

TEMAG Evaluation: school- university partnerships

Report prepared by PTR Consulting Pty Ltd
July 2018



Acknowledgements

This report was developed by PTR Consulting Pty Ltd on behalf of the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL).

Citation

PTR Consulting Pty Ltd 2018, TEMAG Evaluation: school-university partnerships, prepared for the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, AITSL, Melbourne.

The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) was formed to provide national leadership for the Commonwealth, state and territory governments in promoting excellence in the profession of teaching and school leadership with funding provided by the Australian Government.

ISBN: 978-1-925192-53-7

© 2018 Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL).

AITSL owns the copyright in this publication. This publication or any part of it may be used freely only for nonprofit education purposes provided the source is clearly acknowledged. The publication may not be sold or used for any other commercial purpose.

Other than permitted above or by the Copyright ACT 1968 (Commonwealth), no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, published, performed, communicated or adapted, regardless of the form or means (electronic or otherwise), without prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Address inquiries regarding copyright to: AITSL, PO Box 299, Collins Street West, VIC 8007, Australia.

This project was funded by the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) with funding provided by the Australian Government.

Contents

Executive summary	4
Introduction	9
Pivotal role of partnerships	10
Purpose of evaluation	11
Methodology	11
Specific partnership dimensions	11
Gains: Steady progress	12
1. Stakeholders broadly positive about progress	12
2. Notion of partnership now well embedded in ITE reform	14
Critical Implementation themes	16
1. Manage scale: An overriding tension	17
2. Improve provider and school level engagement with the TPAs	19
3. Build data collections for formative and impact assessments.....	21
4. Communicating schools' enhanced role in ITE	21
5. Support improvement in supervising teachers' capability	22
6. Enhance partnerships with interstate/online providers.....	24
7. Better use of existing funds to support partnerships	24
Concluding thoughts	25
Appendix 1: Consultation list	28
Appendix 2: TEMAG reforms and school-university partnerships.....	30
Appendix 3: Stakeholder interview questions.....	31

Executive summary

This evaluation for AITSL is focused on partnerships between schools and providers of initial teacher education (ITE).¹ It is the second in-depth qualitative review of the progress of Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) reforms as outlined in its report *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers* (2014). The evaluation was an input into the 2018 AITSL TEMAG forum and into AITSL's TEMAG evaluation framework.²

While the benefits of strong school-university partnerships underpinning high quality teacher education have been evident for over a decade through a range of innovative initiatives by ITE providers and education jurisdictions, TEMAG reforms have lifted partnerships to a pivotal role in all ITE. They are now integral not only to the professional experience element of courses but also in course design, assessment of readiness to teach, and evaluation of impact.

The evaluation found that the reform aspirations and objectives for partnerships are widely welcomed and the requirements in *The Accreditation of Initial teacher education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures* (2015) are comprehensive and feasible to implement.

Where the challenge lies is in the implementation and change management strategies for embedding partnerships in ITE.

The foundations are in place. Progress is being made with partnership agreements and opening communication channels between providers, teacher regulatory authorities (Authorities), education departments and other employers. The active involvement of employers opens up communication with schools on their roles in ITE – explaining the importance of ITE placements, how supervising teachers can be supported, and how the benefits can be wide ranging. But further steps are now required.

Stakeholders see the opportunity for a collective call to action. The consensus view is that implementation strategies, while on the right track, are in some respects underdeveloped, variable and warrant close attention to build on the current momentum.

The next step should be to clarify roles and responsibilities among providers, Authorities, education departments and other employers, and schools in advancing and implementing the priority tasks through partnerships.

Broadened partnership dimensions

This evaluation explored achievements and challenges across six partnership dimensions:

- Establishing a partnership agreement and agreeing on a shared vision and procedures – an agreement at a system level and/or at a local level.
- Determining the professional experience model – for example, structure and timing, access to classrooms, mentoring/supervision, staffing and costs.
- Identifying and supporting pre service teacher supervising teachers.
- Ensuring regular communication and sustainable relationships in the partnerships agreeing and implementing a teaching performance assessment (TPA) model.
- Gathering other performance and impact data so as to better assess short and longer term improvement in ITE outcomes.

¹ The term school-university partnership is used throughout and this includes all providers of initial teacher education.

² The methodology for this national evaluation by PTR Consulting for AITSL is based on desktop analysis and structured interviews with stakeholders in 20 organisations (Regulatory Authorities, ITE providers and Departments of Education/other employers and experts) and with AITSL committees, in March to May 2018. Schools were not directly engaged in this process and their perspectives were included via universities and their jurisdictions.

Gains: What stakeholders said

Stakeholders were asked to rate their organisation's or jurisdiction's progress in implementing the six partnership themes.

Collective progress

Collectively, stakeholders believe they are making good to modest progress in the more mature processes:

- Establishing partnership agreements.
- Determining the professional experience model.
- Ensuring communication and building sustainable relationships.

Some progress has been made with identifying and supporting supervising teachers of ITE students.

Understandably, far less progress has been made in the new and challenging areas of school provider partnerships:

- Agreeing and implementing the TPA model.
- Gathering performance and impact data of graduate teachers.

These reforms are in the earlier stages of design. Their ratings are noticeably lower.

Sliding scale of awareness

The three stakeholder groups differ in their perceptions of progress. This is highly relevant to the implementation challenge and signals an opportunity at this point in time to close any awareness and engagement gaps:

- Providers are deeply engaged in the reform processes and ensuring school-university partnerships work well is central to their core activities.
- Authorities manage the accreditation process and have strong relationships with networks of deans and others.
- Departments on the other hand see progress in a different light with ratings in the modest to minimal range in all themes.

Departments also said that it is now time to open up discussion and establish stronger implementation plans.

Critical implementation themes

Stakeholders identified seven key implementation themes. They differ in scope and stages of development:

- The management of the scale of ITE together with the expectations of best practice is an overriding theme.
- Two new implementation themes stand out, the TPAs and data collection for understanding impact.
- Four more mature systemic themes have been signalled by stakeholders: schools' role in ITE; mentors; agreements with online and interstate providers; and funding.

These themes do not raise major policy questions but rather signal critical implementation or change management issues. They raise questions of how or when to meet a requirement and who is central to effective delivery. They are a mix of logistical issues (e.g. how to establish a process) and how to ensure quality (e.g. what to prioritise or reshape).

1. Managing scale – An overriding challenge

Questions of scale are central to many of the challenges. An overriding tension in partnerships is the need for providers to place significant numbers of ITE students, versus the goal to have more substantive partnership agreements that demand more engagement.

Responses to consider:

- Clarify ITE student placement purposes and establish a broad consensus on the purpose and type of placement at various year levels.
- Consider school readiness and develop criteria for school to self-assess capability to host ITE students.
- Facilitate wider access to placement data to support department planning.

2. Improve provider and school engagement with the TPAs

TEMAG reforms aim for teacher graduates from all providers being equally ready to enter classrooms to make a positive difference to student learning. The introduction of a final TPA, which is the responsibility of the provider to conduct prior to graduation, is a key component in ensuring the quality of all graduates.

Schools and departments are seeking to better understand the respective roles and responsibilities of schools and providers in the TPA. A related question is about the interface between the TPA and the assessment of professional experience in the final school placement.

