



SUBMISSION IN RESPONSE TO THE TEACHER EDUCATION EXPERT PANEL DISCUSSION PAPER

Contact: Professor Barney Dalgarno deanofeducation@canberra.edu.au
 Carolyn Mc Donnell carolyn.mcdonnell@westernsydney.edu.au

Reform Area 1: Strengthen ITE programs to deliver effective, classroom ready graduates

Key highlights

1. While there is agreement that that basic cognitive science and applied cognitive science have the potential to offer, respectively, significant insights into learning and pedagogic practice, responsibility for the implementation of these content areas into ITE programs must be left to the expertise of individual ITE providers to incorporate the core/foundation studies into the curricula of their program.
2. The adoption of a core/foundation studies will require amendments to Standards 2.1 and 4.2 of the Accreditation Standards and Procedures.
3. The use of matrices which enable the core/foundation curriculum components to be clearly identified will assist accreditation panels to make judgements about where these components are taught, practiced and assessed.
4. The Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) should not be amended or used to assess the core/foundation components of an amended ITE program.
5. A National Quality Assurance of ITE Oversight Body with a clearly defined purpose and remit has the potential to supplement the current authorising environment for ITE program accreditation.

Are there other evidence-based practices which should be prioritised in ITE programs?

The Discussion Paper makes a cogent set of arguments for the inclusion of specific content for ITE programs. However, the arguments made for the application of the content across all contexts and for all students and all curriculum areas do not find support in one of the key seminal texts cited in the paper (Perry et al, 2021). These authors note:

Based on the findings of this systematic review of the evidence, we are convinced that basic cognitive science and applied cognitive science have the potential to offer, respectively, significant insights into learning and pedagogic practice. We are also convinced, however, that the rapid popularisation of cognitive science inspired practice has led to the premature recommendation—and even mandating—of education practice underpinned by particular elements of cognitive science.

Of particular concern is the application of findings from particular subjects, age ranges, and contexts to other—often quite dissimilar—areas. Moreover, given the weaknesses in the applied evidence-base, cognitive science in the classroom is at present largely underpinned by evidence from controlled (laboratory) settings in conditions not typical of everyday classroom practice and with different populations.....

Finally, our findings indicate that substantial investment is needed by the education profession to understand and model how practice might be adapted without eclipsing understandings of other important factors that influence learning, and ensure that members of the profession are skilled to understand and respond practically to these complexities (Perry et al., 2021, p. 264)

This does not negate the basic premise that change in ITE programs are needed to ensure that Graduate Teachers should receive the best preparation possible, drawing on the best available evidence. Rather it suggests that areas identified in the Discussion Paper require careful, considered integration into ITE programs in ways that are transparent, subject to scrutiny and which consider the context(s) for which ITE students are being prepared.

Rather than seeking out additional practices which should be prioritised, ACDE supports the inclusion of the knowledge and pedagogic practices named in the Discussion Paper noting the counsel offered by Perry et al.:

1. *Cognitive science principles of learning can have a significant impact on rates of learning in the classroom. There is value in teachers having some working knowledge of cognitive science principles. They should also be made aware of the serious gaps and limitations in the applied evidence-base, the uncertainties about the applicability of specific principles across subjects and age ranges, and the challenges of implementation in practice.*
2. *There are large disconnects between the evidence-base for basic cognitive science and applied cognitive science. Applied cognitive science is far more limited and provides a less positive, and more complex, picture than the basic science.*
3. *The applied literature has many gaps relating to subject areas and age groups.*
4. *Applied research surfaces many theoretical and practical problems not encountered in controlled lab or pseudo-lab conditions.*
5. *The evidence-base is largely working at the level of principles rather than tests of specific classroom strategies. Principles do not determine strategies and do not determine specific approaches to implementation.*
(Perry et al., 2021, pp. 260-262)

Further, in keeping with this counsel, ACDE recommends that the 'core areas and enabling factors' of learning be renamed 'foundation studies'. This naming will

- require ITE providers to specifically address the evidence-informed knowledge base about learners and their contexts and the foundational teaching practices that draw on this knowledge base in ways that are relevant to the levels of schooling/curriculum areas being addressed by the ITE programs without creating unhelpful hierarchies of content areas and in line with the evidence base on which this recommendation is drawn;
- require ITE providers to be explicit in where this foundation content will be taught, practiced and assessed across their programs in line with the current program accreditation requirements;

- allow ITE providers the scope to tailor the curricula of their programs to their specific audiences and contexts while also considering TEQSA and institutional-specific and jurisdictional requirements related to qualification structures; and
- acknowledge the importance of key areas of study which have been identified as essential components of ITE and as already nationally agreed priority areas. These include Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education, which should not be labelled as an 'enabling factor'.

