, efficacy and catchment. |
| 13 | That the Faculty review BTeach graduate outcomes and attributes, and identify how the program can facilitate graduates moving into a range of non-school and school destinations as well as into national and international markets. This involves gathering further data about community needs and agencies, and recruiting staff in the non-school sector for middle level leadership positions to sustain and expand this area. |

Linked to the issue of variability in content, assessment, and outcomes, as well as student expectations, is the issue of selection into the program. Many academics strongly asserted the need to ‘raise the bar’ in terms of entry beyond a pass. Most identified as a major issue the range of knowledge, expertise, and skill that students in a post-graduate course bring. In particular, it was felt that a minimum level of technical computer literacy be formally required so that the program can focus on the pedagogical applications of ICTs that could in turn be integrated across the curriculum. It was noted that such a process is underway. In light of the range of prior learning and qualifications of students in the BTeach, there is a need to determine systematically their skill levels prior to commencement so that programs can better meet the individual needs of student.

Recommendations

| | |
|----|---|
| 14 | That the requirements into the BTeach be raised by the Faculty to a Credit and a technical computer literacy of operational skills to a minimal standard be required which could be met by a bridging unit. |
|----|---|

| | |
|----|--|
| 15 | Finally, the Panel strongly recommends that the Faculty executive and the Advisory Committee reread the 2001 Review and reconsider its recommendations in light of those laid out here. An implementation program should be determined, and a process whereby monitoring progress toward the goals of each recommendation established. |
|----|--|

9. Summary of Recommendations

| | |
|----|--|
| 1 | That the Faculty undertake a review of its strategic plan to focus more clearly its local, national, and international profile. |
| 2 | That the Faculty undertake a comprehensive benchmarking exercise with a comparably positioned education faculty or school in Australia. |
| 3 | That the Faculty refine organisational structures to chart its planning and decision making processes and to encourage fuller involvement of participant staff in each program. |
| 4 | That the Faculty expand the current review of Professional Studies into a review of the overall program objectives, including an audit of all curriculum with regard to content, pedagogy, and assessment. |
| 5 | That the Dean of the Faculty take direct management of and responsibility for implementing the recommendations of this review and put in place a monitoring process that ensures they are implemented within the next five years. |
| 6 | That one of the new Chairs be specifically dedicated to Teacher Education with responsibility for the BTeach program and that middle level leadership be addressed through systematic and targeted recruitment and promotion. |
| 7 | That teaching teams be established in the Faculty, and that these and existing teams meet regularly (face to face and online) for each curriculum course to oversee the content, pedagogy, and assessment, taking into account outcomes of this Review and of other assessment audits. |
| 8 | That the Faculty immediately re-establish the Course Advisory Committee and ensure that it has a wide base of representation from students, community, education authorities, and industry. |
| 9 | That the Faculty review the role of the Multiliteracies unit, considering how strategies for the integration of ICT into all courses will be developed and the processes and professional learning required for them to be taken up in meaningful ways in all courses, and monitored carefully in its early phases of development. |
| 10 | That the Faculty consider how the BTeach program may adopt different |

| | |
|----|--|
| | approaches to developing its relationship with schools and education systems by drawing on contemporary theory and practice around teachers as researchers, teacher leadership, and team-based and problem-solving approaches to Professional Experience in schools. |
| 11 | That the Faculty consider how the structures, program, and content of the BTeach might better meet emerging labour-market needs in the post-compulsory education and training and non school sectors, with the possibility of a Graduate Diploma in Education (without the practicum) which covers core curriculum areas and current educational studies. |
| 12 | That the Faculty consider international exchange programs and international student placements for practicum, examining comparable programs elsewhere, and mapping a variety of possibilities for their viability, efficacy and catchment. |
| 13 | That the Faculty review BTeach graduate outcomes and attributes, and identify how the program can facilitate graduates moving into a range of non-school and school destinations as well as into national and international markets. This involves gathering further data about community needs and agencies, and recruiting staff in the non-school sector for middle level leadership positions to sustain and expand this area. |
| 14 | That the requirements into the BTeach be raised by the Faculty to a Credit and a technical computer literacy of operational skills to a minimal standard be required which could be met by a bridging unit. |
| 15 | Finally, the Panel strongly recommends that the Faculty executive and the Advisory Committee reread the 2001 Review and reconsider its recommendations in light of those laid out here. An implementation program should be determined, and a process whereby monitoring progress toward the goals of each recommendation established. |