Responses to consider:

- Clarify the role for schools in the TPAs, including how they moderate among different TPAs that might be operational in one school.
- Alignment of the conduct and status of the TPAs with the final professional experience placement assessment.

3. Building data collections and impact assessments

Demonstrating outcomes for student performance, graduate outcomes and program impact requires comprehensive assessments, access to relevant data sources, aggregating data and arranging longitudinal data collection with departments and schools. Consensus is that clarity and agreements around this challenge are not yet fully evident.

Responses to consider:

- As a start in jurisdictions; share methodologies for surveying ITE students/graduates, supervising teachers and principals with newly appointed and first year teachers.
- Share research on best practice for collecting performance data.
- Share research on best practice for collecting impact data.

4. Communicating schools' enhanced role in ITE

Improvement in communications to schools is now needed to signal the significantly changed expectations of their role in ITE as in mentoring, forms of placements, catering for greater numbers, liaising with providers and assisting in assessment.

Responses to consider:

- Explain benefits and address any issues or misconceptions that schools may have in relation to hosting ITE placements by articulating the benefits of ITE placements and demonstrating how ITE placements can be a positive resource or asset for priority projects.
- Communicate with partners and engage with all their schools on the purpose, design and expected outcomes of their ITE courses, and welcome their feedback.

5. Support improvement in supervising teachers capability

A constant theme is how to develop, support and encourage high quality supervising teachers in their key role with ITE students. There are excellent support materials and professional learning courses but consensus is much more could be done.

Responses to consider:

- Develop systemic strategies for enhancing mentoring (e.g. what is working now; can this involve a wider systemic response) and developing recognition for advanced mentoring capability (e.g. micro credentials, leading practitioner status in hubs or centres of excellence).
- Consider how mentoring ITE students could be integrated into schools' wider mentor programs.

6. Enhance partnerships with interstate/online providers

The growth of online provision by interstate providers is expanding and some see an urgent need to clarify how interstate providers meet the requirements for partnership agreements and high quality school-university partnerships in professional experience.

Responses to consider:

- Build trust and transparency through liaison with interstate providers to expand communication to schools regarding ITE student placements from interstate providers.
- Expand the use of written partnership agreements with interstate providers that establish the conditions of the partnership.

7. Clarifying costs to achieve TEMAG objectives

Stakeholders vary in their views of costs and the allocation of funds. An important first step is understanding the contexts, the various ways funds are allocated, and the need.

Looking ahead, with a more active role for all stakeholders and changed models of ITE, some suggest that existing funds could be redirected both to the provider and at the school level.

Responses to consider

- Identification of current actual costs for identifying partners; supervising ITE student placements; provider staff supporting schools; and support programs for supervising teachers.
- Review the allocation of current funds to support school-university partnerships for ITE student placements against current needs.

Concluding thoughts

The objectives and approaches to school-university partnerships are familiar to most partnerships; but putting the systems and practices in place for implementing reform at a national scale is ambitious.

A strong challenge emerging from the evaluation is the need to clarify roles and responsibilities at the systemic as well as the local 'front-line' level – and to do this in a complex governance environment.

The 'sliding scale' of stakeholder awareness and engagement in resolving the challenges opens up the opportunity for a greater role to be played by jurisdictions as the employers of the teaching workforce. The earlier stages have been led by the Authorities establishing the accreditation process and by the providers in meeting the Standards and Procedures. Subsequent implementation now requires more collective action with wider engagement by systems, other employers and, crucially, by more schools.

The TEMAG Forum held on 26 June 2018 in Canberra brought together leaders across the ITE sector to celebrate successes to date, explore the common critical implementation issues and agree practical solutions to shape the collective effort to develop stronger partnerships.

Introduction

This evaluation is focused on school-university partnerships in initial teacher education (ITE). It is the second in-depth qualitative review of the progress of Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) reforms as outlined in their report *Action Now: Classroom Ready Teachers* (2014). The evaluation was an input into the 2018 TEMAG Forum and into AITSL's TEMAG reporting framework.

TEMAG provided comprehensive advice on how beginning teachers can be prepared with the right mix of theoretical knowledge and practical skills to be successful teachers in our schools. Effective school-university partnerships are pivotal to successful reform.

The reform agenda has six key reform themes (Box 1.)³

Box 1: Summary of TEMAG reform themes

Selection

- Clearer requirements for selection
- Implementing new selection requirements
- Developing new materials for potential entrants
- Providers reporting against selection criteria, progress and outcomes

Quality assurance

- Clear information about how to be accredited is available to providers
- National training for panel members, panel chairs and executive officers

Robust assessment

- Requirements for good practice in assessment are clearly articulated
- Providers collaborate to develop a suite of teaching performance assessment tools

Professional experience

- Enhanced requirements for professional experience set and articulated
- Providers have written partnerships with schools
- Providers develop tools and materials to enable supervising teachers to provide feedback against the standards
- Supervising teachers have the skills and knowledge to provide feedback against the standards

Induction

- Clear induction and best practice guidelines are available
- Systems, sectors and Authorities develop policy, programs and resources that reference and clearly align with the Guidelines

National research and workforce planning

- Agreement to develop the capability to drive strong evidence-based practice in ITE and to effectively manage its teaching workforce
- National focus on research into teacher education through articulation of research priorities
- Identification of useful data, modelling and information forms
- Agreement to share and link data across jurisdictions and data sources

³ This evaluation report does not restate the arguments for reform nor provide full detail of the reform requirements. See *Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures 2015* and other explanatory notes <https://www.aitsl.edu.au/deliver-ite-programs>

The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) has a key role in implementing the Australian Government's response to TEMAG. The *Accreditation of Initial teacher education Programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures 2015* (Standards and Procedures) are central to implementing the reforms, and processes for more effective quality assurance of ITE programs have been established nationally.

Pivotal role of partnerships

A strong theme throughout TEMAG and the Standards and Procedures is the importance of partnerships.

*National accreditation is built around partnerships involving shared responsibilities and obligations among initial teacher education providers, education settings, teachers, employers, and Authorities and a shared commitment to improve initial teacher education and work in partnership to positively affect student learning and graduate outcomes.*⁴

A significant dimension is enhancing the partnerships between schools and ITE providers and other higher education providers. The importance of partnerships for the quality of the professional experience strand of ITE has been well established over the past decade though initiatives in most jurisdictions and reflected in the considerable volume of literature.

Professional experience is recognised as a critically important part of ITE and well-structured, integrated and mutually beneficial partnerships are an essential mechanism in ensuring quality.⁵ TEMAG concluded that all schools and providers engaged in ITE should now build on this evidence and develop collaborative partnerships for the development of all new teachers. An issue that is immediately apparent is that this is a demanding commitment given the scale of ITE (see Box 2).

Box 2: ITE national data snapshot

In 2016, 29,961 students commenced an Australian ITE course. Of these:

- 7,461 students commenced via online study
- 20,591 via an undergraduate pathway
- 9,370 via a post-graduate pathway
- 660 students with Indigenous status commenced

63% of commencing students in the 2011 cohort completed their course (over a six year reporting period).