How should the Accreditation Standards and Procedures best be amended to ensure all ITE students learn and can confidently use these practices?

What steps should be taken to ensure curriculum- specific ITE content embeds the evidence-based practices?

Should the Accreditation Standards and Procedures be amended to require TPAs to assess these practices?

ACDE recommends that the following standards from the Accreditation Standards and Procedures be amended to ensure that reference to the foundation studies (named above) are clearly articulated in the most appropriate sections of the standards. We emphasise ***the most appropriate*** sections as those being where the best evidence can be provided to accreditation panels who will be assessing the programs.

The most appropriate standards where amendments could be made are:

- Standard 2.1 – this standard could be amended to require ITE providers to articulate how the program, design and delivery has incorporated the foundation studies which will allow the program to develop Graduate Teachers who meet the Graduate Teacher Standards; and
- Standard 4.2 – this standard needs to articulate how ITE students are prepared for the level of schooling/curriculum/discipline areas and how the foundation studies are integrated into this preparation.

Assuring the inclusion of foundation studies/specific content in ITE programs

The use of matrices which enable the foundation studies to be clearly identified would assist accreditation panels to make judgements about where the foundation studies is taught, practiced and assessed. These matrices, appropriately formatted, would support ITE providers to illustrate the inclusion of the required content in a way that is relevant to the type of program and the education sector for which teachers are being prepared.

These matrices, in aggregate form, could be made publicly available by TRAs as part of summaries for use in benchmarking activities undertaken by a national body to oversight the quality of ITE programs across Australia (see below).

Teaching Performance Assessments

ACDE does not support the requirement that the *Accreditation Standards and Procedures* be modified to require that the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) be used to assess the ITE core/foundation studies.

The TPA is a tool that has been designed to assess classroom readiness which reflects classroom teaching practice including the elements of planning, teaching, assessing and within the context of a school and the selected focus Key Learning Area/discipline study. The TPA is currently implemented across a wide range of school settings and as such must be able to be flexible enough to adapt to the school context while providing a valid and reliable assessment of an ITE student's skills, knowledge and practices across the spectrum of teaching activities including planning, teaching, assessing and reflecting in that context.

ITE providers cannot prescribe specific sets of pedagogical practices to the schools that receive their ITE students on their placements. In a context where addressing teacher workforce shortages are increasingly urgent, any mechanism which limits the availability of quality placements for final year ITE students needs to be carefully considered. Further, while the TPA is a crucial summative assessment item, it is not the only place where assessment of the foundation studies could be undertaken. The foundation studies are a mix of knowledge and practices which should be assessed across ITE programs in ways that are valid, reliable and authentic. The matrixes which show where the foundation studies are taught, practiced and assessed across programs can be a source of information to determine the ways in which ITE providers are meeting the amended requirements of Standard 4.2 in the *Accreditation Standards and Procedures*.

What changes to the authorising environment are required to ensure consistent application of the Accreditation Standards and Procedures and implementation of the core (foundation) content in ITE programs

The question of assuring the embedding of the foundation studies is related, in part to the accreditation environment in which ITE programs operate. The Discussion Paper points indirectly to what it perceives as challenges associated with existing approaches to ensure nationally consistent decision making under the current arrangements. However, the paper also notes the challenges associated with establishing a national regulatory body for ITE and makes the alternative suggestion that that a 'National Quality Assurance of ITE Oversight Body' be established.

ACDE can see merit in considering the establishment of such an entity operating under the following conditions:

- It acts as a body that informs, educates and monitors the current authorising environment;
- It does not add to (and preferably decreases) the already significant regulatory burden for ITE providers;
- Its operation does not diminish the scope of individual jurisdictions to operate in ways that supports the development of their teacher workforces (i.e., the use of Priority Elaborations in NSW);

- Membership is representative of key stakeholders in ITE - including representatives from commonwealth, state and territory governments, the non-government school sector, teacher regulatory authorities, unions, initial teacher education providers, and the Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL); and
- Reports to the EMM via the Australian Education Senior Officials Committee (AESOC) – perhaps in the same manner as the Australian Teacher Workforce Data (ATWD) oversight board operates¹.

