

Response to the Teacher Education Expert Panel Discussion paper April 2023



Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Response to the Teacher Education Expert Panel Discussion paper | 1 |
| AITSL Statement | 3 |
| Summary of recommendations..... | 5 |
| Reform Area 1 | 5 |
| Reform Area 2 | 5 |
| Reform Area 3 | 5 |
| Reform Area 4 | 5 |
| 1. Reform area one: Strengthen ITE programs to deliver effective, classroom ready graduates.. | 6 |
| 1.1 Establishing core content in ITE programs | 6 |
| 1.2 Implications for the Standards and Procedures | 6 |
| 1.3 Core content and the Graduate Teacher Standards..... | 6 |
| 1.4 Recommendations to support reform area one..... | 7 |
| 2. Reform area two: Strengthening the link between performance and funding of ITE | 7 |
| 2.1 Implications for the Standards and Procedures | 7 |
| 2.2 Establishing a national Teacher Education Quality Oversight Body (TEQOB)..... | 8 |
| 2.3 Recommendations to support reform area two | 8 |
| 3. Reform area three: Improving the quality of practical experience in teaching | 9 |
| 3.1 Implications for the Standards and Procedures | 9 |
| 3.2 Supervising teachers and Professional Experience..... | 9 |
| 3.3 Recommendations for to support reform area three | 10 |
| 4. Reform area four: Improving postgraduate ITE for mid-career entrants | 10 |
| 4.1 Proposal for a national success framework | 10 |
| 4.2 Addressing issues related to Alternative Authorisation to Teach..... | 10 |
| 4.3 Implementing market-driven approaches to ITE | 11 |
| 4.4 The length and structure of postgraduate qualifications | 11 |
| 4.5 Recommendations to support reform area four | 12 |
| Attachments..... | 13 |
| A. Table of metrics and data sources..... | 14 |
| B. Table from <i>State Ratings of Educator Preparation Programs: Connecting Program Review to Teacher Effectiveness</i> . Comb, M., Cowan, J., Goldhaber, D., Jin, Z., & Theobald, R., 2021 | 16 |
| C. Proposed national moderation and standard setting for TPAs | 17 |

AITSL Statement

A strong and consistent view from the AITSL Board is that the weaknesses in the current authorising environment for the accreditation of initial teacher education (ITE) must be addressed to ensure that further amendments to the *Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia: Standards and Procedures (Standards and Procedures)* have a real and positive impact on ITE programs and the quality of graduates. This must be fundamental to the implementation of any decisions made by ministers.

The history of the Standards and Procedures is characterised by successive amendments designed to strengthen the delivery of ITE. These amendments include substantial changes recommended by the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) in 2015, additional amendments in 2018 to further strengthen the TEMAG reforms, and finally the inclusion of explicit reference to reading instruction, including phonics, in 2019. It is noted that there is much evidence of improvement since the TEMAG recommendations were introduced, and this relates to the commitment from many ITE Deans and others in the ecosystem to help lead these improvements. That said, the pace of reform is maturing (for example, Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) are in place but have yet to reach their potential) and the ambition of national consistency is still developing. As this paper proposes, greater explicitness in the authorising environment is needed.

The Teacher Education Expert Panel (TEEP) Discussion paper (Discussion paper) makes further recommendations to amend the Standards and Procedures to accommodate recommendations in four reform areas. The work of the TEEP is positioned within the broader endeavour of the National Teacher Workforce Action Plan (NTWAP), specifically Action 8. At the heart of NTWAP is the stated need to attract, train and retain people in the teaching profession.

This response reiterates previous AITSL Board advice that proposed strategies to address the weaknesses in the current authorising environment that thwart the consistent implementation of previous reforms. The strategies do not challenge the legislative decision-making power held in jurisdictions to accredit programs. However, the Board recommend the establishment of a national body to provide national oversight of the quality across ITE programs. This is not a proposal for a national regulator, but a body whose purpose would be to address the structural differences resulting from eight different interpretations of the accreditation standards and 47 providers, their 309 programs, and 12 different TPAs.