The TEMAG reforms and the Standards and Procedures take a wide perspective on school-university partnerships. Accreditation requirements place a priority on partnership facilitating the development and delivery of the professional experience component of an ITE program and require an overarching formal partnership agreement between provider and school (Standard 5.1). Partnerships also contribute to course design, assessment of readiness to teach, and evaluation of impact of the ITE course over time (see Appendix 2 for the map of partnership requirements across the TEMAG reforms).

⁴ Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (2015), *Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia, Standards and Procedures*, AITSL, Melbourne.

⁵ Le Cornu, R (2015), *Key components of effective professional experience in Initial teacher education in Australia*, Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, Melbourne.

The ambitious reforms apply to all ITE programs and all ITE students. Partnerships are not an end in themselves but a critical vehicle to enable high quality professional learning and assessment of teacher readiness.

Purpose of evaluation

The evaluation focuses on achievements and challenges of school-university partnerships in the implementation of the TEMAG reforms including:

- The need for a shared understanding of the TPA requirements, and the interplay between this requirement and the current assessment processes related to professional experience.
- The role for schools and education systems in the reform agenda, particularly at the interface of the shared responsibility related to professional experience, and the wider benefits to schools, such as professional learning opportunities for practising teachers.
- Any shift in program design and models related to school-university partnerships as a result of the reforms or what might be future considerations.
- Solutions for funding model constraints.
- Identification of emerging themes.

This report considers the key themes that emerged from a qualitative stocktake of stakeholder views of the progress being made with school-university partnerships. It is an analysis of progress and issues at this point in time rather than a definitive account of the status of the reforms as a whole.

The evaluation was conducted by Dr Dahle Suggett and Mr Graeme Jane, PTR Consulting.

Methodology

The evaluation of the reform agenda centred on desktop analysis⁶ and structured stakeholder interviews. Consultations were held in every state and territory between March and May 2018. Senior leaders of twenty organisations were consulted (mix of face to face and phone interviews). Key stakeholder groups interviewed included those engaged in the early stages of implementation—Authorities, a sample of ITE providers nominated by Australian Council of Deans of Education and education departments (Departments), other employer representatives, teacher unions and experts and AITSL committees (see Appendix 1). Schools were not directly part of the consultation process; the school experience and perspective were included via their jurisdictions and ITE providers.

While the focus of the evaluation involves partnerships between schools and ITE providers, we did not consult directly with schools but focused on inputs of case studies and data from Departments and providers.

The framework for consultation is informed by the recent literature concerning the role and value of partnerships, TEMAG documentation and AITSL policy.

Specific partnership dimensions

The interviews gathered qualitative data to better understand key stakeholder groups' experience of and response to the school-university partnership components of the TEMAG reform agenda.

The questions explored achievements and challenges across the following six partnership dimensions:

- Establishing a partnership agreement and agreeing on a shared vision and procedures – an agreement at a system level or at a local level.

⁶ For example, Darling-Hammond, (2006) Constructing 21st century Teacher Education, *Journal of Teacher Education* 57 (3): 300-314; Ingvarson, L., Reid, K., Buckley, S., Kleinhenz, E., Masters, G., and Rowley, G. (2014) *Best Practice Teacher Education Programs and Australia's Own Programs*, Department of Education, Canberra.

- Determining the professional experience model – for example, structure and timing, access to classrooms, mentoring/supervision, staffing and costs.
- Identifying and supporting supervising teachers of pre-service teachers.
- Ensuring regular communication and sustainable relationships in the partnerships agreeing and implementing a TPA model.
- Gathering other performance and impact data so as to better assess short and longer term improvement in ITE outcomes.

The questions also explored:

- Context for establishing school-university partnerships including the interface with state jurisdictions' policies and aspirations for future partnerships.
- Priorities for the immediate future.
- Innovations that could be taken to scale.

The report discusses the gains to date and the critical themes that have emerged in implementation of the reforms.

Appendices comprise:

- The consultation list.
- Partnership requirement for accreditation.
- Interview questions for Authorities, providers and education departments.

Gains: Steady progress

There is overall steady progress in the development of school-university partnerships in the implementation of the TEMAG reforms but there is a sliding scale of stakeholder engagement. The perspectives of the three main stakeholder groups – ITE providers, Authorities, and Departments/employers – vary and there are differences across jurisdictions. Understandably, given the intense work of providers and Authorities on accreditation transition plans and other aspects of the reforms, providers are most positive about progress, followed by Authorities and then Departments.

1. Stakeholders broadly positive about progress

The substance of school-university partnerships is captured in the six dimensions. In structured interviews, stakeholders were asked to rate from 0 to 3 (from no progress to well advanced) their perception of their organisation's or jurisdiction's progress in implementing the six partnership aspects. A rating of 2 and above is considered as satisfactory progress.

The six dimensions of partnerships refer to tangible processes that are included in accreditation requirements. They are central to TEMAG reforms and are embedded in the Standards and Procedures. It is assumed that implementation of TEMAG would mean these requirements are fully implemented.

The table below shows the average ratings by stakeholder group. While the ratings are only broad brush they indicate perceptions of relative progress.

Table 1 Comparison of progress on partnerships by stakeholders

School-University Partnership Themes	Departments	Authorities	Providers
Establishing partnership agreements – agreeing a shared vision and procedures	1.8	2.1	2.2
Determining the professional experience model	1.9	1.9	2.3
Identifying and supporting pre-service teacher supervising/mentor teachers	1.7	1.9	1.7
Ensuring communication and building sustainable relationships	1.8	2.1	2.3
Agreeing and implementing a teaching performance assessment model	1.2	1.9	1.6
Gathering other performance and impact data	1.1	1.4	1.3

0 = Not at all; 1 = Minimal progress; 2 = Good progress; 3 = Well advanced

There are two relevant perspectives: what is the collective rate of progress and what are the similarities and differences among stakeholder groups.

Collective progress

Collectively, stakeholders are most positive about making good to modest progress in the more mature processes that have been developed over the past decade:

- Establishing partnership agreements.
- Determining the professional experience model.
- Ensuring communication and building sustainable relationships.

Progress in these areas also reflects positively on the strength of guidelines, support materials and workshops and forums that AITSL, jurisdictions, some providers and others have been providing.

All stakeholders say some progress has been made with identifying and supporting ITE student supervisors. Again, support materials and professional learning opportunities have supported schools in progressing development of the mentor role and supervising teachers' capability.

Understandably, far less progress has been made in the new and more challenging areas of school-university partnerships. Stakeholder ratings of progress are noticeably lower for:

- Agreeing and implementing the TPA models, including the interface with the existing assessment requirements for professional experience.
- Gathering performance and impact data of courses and graduate teachers.

These reforms are of a different magnitude and are at the early stages of design. The common expectation is they will include new tools and techniques for data collection and data analytics. They also call for collaboration that has a wider scope than a one-on-one partnership and will need to be underpinned by system wide or cluster mechanisms.

Stakeholder variation: sliding scale of awareness

The three stakeholder groups differ in their perceptions of progress in a number of the themes. This is to be expected in a complex reform strategy but the differences do signal an opportunity at this point in time to close any awareness and engagement gaps so as to continue to advance the reforms at a consistent rate.

- Providers are deeply engaged in the reform processes and partnerships with schools are central to their core activities. They are more confident they are making progress, particularly with partnership agreements, the professional experience model and communications and relationships.
- Authorities manage the accreditation process and have strong relationships with networks of Deans of Education and others and see strong progress particularly in the development of partnership agreements and communication channels among the partners.