Such a body could be charged with the following functions:

- Providing regular reporting to the Education Ministers Meetings on the ‘current state of play’ of ITE in Australia using the agreed performance measures (see Reform Area 2);
- Monitor the outcomes from the accreditation of programs to provide insights into the consistency of accreditation decisions across jurisdictions for like ITE programs including the adoption of the core/foundation studies using data/information drawn from accreditation applications; and
- Update national standard setting and moderation for TPAs.

¹ [Australian Teacher Workforce Data \(ATWD\) Collection DSS 2018– \(aihw.gov.au\)](https://aihw.gov.au/data-and-reports/australian-teacher-workforce-data-atwd-collection-dss-2018/)

Reform Area 2: Strengthen the link between performance and funding of initial teacher education

Key Highlights

- 1. Performance measures can be used to monitor and understand various aspects of ITE programs; they cannot be used or aggregated to offer a summative judgement of the quality of an ITE program.**
- 2. The performance measures being suggested are not all within the remit of ITE providers to influence. Without increased resources and closely focused partnerships with employers who have a great influence on the working conditions of their workforce including early career teachers, some outcomes may prove difficult to shift.**
- 3. Numbers of ITE students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds should be included as a key indicator to be monitored across ITE providers.**
- 4. Existing data and dashboards from QILT should be leveraged as far as possible to provide information to existing students and to illustrate performance of individual institutions.**
- 5. A review of Standard 6 in the Accreditation Standards and Procedures to incorporate the use of plans by ITE providers to monitor and improve selection performance over the life of the accreditation of a program would add an additional mechanism to promote quality in ITE programs.**
- 6. The availability of transition funding would find immediate application to support ITE program quality and potentially could be used to incentivise ITE providers to undertake a more extensive review of their programs earlier than planned.**
- 7. Rather than rewarding individual ITE providers, a program of enhancement projects may be a better driver for improving the overall quality of ITE in Australia.**

Are there additional indicators that should be considered? To what extent should the performance measures form the core part of the evidence requirements in providers' Plans For Demonstrating Impact required in the Accreditation Standards and Procedures?

The Discussion Paper suggests a number of indicators that could be used to assess the performance of ITE programs. While the suggested indicators can be used to monitor and understand various aspects of ITE programs, they cannot be used or aggregated to offer a summative judgement on the quality of an ITE program. They can, if carefully selected and aligned with the core mission of the Higher Education provider which offers the ITE program(s), provide insights into the individual performance of ITE provider and, at a national and state/jurisdictional level provide a system-level snapshot of the health of the ITE system in Australia.

The performance measures being suggested are a mixture of inputs (selection), processes (retention and attrition/dropout rates) and outcomes (classroom readiness and transition). Not all of these indicators are within the remit of ITE providers to influence. This is particularly true of the transition measures related to the sustainability of employment and employment of graduates in areas of need. These two latter indicators are influenced by decisions that are made by the employers of ITE graduates and the graduates themselves (e.g., graduates being limited in where employment can be sought; changing personal

circumstances post-graduation). Transition to working as a teacher and support during the early years of teaching are shaped by the human resource and workforce development policies of employers. The lack of induction² and the lack of systematic use of mentoring and other strategies to support transition to workplaces have been well documented³. If the intention is to involve ITE providers in providing transition pathways along with employers for early career teachers, funding to support the development of partnerships to support this work would be needed.

The use of measures such as attrition can be complicated because not all ITE students are able to complete their programs in one seamless course of study. There are students who intermit their studies for a range of reasons as well as those who might change from full to part time modes of study across their programs of study. A six-year window to assess dropout/attrition rates does not consider part time students who could take up to eight years or more to complete a 4-year degree.

One key indicator that is missing is the numbers of ITE students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. The diversity of the teaching workforce needs to mirror the diversity of children and young people in Australian schools and on this basis, this attribute merits some attention.

Should the Australian Teacher Workforce Data collection be the basis for reporting and publicising the performance measures? Are there other approaches for reporting the performance measures?

Higher Education Providers already contribute to a suite of surveys as part of the Quality Indicators for Learning and Teacher (QILT). These include surveys across the student lifecycle from their studies to employment. Further data from these surveys are used to drive the ComparED website. Prospective students can use ComparED to explore and compare Australian higher education institutions and study areas, based on the real-life experiences of current students and recent graduates. Course Seeker helps potential students make informed decisions about future study. It provides information about ATARs, pre-requisites, student satisfaction and graduate outcome survey results, both at the study area level and for the provider as a whole⁴.

