

Anonymous Submission 012

Related consultation – Teacher Education Expert Panel Consultation

As the TEEP discussion paper acknowledges, Initial Teacher Education (ITE) has been the subject of significant national reform and review. The TEEP Teacher Education Expert Panel now includes recommendations on the following reforms:

- strengthen ITE programs to deliver confident, effective, classroom ready graduates
- strengthen the link between performance and funding of ITE
- improve the quality of practical experience in teaching
- improve postgraduate ITE for mid-career entrants.

██████████ private provider of tertiary programs that prepare students for a range of people based professions, including Initial Teacher Education (ITE).

██████████ has contributed to their submission to the TEEP review. We also offer a few brief thoughts on the suggested reforms here.

- It is important to not merely add another layer of accreditation to ITE programs. The current regulatory burden is far higher than on other disciplines – and this burden seriously detracts from the time and energy and good will needed to produce and maintain quality programs.
- It seems that review/reform after review has simply been successively done in a way that adds layer upon layer of administrative and quality burden on ITE providers.
- The current ethos around teaching and teacher preparation is a deficit model that does not incentivise but sets up a strata system that rewards some and punishes others, based on unreasonable criteria.
- This is perhaps the time to unravel the layers of regulatory bodies and to start again. One single national identity with core parameters agreed to by ITE providers,

clearly allowing for equal funding of differentiated delivery that allows for nuances of the providers context, would encourage quality.

Reform 1

- Whilst evidence-based practices have merit, it is important to consider these – and the assessment of such – within the broader understanding that strengthening ITE is not the solution for teacher attrition from schools.
- ITE programs are already crowded with ‘must haves’ in terms of curriculum – it is a useful idea to select a small set of core knowledge/understandings/skills but flexibility needs to be afforded as to how to embed and evidence this content within courses. Simply expecting another core subject/unit to be included will detract from other important core content. Allowing providers to thread such content through existing units, and demonstrate its inclusion through a range of ways, may enable a more effective praxis approach to delivery of such content.

Reform 2

- League tables seem counterproductive to the cause of improving quality. Comparisons or rankings are a simplistic means of manipulating public perception. They are competition based and do not encourage or incentivise. They do not work in a field where differentiation should be at the heart of the learning experience.
- Allow for genuine differentiation and allocate csp’s based on broader categories other than quality perceived from meeting set standards or enrolling certain types of students.
- There seems little point in every provider trying to cater for every category of student. Genuine diversity means providers funded specifically where greater need exists, and not tying funding availability to this criteria, effectively delineating better providers as those whose jurisdictions have greater need for diversified opportunity.
- Are there more collaborative ways for providers to encourage one another to best practice – the sharing of such, for example.

- Classroom readiness is contestable as a funding criteria as it is a contextual standard – and pst's themselves are not necessarily the best judge of this.

Reform 3

- In some ways better professional experience placements starts not with the ITE providers but with schools – placements should be a matter of course where the aim is to have quality placements and to promote the teaching profession and teacher supply.
- Schools need to be adequately funded and teachers enabled to be quality mentors.
- Schools could be managed with a quota system based on size – or linking the expectation of teacher mentoring to high achieving or lead teacher standing. Evidence of quality mentoring could be used in the assessment for such standing.
- Expecting ITE providers to provide such training in schools for teachers nominated by schools as mentors, incentivises quality preparation and practice on both sides.

Reform 4

- Better to ensure teachers are supported well enough that they do not leave the profession than to 'band aid' teachers who are not properly prepared into it.
- ITE that is of the best quality foundationally prepares preservice teachers for a profession, not for specific employment. To place the burden of employability on ITE providers oversteps the bounds of their responsibility and is counterproductive to teacher quality.
- Obviously ITE providers need to work with government to not under or over supply re:
employment needs – so greater transparency and data needs to be shared between government and all ITE providers.