- Departments on the other hand see progress in a different light with ratings of progress in the modest to minimal range in all themes. For example, Department representatives had received little information on the development of TPAs to date.

While this variation reflects understandable systemic differences in roles and responsibilities, it does point to opportunities for improved alignment of objectives and strategies. Departments are employers of graduate teachers and the gateway to forming partnerships with school systems. Without their full engagement, achieving the ambitious TEMAG reforms could be problematic. The differences signal the opportunity for all stakeholders to come together to accelerate implementation and engagement with the reform issues.

2. Notion of partnership now well embedded in ITE reform

There is strong acceptance of the core idea of cross sector or system partnerships. Formal partnership agreement statements are being developed and approaches to enhancing professional practice are centred on improving the quality of partnerships.

TEMAG has cemented partnerships in the reform process

The core idea of a systemic partnership among stakeholders is well accepted and jurisdictions are working to enhance TEMAG reforms according to their own context. Some jurisdictions had policy frameworks for ITE before TEMAG (e.g. New South Wales and Queensland) and most others have subsequently developed or are developing jurisdictional policies. Most jurisdictions have established more formalised communication channels and have executive level committees or the like.

Commentary, however, highlights the value but also the complexity in establishing strong avenues for communication and negotiation.

***‘Turning engagement into a shared process is a real challenge – we still have a way to go.’** Department executive*

***‘This is a contested space. In one sense we have sound agreements with our schools; but state-wide our experience is very patchy.’** Dean*

***‘We are doing well; we have a state wide task force in place and it is where we share data and communicate well.’** Dean*

Formal partnership agreements being consolidated

Some jurisdictions have umbrella agreements with ITE providers for accessing government schools for professional placements; others leave it to providers and schools to reach site by site agreements. Parties to state-wide umbrella agreements are generally satisfied with this as an initial process but consensus is that any overall agreement needs to enable more site specific agreements to also be generated. This is particularly the perspective of providers.

Striking agreements is complex. Some interviewees indicated that there is reluctance by providers to commit to more detailed support for individual schools unless these schools commit to a longer term agreement. On the other hand, schools that do not have a long term strategic view about how ITE students can be a valuable resource are reluctant to commit to longer term agreements.

***‘TEMAG has reignited conversations about the potential of partnerships and that quality relationships count. It is now the time for us to move from formal partnerships to sustained relationships.’** Dean*

Consensus is that formal partnership agreements are an important process but are a work in progress.

For example

- Western Australia: The Department of Education has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with all providers for government schools. This MOU enables details of particular arrangements to be included for each school (number of placements; types of placements; provider services e.g. training for supervising/mentor teachers; provider support for school priority programs; resources/data to be shared between the school and the provider). Schools can partner with any provider and this increased competition has stimulated providers to improve the quality of their arrangements. A large school typically has agreements with three providers. The MOU has improved the quality of school-university partnerships but progress is slow.
- New South Wales: The Department of Education has Professional Practice Agreements with 17 ITE providers. These commenced in 2016 and will continue to 2019. The Department has a process for establishing school-university partnerships for placements and has improved the logistics and consistency of placements. Government schools nominate who they agree to partner with so a school may have multiple partners. There is a streamlined 'request week' where ITE providers nominate their need for access to professional experience placements.
- Tasmania: A key initiative of the Department of Education and the University of Tasmania in the last three years has been the Teacher Internship Placement Program (TIPP), which involves final year ITE students being selected for a full year internship at a school and upon graduation as classroom ready, being appointed to a permanent staff position at that school. The Department of Education, the University of Tasmania and participating schools have a detailed partnership agreement for the TIPP.

Broad consensus on best practice professional experience characteristics

The quality of professional experience is central to successful ITE and there is consensus around the broad 'best practice' characteristics of school-university partnerships for professional experience (Box 3). The Standards and Procedures, professional experience as set out in Standard 5, and the high quality support materials are consistent with this.

Box 3: Consensus on characteristics of partnerships for professional experience

School-university partnerships require:

- *Collegial and professional interaction*: ensuring relationship qualities such as a shared conceptual understanding, mutuality in roles, trust and respect.
- *Connecting theory and practice*: making connections in course theory to the realities of the school context and classroom environment; explicitly building the confidence, pedagogical skills, knowledge and attitudes for effective teaching.
- *Organising to offer authentic learning in meaningful learning environments*: offering a suite of tailored learning environments e.g. clinics, practical placements, internships, work integrated learning.
- *Ensuring organisational capability*: this requires a shared commitment to implement and resource best practice from the human resource and budgetary perspective, often requiring new roles to be established.

These features may not be present at scale in current arrangements and the actual arrangements may differ but they are aspirational. Many providers and Departments see this aspiration as an important first step in the further development and wider adoption of best practice professional experience as a priority over the next few years.

Most jurisdictions have models and pilots to call on, often established in past years under the *National Partnerships Agreement for Quality Teaching*⁷ or developed subsequently. These success stories should enable alumni from quality partnerships to champion change.

- New South Wales: *Professional Experience Hub Schools* – 23 hub schools have been established to demonstrate and develop high quality ITE practices in conjunction with a provider.
- Victoria: *Teaching Academies for Professional Practice* – this is a network model with groups of schools working in partnership with a provider. Clusters receive additional resources for planning and delivery (e.g. immersive placement models, mentoring, and joint research). There are now 12 academies, collectively 140 schools with approximately 3,500 ITE students.
- Queensland: *Teacher Education Centre of Excellence (TECE)* programs provide participants with high quality mentoring and professional development that complements the final year of their ITE program studies. There are 6 TECE and each has a specific focus aimed at identifying and developing high quality pre-service teachers for employment in high priority state schools. Interested pre-service teachers apply for selection into a TECE program.
- Australian Capital Territory has developed a professional experience framework that spells out the best practice characteristics through seven key elements including *collaborative*, through strong partnerships; *planned*, that links professional experience with course content; and *integrated*, through whole school engagement with the ITE provider.

Most ITE providers have also established networks or clusters of schools through which they provide for ITE with effective partnership models such as the University of Melbourne, University of Newcastle and Deakin University.

All agree partnerships need to be far more than the transactions of the past and instead need to work through relationships, collaboration and mutual support.

‘I know where we want to move to; I want our successful pilots to be the norm for all our schools. I want to be assured that all our students are really looked after in their schools; that the school’s teaching philosophy is shared; that the students have real opportunities to develop their teaching practices; that they can attend forums with teachers; and become confident and grow as professionals.’ Dean

Critical implementation themes

Stakeholders identified the achievements to date and the challenges they are facing in implementing the reforms for school-university partnerships. These have been grouped into seven key implementation themes (Box 4). These themes were consistently aired by stakeholders across jurisdictions, alongside possible solutions, with some more or less important for each stakeholder group. They are a mix of logistical issues – how to establish a process or structure, and issues that are more about quality – what to prioritise or re-shape.

An overriding theme is how to better manage the scale of ITE students to ensure the benefits of TEMAG reforms are universally available.