ACDE recommends that these existing suite of data and dashboards from QILT, be leveraged as far as possible (with some amendments – e.g., 6-year completion rates, additional questions that specifically relate to ITE students/graduates) to provide information to existing students and to illustrate performance of individual institutions.

If made publicly available, are these performance measures sufficient to drive quality improvement in ITE?

² [A good induction is important for all new jobs. So why are teachers being left behind? \(theconversation.com\)](https://theconversation.com/a-good-induction-is-important-for-all-new-jobs-so-why-are-teachers-being-left-behind-125444)

³ AITSL, Australian Teacher Workforce Data (ATWD) Key Metrics Dashboard, March 29, 2023

⁴ [About \(qilt.edu.au\)](https://qilt.edu.au)

As noted above, data for individual institutions are already available through the ATWD and QILT and this has already been used by Higher Education Providers to drive quality improvements in areas such as retention, completions, graduate satisfaction and graduate outcomes.

One additional reform that would assist promoting quality in ITE programs would be a review of Standard 6 in the Accreditation Standards and Procedures. Standard 6 currently requires ITE providers who are presenting programs for Stage 1 accreditation to develop a plan to demonstrate impact of their program and to report on the outcomes from this plan as part of Stage 2 accreditation. ACDE supports the repurposing of these requirements so that as part of Stage 1 accreditation, ITE providers can nominate appropriate performance measures and present a plan for improving these selected indicators. Stage 2 accreditation would then provide an opportunity for institutions to evaluate the outcomes of their plan including reporting on how and what indicators had improved across the five-year accreditation period. Coupled with the changes to the authorising environment noted under actions to strengthen ITE programs, this repurposing would provide ITE providers with opportunities to demonstrate performance outcomes relevant to their context and contribute to the evidence base for assessing the overall health of ITE in Australia.

How could transition funding be used to set higher education providers on a path to improving the quality of their programs?

Depending on the current state of ITE programs, the process for ITE providers to implement the core/foundation content and adopt performance measures, could be a lengthy and costly process. As such, transition funding would find immediate application to support ITE program quality and potentially could be used to incentivise ITE providers to undertake a more extensive review of their programs earlier than planned (for example, bringing forward Stage 1 accreditation which would be needed if extensive changes were made to programs). Transition funding could be used for preparing documentation for an amended accreditation process, developing core content resources, providing professional development for school and university-based staff who teach in or support professional experience in programs, enhancing the quality of partnerships with employers, and planning for the systematic collection of evidence to support a revised approach to complying with Standard 6.

How could a system of reward funding be best designed to support high performing ITE programs and encourage them to increase their enrolments? Are there any risks to such an approach and if so, how should they be addressed?

Past experience with a Learning and Teaching Performance Fund in Higher Education would suggest that systems funding for high performing ITE programs are risky and may not deliver the outcomes that are desired⁵. Under the first iteration of this scheme, only universities with the very best outcomes were rewarded. Little resource flowed to regional and less well-resourced universities. ACDE would argue that incentives that encourage ALL ITE providers to improve their performance will be more likely to result in benefits to a wider number of ITE students – regardless of where they study.

⁵ [EJ802275.pdf \(ed.gov\)](#)

Rather than rewarding individual ITE providers, a program of enhancement projects which focus on collaborative, sector wide projects that disseminate good practice, provide empirical evaluations of innovations and address sector-wide challenges may be a better driver for improving the overall quality of ITE in Australia.

Reform Area 3: Improving the quality of practical experience in teaching

Key Highlights

1. System level agreements, where implemented, need to provide an operating environment that supports the flexibility and innovation needed at a time of considerable teacher workforce shortages.
2. A Centre of Excellence can act as a mechanism for building capacity across the ITE system in Australia by stimulating research and innovation and operating to support current jurisdictional initiatives towards enhancing the quality of professional experience placements.
3. Further national guidance to strengthen the quality of Professional Experience can be provided in amendments/elaboration of Standard 5 of the Accreditation Standards and Procedures rather than adding national frameworks.
4. A national program of bursaries for ITE students should be developed to provide flexible, student-centric support to defray costs associated with completing professional experience placements.
5. Better integration of theory and practice rests on the design of ITE programs that address the nexus between theory and practice as a cross curricular matter.
6. The cost of Professional Experience in ITE –for providers, the schools and individual teachers and school leaders who support ITE students – Is high and must be tackled at a national and jurisdictional level.

