

Submission for Teacher Registration Review

I would like to comment on the 2 elements of 'initial period of registration' and 'fixed period of registration'.

I have experienced and observed **persistent inconsistency** [REDACTED] **in the accreditation of pre-service and graduate teachers**. Pre-service teachers can choose their placements and mentors, often from their own networks. Thus, those already acquainted with their mentors will have glorious reports and pass without issue. In contrast, those who are foreign to their placement school, or worse, do not fit the beliefs and agenda of school leaderships can be failed without any need of schools to provide concrete evidence nor to discuss their assessment with the education course leaders. When asking AITSL [REDACTED] about any regulation for school leaderships to follow a consistent, evidence based formal assessment report that matches expectations of the course providers and regulatory bodies, the bug is passed from one to the other. Consequently, **schools assess pre-service teachers against their own expectations, which differ significantly between different schools based on preference of specific classroom management protocols and pedagogical strategies, most notably between public and private schools**. The school's specific scope and agenda is NOT explained to pre-service teachers, who are expected to fulfill the requirements of their education providers, which in turn differ from those of many schools. Just as I fell victim to these shortcomings during my initial teaching period, I was similar met with unfair bias and discrimination when trying to fulfil requirements for transition to full registration, as detailed below.

Before even having the opportunity to start the inquiry process for gaining full registration, I struggled through 2 years to find employment in any capacity, with minimal opportunities for casual relief teaching. Only able to get a single term of full-time employment, I applied for extension of the provisional registration period. This provided for nearly 2 terms of full-time relief teaching. Nevertheless, a relief teacher stands in for a proficient teacher, and in a full-time capacity needs to participate in all meetings, and carry out all standard tasks including planning and reporting at a proficient level. **Schools cannot afford to provide mentorship and graduate support to relief teachers, and there is also no time scheduled to allow for professional development when new graduates try to handle a workload and responsibility that is meant for a proficient teacher**. In addition, in the short time spent at a school as relief teacher, it is difficult to find suitable and willing experienced teachers to mentor [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

When finally gaining a full-time position in my 4th year after graduation, I initiated all relevant processes and informed leadership and my mentor at the start of the year to ensure completion of the application for full registration within that year. However, during that year, the school was electing a new principal, with 3 different people passing temporary principalship from one to the other until appointment of a new principal mid-year. This principal brought with him his own new agenda and values to the school, for which he selected his preferred future staff and those who needed to leave, because they did not meet his agenda.

Suddenly, my **inquiry process was actively delayed** by the principal's insistence on personal observations by himself and his assistant principal, which he scheduled for late of Term 4. Any feedback was delayed until the end of the year to prevent me from including any recommendations into my practice. I was told in Term 3 that I will not be employed by the school in the next year, I was not told, however, that my mentor will be away during critical 2 weeks at the end of Term 4, nor that I will be unable to complete my [REDACTED] application. I never received a copy of the "recommendation report" which was only uploaded [REDACTED] in Term 1 the next year. I was **not given the opportunity to present my evidence** collected throughout the year in collaboration with my mentor in weekly meetings,

including observations by other teachers. I was told to attend a “pre-panel” meeting consisting of the assistant principal, principal and mentor during which I was told to listen to the “panel’s decision” in the absence of a teacher of my choice as recommended [REDACTED] and **without the opportunity to defend myself against the decision.**

[REDACTED] **I was left without help, as [REDACTED] leaves the entire decision up to the school without asking for any evidence** by the school to support their decision nor any clear checkpoints other than personal opinion as to whether standards are met or not. This is particularly ironic in light of the excessive demand for evidence put onto graduate teachers. I was, however, kindly offered another 2 year extension of the provisional registration period. By the end of the year, I did not have any employment offers despite plenty sincere efforts, which also meant no opportunity to start or continue an inquiry project for full registration. The **regional [REDACTED] office refused to take any action** in response to my complaint, and the matter has now **escalated to the regional director**, who only responded start of Term 2 this year, after I also **involved the ombudsman**. As my current place of employment in the education sector is of entirely different background, scope and operation, **not any part of my inquiry project can be applied to my new practice**. This means I would have to start the entire process from the very beginning. After negotiation through an **AEU** representative on my behalf, **I am now still awaiting the final advise [REDACTED] on how to proceed with my inquiry project during my 5th year of the provisional registration period.**

In summary, the current **registration framework is flawed in arbitrary granting registration** to teachers based on personal relationships between school leaderships and pre-service/graduate teachers. School leaderships are not required to provide evidence nor to demonstrate compliance against common, formal statewide expectations. The [REDACTED] also does not require teachers serving as mentors to be formally mentor trained. The mentor training available still allows very arbitrary assessment of graduates. Consequently, **many teachers selected for full-registration do NOT meet the standards to a level expected by AITSL, and many teachers with much better qualities are prevented from continuing in that profession.** There are **no regulations that ensure fair and just process in cases of discrimination in the registration process.**

I see it urgently necessary that the burden of evidence for support of graduate teachers is put onto the registration bodies [REDACTED] and school leaderships, including consideration of opportunities to carry out inquiry projects.

- ◆ **School leaderships should be required to be formally trained and assessed in:**
 - a. **objective observation methods and reports,**
 - b. **the expected evidence for each of the checkpoints in recommendation reports, and**
 - c. **the collation of evidence from panel members and graduate teachers.**

- ◆ **Graduate teachers should be entitled to a full, independent review and reassessment in case of unsuccessful applications for full registrations.**

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the review!