Two of the implementation themes are relatively new: the further development, dissemination and

⁷ National Partnerships Agreement for Quality Teaching: a 2012 agreement between Commonwealth and States and Territories. It was designed to sustain a quality workforce through improvements to teacher and school leader quality.

implementation of the final TPA; and building data collections for formative and impact assessment of the courses and of the graduate teachers. Both need to be implemented nationally and consistently and both require new tools and analytical processes.

Four themes are more mature and require local level as well as systemic solutions.

Importantly, the seven themes do not raise major policy questions that require further national decision-making. The key decisions are in place and the policy framework is strong. The challenges stakeholders have raised are essentially implementation and change management issues.

The themes are discussed below with the caveat that jurisdictions typically have their unique contexts that shape their strategies. We have attempted to highlight those ideas that would have the greatest traction nationally.

Box 4: Critical implementation themes

Meeting the challenges or inhibitors

Overriding theme

1. Manage scale: An overriding tension in workforce planning and in ensuring TEMAG reforms and best practices can be fully implemented

New challenges

2. Improve provider and school level engagement with the TPAs
3. Build data collections for formative and impact assessments

More mature systemic challenges

4. Expand communications to schools about changing expectations of their role in ITE
5. Support improvement in supervising teachers capability
6. Ensure partnerships with interstate providers
7. Clarify costs of partnerships in achieving TEMAG objectives

‘TEMAG has shone a light on the great complexity of ITE – we now have to deal with it.’ Department

Each challenge requires further analysis by the Department, Authority and provider in each jurisdiction for better delineation of roles and responsibilities for specific outcomes. Some call for national collaboration and sharing of strategies; most call for engagement and resolution of issues at the jurisdictional level and improved communication, especially with schools.

1. Manage scale: An overriding tension

The challenge

Questions of scale are central to many of the challenges. An overriding tension in school-university partnerships is the need for providers to place significant numbers of ITE students versus the goal to have more substantive partnership agreements that demand more engagement by the provider and the partner school.

While there are national workforce planning processes being developed, Departments express concern that they are not fully aware of the numbers in ITE in their jurisdictions who will be seeking placements for professional experience. Moreover, as the more relationship-driven partnerships mature, many jurisdictions fear the supply and demand imbalance will intensify.

‘There are many local issues and variations but it is now time for greater transparency.’ Authority

The numbers are significant. In 2018, school placements were required in metropolitan, regional and remote locations across Australia for over 85,390 pre-service teachers in 358 accredited ITE programs offered by 48 accredited providers in 85 different locations.⁸

Each jurisdiction has its own context. For example:

- South Australia: In 2017 there were approximately 3,300 ITE placements for students from 31 providers nationally with around 90 per cent of these placements from the four South Australian providers and one interstate provider (who has staff based in the state). There were approximately 940 vacancies in SA government schools in 2017. The Department is concerned that government schools are devoting valuable school based resources to ITE students, many of whom will not enter the teaching profession.
- New South Wales estimates that 30 per cent of graduates do not go onto teaching so again valuable resources for teaching placements in schools needs to take account of this. More filtering of students in the early years may reveal ways to manage this imbalance.
- A large jurisdiction might have up to 20,000 teachers engaged in supervision in a year which is demanding if the expectation is for more comprehensive mentoring.
- Other jurisdictions indicate they want to look closely at the capacity issues but do not feel that the providers are sufficiently forthcoming with their data.

On the other hand the balance can be right:

- Western Australia: There are approximately 5,000 ITE student placements per year. Although there are few teacher vacancies, there are skill shortage areas and teachers teaching out of area. The Department’s view is that the teacher demand supply balance is about right with 1,200-1,500 graduates being employed each year. The Western Australia department has rich data sources and provides these data to providers and liaises closely with providers to adjust ITE enrolments to better meet workforce demand.
- At the provider level the pressures of scale are also evident.
- A large provider requires approximately 6,000 placements per year.
- Providers with well-developed partnerships say their best practice model may only be available to 20 to 30 per cent of their students, mainly due to the barriers of scale.

While many schools welcome well integrated and large scale professional experience placements, some providers are seeing a growing reluctance of schools and their teachers to take ITE students for placements. The reluctance is mainly due to increased work demands, competing priorities, lack of recognition for supervising teachers and the lack of understanding that ITE students can be useful resources for school initiatives. Some stakeholders report that parents’ high expectations of schools can conflict with support for ITE students in classrooms.

Many providers therefore struggle to place all ITE students in schools.

‘Finding placements is the most stressful and difficult part of our job.’ Dean

Some providers fear that defining more responsibilities for supervising teachers (e.g. regarding the TPA) may lead to less teachers volunteering to take ITE students thereby making the task of placing all ITE students in schools even harder.

⁸ AITSL (2017) *ITE data Report 2018* <https://www.aitsl.edu.au/research/ite-data-report-2018>

‘Agreements can be fragile. They need very strong connections at the school level; one mishap and a relationship can be damaged.’ Dean

From jurisdictions’ perspectives there are queries by some about how to resolve making high quality work placements available when 20-40 per cent of those who prepare as teachers do not go on to teach.

Responses to consider

Clarify ITE student placement purposes: Establish a broad consensus on the purpose and type of work placements at various year levels so as to design a graduated ITE student experience, and through this, build better understanding and certainty of the expectations at the school level. Schools would then be better equipped to negotiate and develop a strategy for mutual benefit.

From the Departments’ perspectives, work with schools to reorient their view of work placement to where ITE students are seen as an asset to a school. For example, one jurisdiction is exploring a ‘sponsorship model’ for schools through a culture change strategy that encourages schools to routinely and positively support ITE students at a 1:3 ratio of ITE student to teachers.

Consider school readiness: Not all schools are ready nor have the capability for hosting ITE placements at a more advanced level. A suggestion is that criteria be articulated for schools to self-assess capability to host ITE placements.

For those schools with the expected attributes employers could encourage them to negotiate longer term agreements with providers for ITE student placements. Employers could also provide advice to schools on a reasonable scope for individual schools to host placements.

Access to placement data: Most jurisdictions expressed a need for enhanced dialogue with ITE providers on their enrolments and projections – that is, Departments would welcome access to enrolment data that enhances their capacity to plan for full engagement in supporting ITE providers and their students. It is important to avoid any additional burden on providers by asking for additional data but a resolution might be attainable through existing data collection mechanisms

2. Improve provider and school level engagement with the TPAs

The challenge

TEMAG reforms aim for teacher graduates from any provider being equally ready to enter classrooms to make a positive difference to student learning. The introduction of a final TPA, which is the responsibility of the provider to conduct prior to graduation, is a key component in ensuring the quality of all graduates.

As one Department said,

‘This is a high stakes reform and we can no longer rely on individual assessments; we need to be assured of capability.’

There will be multiple TPAs. While the content of the assessment is being developed through the consortia and by individual providers outside the consortia, a major question for the schools and Departments is what are the respective roles and responsibilities of schools and providers in the TPAs.

A related question is about the interface between the TPA and the existing assessment of professional experience in the final placement; how do the assessments differ; and are both required for graduation? One view is that while the TPAs at a national level will have addressed the questions of reliability, this is not the case for assessments of professional experience. However, both will have a critical role in assessment of classroom readiness.