System Level Agreements: Would establishing more comprehensive system level agreements between school sectors/ systems and higher education providers addresses challenges in the school matching process and deliver more effective placements? How could these agreements complement current localised arrangements?

While ACDE supports the notion of system level agreements at the jurisdictional level; the challenge lies in providing a framework within which all of the different school sectors can operate with the degree of flexibility and innovation needed at a time of considerable workforce shortages. While government schools already benefit from a number of system level agreements (for example, in NSW, Victoria), other education sectors by their nature can require Higher Education Providers to engage with individual schools.

One example of a system level, cross sectoral framework⁶ is in operation in NSW. The framework was developed by NESA, in consultation with:

- the NSW Department of Education;
- the Association of Independent Schools of NSW;
- the Catholic Education Commission NSW;
- Deans of Education; and
- NSW Vice-Chancellors Committee.

The framework consists of:

⁶ [Statement | NSW Education Standards](#)

- Best Practice Guidelines for Teachers, Teacher Educators and Teacher Education Students;
- An Evidence Guide for Supervising Teachers;
- A Common Report Template;
- A Statement of Common Roles and Responsibilities for all stakeholders; and
- Data Exchange Guidelines.

While frameworks provide a key enabler in offering quality professional experience placements, quality partnerships between ITE providers and schools are the crucial factor. These partnerships are crucial because it is in these spaces that the enabling conditions for quality placements are negotiated. Notions of ‘matching’ suggest a transactional process which has the potential to overstate the level of control and standardisation that could be implemented at the expense of innovation and responsiveness. The Discussion Paper offers a range of examples where quality partnerships have laid the foundation for innovation and responsiveness to specific workforce development needs. These need to be better understood through systematic evaluation and longitudinal research.

Levels of innovation and responsiveness are particularly important in the current environment where ITE providers are already working with employers to accommodate in-service models of teacher education (where completion of an ITE program is paired with working in schools) and accelerated programs (such as those being offered to support mid-career transitions into teaching). The emergence of these hybrid model which combine pre- and in-service development for ITE students rests on quality partnerships, a responsive teacher accreditation environment that supports conditional/permission to teach arrangements as well as ITE curricula which have been designed with the integration of theory and practice in mind.

Centres of excellence: Would encouraging centres of excellence such as hub schools, support high quality practical experience? What are the impediments to delivering these centres of excellence?

ACDE believes there is some merit in exploring the role centres of excellence as a mechanism for building capacity across the ITE system in Australia by stimulating research and innovation. A centre of this type could add value to the existing arrangements where ITE providers partner with schools to promote high quality placements. It could also take a lead in the development of an evidence base to drive policy and decision making.

National Frameworks: Would higher education providers, schools and teachers benefit from more specific guidance in delivering professional experience? What guidance would be beneficial to address key barriers to high quality practical experience?

Rather than setting up additional national frameworks , ACDE would suggest that further national guidance to strengthen the quality of Professional Experience could be provided in amendments/elaboration to Standard 5 of the Accreditation Standards and Procedures. As noted in the Discussion Paper there are a range of existing partnerships and arrangements in place to support the provision of Professional Experience to ITE students. Adding national frameworks across already existing arrangements risks adding complexity and added

regulatory burdens across all stakeholders. It also runs the risk of reducing the flexibility of individual jurisdictions to work with ITE providers to find innovative solutions to the development of their teaching workforce.

Student support during placements: What supports for students would be beneficial to assist in managing their practical experience requirements?

ACDE supports expanding ways to support ITE students to meet their practical experience requirements. Some students are already receiving support via engagement in employment-based initiatives which allow them to combine employment with their study. However, places in these programs are limited and are very costly for employers to sustain.

Some support is being offered via the implementation of accelerated programs which enable ITE students to commence employment after completing one year of a Master of Teaching program or during the final year of a 4-year program. These initiatives need to be sustained and supported. However, these initiatives do not suit all ITE students – some of whom need to sustain a range of personal circumstances which preclude engagement with these types of initiatives. The provision of bursaries that could be accessed by ITE students to cover costs associated with professional experience placement would particularly support this latter group of ITE students.

Integrating theory and practice: How can professional experience be better integrated with the academic component of ITE programs?