What more will be expected of schools? For example, schools will most likely be expected to ensure final placements of a sufficient duration, access to classrooms under specific circumstances for assessment, additional involvement of teachers in the TPA process, and engagement in moderation to assure greater validity and consistency in assessment.

‘Partnerships are not an end in themselves; they are the means to enable high quality learning and ensure rigorous and consistent judgement of classroom readiness.’ Authority

There are differences in attitudes across jurisdictions to the TPAs depending upon whether providers are involved in the AITSL funded TPA development consortiums or not. In jurisdictions where none or a small proportion of providers are involved in TPA development consortia (e.g. New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria) few stakeholders understand how the TPAs will be implemented. Developments are occurring at the level of the individual provider.

In jurisdictions where providers are involved in TPA development consortia (e.g. Queensland) there are still unknowns about how the TPA will be implemented, although there is greater confidence in the process going forward. For example:

- Tasmania: The TPA was trialled in Teacher Intern Placement Program (TIPP) schools in 2017. Supervising teachers were given 0.1 EFT time release to prepare for the TPA. The trial showed that implementing the TPA was onerous and implementation procedures were subsequently refined. However, there is little understanding of the TPA in other ITE placement schools – and many ask the question who is responsible for ensuring their understanding?
- Queensland: Analytical work has commenced on the intersection between the TPA and the school-based assessment of the final professional experience so that schools have a coherent sense of their role and the provider’s role in the final assessment. An ‘evidence hub’ being developed by the department will support this. A key question is what happens when students pass one but not the other; to what extent does the school then play a role in subsequent steps?

The Australian Capital Territory has already clarified for schools and providers through the *Australian Capital Territory Ready to Teach Assessment* that graduates will have completed the final professional experience placement assessment and the TPA. They are still however seeking to iron out the details in terms of respective roles of the provider and schools.

Building confidence in and familiarity with the TPAs will require engagement with schools by providers but this will most likely need the support of education systems.

As one Dean said:

‘No one university can do this alone; some of these questions require collective effort and better alignment with schools.’

Responses to consider

Clarify role for schools: An important first step is to clarify the role and expectations of schools in the TPA process. This could be achieved through Authorities reviewing existing TPAs that have been proposed in accreditation transition plans to draw out the respective roles in the partnerships.

A related issue to understanding the role of schools in the TPAs is exploring the logistics of working with different TPAs in a school hosting ITE students from multiple providers.

A subsequent step would be for Authorities to brief providers who are not involved in the consortia developing TPAs on what has been learned to date on the roles and responsibilities and what is required of schools.

Alignment of TPAs with final professional experience placement assessment: Standard 5 of the Standards and Procedures covering professional experience expects providers to work with their

placement schools/systems to agree on a rigorous approach to the assessment of ITE students against the Graduate Teaching Standards. Assessment tools, guidelines, timing and roles for teachers are to be agreed. This is relatively familiar territory.

However clarity about this process in alignment with the TPA is not yet agreed in most jurisdictions. Stakeholders indicate that alignment of the two processes needs to be agreed collaboratively for the best outcomes and for schools to be clear of their role in the partnership.

3. Build data collections and impact assessments

The challenge

Demonstrating program outcomes for ITE student performance, graduate outcomes and program impact requires comprehensive assessments, access to relevant data sources, aggregating data and arranging longitudinal data collection with Departments and schools. Consensus is that clarity and agreements around this requirement are not yet evident.

There are some advances but the overall picture is patchy:

- Western Australia: The Department of Education has rich data sources (First Year Graduate Survey of all ITE graduates and the Principal Perceptions of First-year Graduate Teachers Survey, a sample survey about graduates after 9 months of employment). The Department is providing these data to providers which allow providers to review and amend their ITE course details. For example, 2016 survey data highlighted weaknesses and providers amended their courses accordingly.
- South Australia: The Department of Education has an online system to pay ITE student supervising teachers. Data from this system proves detailed information on ITE student placements by provider.
- Victoria: The Government's commitments in *Excellence in Teacher Education 2016* signalled an ITE feedback survey of new teachers and their principals for advice to providers. This is underway in 2018.

Other jurisdictions vary from considering adaptation of existing data systems to having no data source on ITE student placements/graduations. Some Departments indicate they have not been asked by providers to consider how this might be gathered; some providers have considered data needs but have not yet established the collection methodologies.

Responses to consider

Exchange of methodologies: There is a groundswell of interest in sharing research on best practice for collecting performance and impact data; and among jurisdictions for sharing methodologies for surveying ITE students/graduates, supervising teachers and principals with newly appointed and early career teachers.

4. Communicating schools' enhanced role in ITE

The challenge

As the reform elements are being progressed, the changed expectations of schools' roles in ITE education have become apparent. School involvement 'at the front line' is pivotal to the reforms; such as mentoring, accommodating different forms of placements, possibly supporting greater numbers of ITE students, liaising with providers, and assisting in assessment of professional experience and readiness to teach.

While most of these functions are known to schools already in networks or partnerships with providers, this is not universal, and indeed these functions might be known but schools are reluctant to be partners in a more demanding role. All stakeholders have strongly stated it is now time for full and transparent communication with all schools.

‘We need to align expectations. The greater formality of our processes has possibly made a flexible partnership arrangement more difficult; we need to strike the right balance.’ Authority

In some jurisdictions, Department officials have to encourage school principals to take ITE student placements in order for providers to place all ITE students. Implementation of a more consistent approach across all schools would spread the load and ameliorate the panic of some providers about placing all ITE students.

There are questions about how this is best achieved. Is it the responsibility of providers to liaise with their network of schools on respective roles; or are they anticipating that Departments and employers will communicate and advise on how ITE is changing and importantly, how schools will ultimately benefit from the changed approaches to professional experience?

Some jurisdictions already have frameworks or guidelines for professional experience that outline roles and responsibilities, including for schools. For example,

- New South Wales: *A Framework for High Quality Professional Experience in New South Wales Schools* which is a high level cross sector agreement.
- Australian Capital Territory: *High Quality Professional Experience in Australian Capital Territory Schools* outlines the seven essential elements and respective roles that need to be present in an effective professional experience program.
- Queensland: A set of frameworks and support materials e.g. *Queensland Professional Experience Reporting Framework* that outlines the requirements and roles needed for a streamlined and moderated approach to assessment.

Others (e.g. South Australia and Tasmania) are considering developing policies to define requirements and responsibilities for schools and supervising/mentor teachers.

A common view, however, is that school's full engagement with these materials is not yet assured. All agree that communication with schools and facilitation of their roles needs to move to the next level.

Responses to consider

Explain benefits: The TEMAG reforms require greater collaboration with schools. Stakeholders invariably agree it is now time for Departments and other systems/bodies to mount a detailed communication strategy with schools on the changed nature of ITE. It needs to explain their role; and address any negative attitudes or misconceptions schools might have to hosting ITE placements by articulating the benefits of and demonstrating how they can be a positive resource for priority projects.

Communication with partners: At the partnership level providers are increasingly communicating and engaging with their schools on the purpose, design and expected outcomes of their ITE courses. All stakeholders agree this now has to be extended to communication with all schools on the particular activities, consistent with the partnership agreement and mechanisms established for welcoming feedback.

5. Support improvement in supervising teachers' capability

The challenge

Related to the school communication challenge is the question of ensuring the consistent quality of supervising teachers. In jurisdictions that have survey data from ITE graduates, most ITE students rate their placement experience highly. In a New South Wales evaluation of their schools in Centres

for Excellence, ITE students indicated that supervising teachers have the greatest influence on the success of their professional experience and preparation for teaching.⁹

However, providers refer to the underperformance of some supervising teachers, and the shortfall in suitable role models for ITE students. Providers have observed that not all supervising teachers are prepared for the task and some do not fully understand the *Australian Professional Standards for Graduate Teachers*.

‘Mentoring has to be professionalised before it advances and serves the intended purposes.’ Dean

There are also specific context issues. For example, in Western Australia, there is a shortage of science and maths teachers resulting in teachers teaching out of area but these teachers are supervising science and maths ITE placements.

Stakeholders agree that supervising teachers require more support but the current model that relies on the Department or provider offering courses for individual supervising teachers may not be the best model. Most jurisdictions have extensive guidance material available and delivery mechanisms – webinars and graduate certificate and diplomas but see that take-up could be more extensive. For example, only 10 per cent of Tasmanian supervising teachers attended training provided by the University of Tasmania.

‘We need to think more broadly. An aspiration might be to develop expert teaching schools that have affiliated schools and have the capability and the resources to guide mentoring and moderation of assessments.’ Authority

Some jurisdictions are considering or have more explicit requirements such as New South Wales’ professional experience agreement that requires classroom teachers to have undertaken at least one of the AITSL professional learning modules: *Supervising Pre-Service Teachers* for supervising ITE students but the pressures for placements may weaken that requirement.

A number of Departments (e.g. Western Australia and Victoria) see the opportunity for pre-service mentoring to be better integrated with mentoring for beginning teachers and for further advancement. In the first instance ITE placement, supervising teachers could be linked to the school’s graduate mentoring program. Subsequently, mentoring could be scaled from beginning to experienced teachers to foster a professional learning community with strengthened mentor training embedded in the schools’ program.

All stakeholders agree that more training for supervising teachers is needed and they agree that considerable benefits will flow back to the school as well as to the ITE students.

Responses to consider

Systemic strategies for enhancing mentoring: There are many high quality resources available to support professional learning in mentoring and many mature mentoring initiatives. A common request is to identify or devise the best models for training and support of school mentors by understanding what is working now; and considering how this knowledge could be spread systemically.

Related to establishing a more coherent approach to training is the opportunity to formally recognise advanced mentoring capability (in this case for ITE support) in the teaching workforce. This might be via micro credentials; establishing a leading practitioner status for a leading role in hubs or centres of

⁹ New South Wales Department of Education, (2015) *Evaluation of the Impact of Selected Reforms Improving Teacher Quality*, National Partnership Abridged Report, Report to the Advisory Council of the Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation, June, Sydney.

excellence; in establishing 'boundary crossing' roles where expert mentors also have a role in ITE course instruction; and in career advancement more generally.

Integrated mentoring at the school level: Parallel strategies apply at the school level. There is a need to consolidate the examples of best practice and in particular how mentoring ITE students can be integrated in schools' wider mentor programs.

Schools would also welcome advice and guidelines for helping them to choose mentors by identifying the key characteristics of the best mentors; and advice on improving school-based recognition of the work of supervising teachers (e.g. time release, involvement in provider program and action research).

6. Enhance partnerships with interstate/online providers

The challenge

The role of online courses in ITE and the growth strategies by many providers has resulted in a considerable increase in the number of interstate providers in a jurisdiction. To date, few if any jurisdictions have a system to collect data on ITE placements by an interstate provider and be in a position to communicate priorities and monitor the quality of partnerships.

For example, in 2017 in South Australia, there were approximately 3,300 ITE placements for students from 31 providers nationally. Around 90 per cent of these placements were from the four South Australian providers and one interstate provider (who has staff based in the state), and they essentially met the jurisdiction's partnership requirements. The jurisdiction's requirements however had little influence on how the other 27 providers conducted their partnerships with the remaining 10 per cent of placements.

Similarly, in the Australian Capital Territory, partnerships are established with the two local providers but the Authority has no knowledge or engagement with multiple other providers operating in the territory.

Providers also experience the challenges of ensuring online students have access to the highest quality partnerships. One provider discussed the challenges and strategies for a cohort where 65 per cent are in a distance learning mode.

Responses to consider

Build trust and transparency: This is a complex and evolving area. The overriding perspective of stakeholders is to further the ethos of trust and transparency among Authorities and establish communication channels on that basis.

Establish simple systems: Options from stakeholders included liaison by Authorities with interstate providers on expanding communication with schools on their priorities and expectations of placements; and the expanding the use of written partnership agreements by interstate providers with schools or jurisdictions.

7. Better use of existing funds to support partnerships

The challenge

A frequently expressed theme from stakeholders is that the quality of school-university partnerships cannot be expanded without additional resources but establishing a national perspective on this is difficult.

The level of funds and distribution of funds for ITE placements are highly variable across providers and jurisdictions and it does not appear there is as yet a consolidated national view of the levels and allocation patterns. Moreover, funding appears to be a significant challenge for some providers but not for others.

- Some jurisdictions (e.g. South Australia) centrally fund teachers to be supervising teachers for ITE students. Some locate the responsibility with the provider to strike an agreement with schools on the allocation of the funds (e.g. Victoria).
- Other Departments (e.g. Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland) have supplemented federal university funding through state supported professional experience hub schools/teaching academies/centres of excellence.

Providers vary in the way they are funded for professional practice and allocate resources. Some faculties have the capacity to allocate their funds; others indicate their faculty funding is more complex; some directly support supervising teachers for ITE students and some pool funds at the level of the school.

Looking ahead, given the more active role of employers in the partnerships and the progressive improvement of partnerships some stakeholders suggested that existing funds could be redirected. For example if the Department/employers and schools strike longer term agreements to host ITE student placements, then providers may be able to redirect funds away from their placement offices to mentor support programs.

At the school level, if general mentor programs sponsored by employers are merged with those for ITE students, it may be possible to fund other more general pedagogy development programs for schools.

Responses to consider

Identify sustainable models: In the first instance, current sustainable funding models need to be identified, including the allocation of current funds to support school-university partnerships for ITE student placements. Identification is needed of current actual costs for provider placement staff; provider staff supporting schools; and any supplementary initiatives such as support programs for mentor teachers.

Concluding thoughts

There is little that is conceptually new in the objectives and approaches to school-university partnerships. However, putting the systems and practices in place to implement reform at a national scale is new and ambitious and there are challenges to manage.

A theme running through these challenges to effective school-university partnerships and possible responses; is the need to clarify roles and responsibilities at the systemic and the local 'front-line' level – and do this in a complex governance environment.

The 'sliding scale' of stakeholder awareness and engagement in resolving the challenges opens up the opportunity for a greater role to be played by state jurisdictions as the employers of the teaching workforce. The earlier stages have been led by the Authorities establishing the accreditation process and by the providers in meeting the Standards and Procedures. Subsequent implementation now requires more collective action with wider engagement by systems, other employers and, crucially, by more schools.

The TEMAG Forum held 26 June 2018 in Canberra, brought together leaders from ITE sector, Authorities, and government and non-government school sectors to celebrate successes to date, explore the common critical implementation issues, and agree practical solutions to shape the collective effort to develop stronger partnerships.