Professional experience is integral to the design of ITE programs. This is where ITE students ‘take their learning to work’. But is it not the only place where ITE students learn about how to work as a teacher. Research into high quality ITE programs highlights the importance of ‘bringing work to learning’ – that is the design of curricula which supports ITE students to integrate their learning from their placements and institution-based learning as a means of growing their capacities to effectively tap into their knowledge when teaching. (Darling-Hammond et al. 2019).

Bringing work to learning already occurs in a number of ways across ITE programs – for example, the use of External Advisory Boards to guide program development, the use of resources found in schools as part of learning at university, the employment of current teachers and school leaders as lecturers and tutors, offering careers events and conferences that engage ITE students with the wider teaching profession and employers, the use of professional tasks as forms of assessment etc. Most importantly this nexus between theory and practice lies at the core of the TPAs where ITE students enact practice, collect evidence, connect theory with their practice to produce a portfolio of evidence which allow ITE students to demonstrate their ability to use evidence, to increase their understanding of teaching, justify their decision making and inform their future practice.

Role of schools in supporting practical experience: what incentives can be offered to schools to be more active participants in ITE placements?
--

The provision of quality professional experience placements is vital to the overall quality of ITE programs. It cannot be addressed by simply applying incentives to ensure the quality of partnership and engagement that all stakeholders must bring to this work.

The cost of Professional Experience in ITE – not only for providers, but also the schools and individual teachers and school leaders who support ITE students – is high and must be tackled at a national and jurisdictional levels. The funds available to ITE providers to support ITE programs have been reduced under JRG amid increasing costs which have been absorbed by ITE providers. This matter can potentially be addressed as part of the development of an Australian Universities Accord where actions relating to ameliorating the impact that the funding changes implemented under the JRG will be considered.

As noted in the Discussion Paper, schools and individual teachers experience a number of barriers which prevent them from engaging in the essential task of developing the next generation of teachers. Systemic and sustaining solutions need to be found to these barriers – some of which require additional funds⁷. There is an opportunity to allocate funds to states and territories as part of the National School Reform Agreement which is currently being negotiated.

⁷ Others actions form part of the Nation Teacher Workforce Action Plan [National Teacher Workforce Action Plan - Department of Education, Australian Government](#)

Reform Area 4: Improve postgraduate ITE for mid-career entrants

Key Highlights

1. There is already significant innovation occurring in the development of new and accelerated Master of Teaching programs.
2. This current innovative practice does not need further intervention; rather funding to support the evaluation of the short-, medium- and long-term outcomes and impacts of these initiatives is needed.
3. Efforts to harmonise enabling mechanisms such as permission to teach/conditional accreditation should be explored further to enable use of these mechanisms as part of 'business as usual' for ITE providers.

How can Masters degrees be structured so that mid-career entrants can assume roles in the classroom within 12-18 months instead of two years? What changes to regulatory arrangements are needed to enable this? Would a framework for assessing the success of mid-career programs assist in sharing lessons learned in designing mid-career programs? Is there sufficient flexibility in providers delivery of ITE to cater to the circumstances of mid-career entrants?

ACDE notes that while there is an emphasis on Master of Teaching pathways for mid-career entrants, this group of entrants are not confined to postgraduate course work programs. Entrants from a variety of personal backgrounds can be found across all ITE programs. Across Australia a number of providers already offer accelerated Master of Teaching Programs of 12–18-month duration alongside 2-year programs that can be completed in part time mode to suit the needs of ITE students. These programs are being offered within existing regulatory frameworks, albeit where some flexibilities afforded during COVID remain in place. ACDE supports these arrangements such as conditional accreditation/permission to teach continuing into the future, with the caveat that attention be paid to harmonising the use and practical application of these mechanisms across jurisdictions where this is possible.

When implemented, specific actions in the National Teacher Workforce Action Plan have the potential to add to the flexibility that ITE providers can add to their program designs. These include Action 5 (Prioritise conditional or provisional registration to increase the supply of teachers) and Action 9 (Recognise previous study, work experience and skills that may be transferable to teaching).

Based on this current set of experiences, ACDE endorses the need to continue to support work to develop new models for Master of Teaching programs. ACDE does not see the need for intervention or additional frameworks or models that might be centrally authorised to guide work that is already been fostered by ITE providers in collaboration with various jurisdictional partners. Rather, we would like to see funds made available (possibly through an extension of the current High Achieving Teachers (HAT) Program. Such funding would support filling the evidence gaps that currently limit an assessment of the efficacy of these pathways and the contribution that they make to the overall teaching workforce.