Appendix 1: Consultation list

Institution	Name	Position
Regulatory Authorities		
ACT Teacher Quality Institute	Ms Anne Ellis	Chief Executive Officer
	Ms Anna McKenzie	Director
	Mr Michael Bateman	Director
NSW Education Standards Authority	Mr John Healey	Director, Initial Teacher Education
Queensland College of Teachers	Mr John Ryan	Director
Teachers Registration Board of South Australia	Dr Peter Lind	Registrar
Teachers Registration Board, Tasmania	Ms Lee Rayner	Chief Executive Officer
Victorian Institute of Teaching	Ms Fran Cosgrave	Director Standards and Strategy
	Ms Fiona James	Manager Standards and Accreditation
Teachers Registration Board, Western Australia	Mr Richard Miles	Director
	Ms Rozana Kemp	Assistant Director Policy and QA
	Mr Peter Mitchell	Manager Accreditation and Qualifications
	Ms Emma Beveridge	Senior Qualifications Officer
Departments of Education		
Department of Education, Victoria	Stephanie Condon	Director Professional Practice and leadership
	Ms Anita Brown	Manager Teacher Education Reform
Department of Education, Western Australia	Ms Christine Porter	Director Workforce Policy and Co-ordination
	Mr Peter Glendenning	Director Institute for Professional Learning
	Mr Neil Purdy	Manager Workforce Planning
	Ms Caroline Ostrowski	Principal Advisor – Planning
Commonwealth Department of Education and Training	Ms Carolyn Shrives	A/g Branch Manager Teaching and School Leadership Branch
	Ms Deborah Flemming	A/g Director Initial Teacher Education Team
Department of Education, Queensland	Mr Duncan McKellar	A/Assistant Director General Human Resources
Department for Education and Child Development, SA	Ms Susan Miels	Manager Teacher Standards and Certification
	Ms Virginia Barter	Policy and Research Officer, People and Culture
Department of Education, Tasmania	Ms Jodee Wilson	Deputy Secretary, Support and Development

Institution	Name	Position
	Ms Sue Kennedy	Director Intergovernmental Relations and Legislation
	Ms Kathy Davis	Principal Network Leader
Department of Education, NSW	Ms Sandra Robinson	Director Leadership and Teacher Quality
ITE Providers		
Monash University	Professor John Loughran	Dean
University of Tasmania	Professor Karen Swabey	Dean
Griffith University	Professor Donna Pendergast	Dean
University of Newcastle	Professor John Fischetti	Dean
University of South Australia	Professor Stephen Dobson	Dean
	Professor Peter Buckskin	Dean
Central Queensland University	Prof Bill Blayney	Dean
	Dr Angelina Ambrosetti	Deputy Dean-Operations
	Mr Cory Bloomfield	Lecturer
Other stakeholders		
AHISA	Beth Blackwood	CEO
Independent Education Union (Teacher Union)	Mark Northam	Assistant Secretary
AITSL committees	ACDE and AITSL TEMAG Forum Planning Committee	
	Teacher Education Expert Standing Committee (TEESC)	

Appendix 2: TEMAG reforms and school-university partnerships

TEMAG reform element	Accreditation standards: Specific expectations of school-university partnerships
<p>Selection Ensuring entrants to ITE are suited to teaching</p>	
<p>Quality assurance All initial teachers education programs meet rigorous new standards</p>	<p>Standard 2: Program development, design and delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherent course design/delivery that integrates professional experience • Schools inform ITE course design • ITE provider staff include those with recent or current teaching experience <p>Standard 6: Program evaluation, reporting and improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to ongoing and aggregated data on courses performance and impact
<p>Robust assessment All graduates pass a teaching performance assessment (TPA) of their classroom readiness.</p>	<p>Standard 1: Program Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching performance assessment reflects classroom teaching standards and shows achievement of graduate standards • Data available on graduates impact on student learning
<p>Primary specialisation Primary teaching graduates have a specialisation in a learning area of the Australian Curriculum</p>	
<p>Professional experience Better school placements for student teachers</p>	<p>Standard 5: Professional experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal partnerships and communication • Access to classroom environment and assessment • Support for mentor/supervisors <p>Standard 4: Program structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall awareness of schools' and jurisdictions' priorities and policies
<p>Beginning teacher induction The right support for graduate teachers to stay in the classroom</p>	
<p>National research and workforce planning Enhancing Australia's capability to drive strong evidence –based practices in ITE and to manage its teaching workforce.</p>	

Appendix 3: Stakeholder interview questions

AITSL has engaged PTR Consulting Dr. Dahle Suggett and Graeme Jane to conduct targeted stakeholder interviews and report to the second TEMAG Forum hosted by the AITSL Board in Canberra June 2018.

Interviews are to be held with all Authorities, state education departments, and a selection of ITE providers nominated by the Australian Council of Deans of Education.

The focus is school-university partnerships that are included in the Standards and Procedures for the accreditation process and integral to successfully implementing the TEMAG reforms overall

The questions are only a guide. Commentary can also be about the most important aspects for you.

Context-holistic view

1. How would you describe the current status of school-provider partnerships in your State/Territory?
2. Does your State /Territory have an Initial teacher education (ITE) policy that influences/incentivises school-provider partnerships? If so, how does that interact with TEMAG reforms?
3. For your organisation, how different are school-provider partnerships in 2018 from what they were before the TEMAG reforms in 2015?
4. What does your organisation regard as the key benefits from reformed school-provider partnerships?
5. What are your aspirations for the further development of school-provider partnerships over the next five years?

Achievements and challenges in school-provider partnerships

6. Could you rate your progress with the components of school-provider partnerships listed below from 0-3 in terms of progress (0-not at all; 1-minimal progress; 2-good progress; 3-well advanced).

We have progressed in

- establishing a partnership agreement and agreeing a shared vision and procedures
- determining a high quality professional experience model – (e.g. structure, access to classrooms, mentoring/supervision, staffing, funding)
- identifying and supporting pre service teacher mentors/supervisors
- ensuring regular communication and sustainable relationships in the partnerships
- agreeing and implementing a teaching performance assessment model
- arrangements for gathering other performance and impact data

7. What are the particular challenges for you in any of the partnerships components above?
8. What components are you mainly working on now; are you making progress in finding solutions?

Progress with specific elements of school-provider partnerships

9. What professional experience models do you wish to further develop; what are the implications for the resource/funding model?
10. Has the role of practising teachers as mentors or supervisors of pre-service teachers changed (or will it change)?
 - What are the levers to enhance this role for practising teachers?

11. How is the TPA requirement being met in the context of professional experience arrangements?
 - How equipped are schools to engage; how might further capability be built?
12. What partnership arrangements are being developed for performance monitoring and reporting?
 - Have state jurisdictions and schools been engaged in the development of methodologies?

New and innovative approaches that could be profiled and scaled up

13. Are there any particular procedures or strategies for forming partnerships that have been successfully trialled and now are being or will be scaled up?



aitsl.edu.au

Telephone: +61 3 9944 1200

Email: info@aitsl.edu.au

Melbourne | Brisbane | Canberra

AITSL is funded by the Australian Government