With explicit Terms of Reference and line of sight directly to AESOC and then EMM, this national body would report and advise on quality issues including **a single national moderation** of TPAs, selection, agreed performance measures, and further refinement to core content to ensure graduate students can successfully know and do what's expected.

The establishment of a national oversight body would enable national quality assurance of ITE programs. For example, the body would ensure all TPAs remain rigorous and valid by strengthening the existing Expert Advisory Group (EAG). In line with the strengthened EAG, associated strategies would be implemented including a robust system of Cross Institutional Moderation incorporating benchmarking, setting conditions on the continuing approval of TPAs and a single national moderation of all TPAs. AITSL has heard from stakeholders that such a body could be formed with representation similar to the Australian Teacher Workforce Data (ATWD) Oversight Board, with its own explicit and all-ministers endorsed Terms of Reference, chaired by an Australian Education Senior Officials Committee (AESOC) member. This could be facilitated through the Statement of Expectations required for Action 5 of NTWAP.

Throughout the Discussion paper recommendations are made to amend individual Program Standards. For example, the changes recommended to implement core content identify Program Standards 1 and 4, without considering the impact on Standard 2 and its effect on program (re)design. A more thorough review of the Standards and Procedures would be more likely to give effect to the intent of the TEEP recommendations and be less likely to have unintended consequences. This would signify a welcomed departure from the previous practice of making incremental changes to the Standards and Procedures.

AITSL strongly recommends that the Standards and Procedures are revised in the context of a **strengthened authorising environment**. Without such a change, the reforms described in the Discussion paper are likely to be subject to inadequate and inconsistent implementation.

In the context of the strategic goals of NTWAP to attract, train and retain teachers, the Discussion paper focuses primarily on strategies to “train” classroom ready teachers. Action 8 of NTWAP requires the Panel to “recommend ways to boost graduation rates”. It is essential that a focus on attracting people through to graduation is given equivalent emphasis in the Panel’s final report to ministers.

Finally, it is worth highlighting that the implementation and establishment of the Standards and Procedures represents a successful collaboration between all involved in the eco-system of Education, including teachers, ITE providers, Teacher Regulatory Authorities (TRA), jurisdictional governments and employers, and the Australian government. Program accreditation is embedded in the work of ITE providers and TRAs and is regarded as a respected expectation of the teaching profession. This history of collaboration together with an explicit authorising environment provides a solid foundation for the further reform sought in this paper.

Summary of recommendations

This response proposes that the following recommendations be implemented to achieve the structural changes required to address the questions raised in the Discussion Paper:

Reform Area 1

1. Further explore the:
 - a. nature and specificity of core content,
 - b. relationship of core content to the Graduate Teacher Standards (GTS).
2. AITSL to undertake a review of the Standards and Procedures.
3. AITSL to undertake a review of the Teacher Standards.

Reform Area 2

4. Instruct the ATWD Oversight Board to identify, collect and analyse key metrics to measure the performance of ITE programs against each category, including using the TPA as a key metric for measuring classroom readiness.
5. Strengthen the authorising environment to allow changes to the Standards and Procedures to support the implementation of performance measures.
6. Implement a **single national moderation process** for TPAs, with consequences (see **Attachment C** for proposed national moderation activities).
7. Explore changes to accreditation processes to allow for the linking of program accreditation and performance to funding.
8. Establish a Teacher Education Quality Oversight Body.

Reform Area 3

9. Instruct AITSL as part of a broader review of the Standards and Procedures to:
 - a. review the program standards to allow for flexible placements that meet varied and diverse professional experience placement (PeX) needs including employment based and condensed programs
 - b. revise the Accreditation Guidelines to require stronger integration between what is taught in programs and what is practiced during PeX.
10. Develop and implement a structured approach to address the needs and concerns of supervising teachers, such as workload issues and mismatched partnerships through a complete revision of the Standards and Procedures and the development of mentoring standards.
11. Define stronger national expectations for supervising teachers when supporting pre-service Teachers (PSTs).

Reform Area 4

12. Review and change Program Standard 5, as part of a wider review of the Standards and Procedures, to ensure each jurisdictional approach to Alternative Authorisation to Teach (AAT) aligns with the Standard's supervision and assessment requirements for the GTS (where relevant).
13. Promote the implementation of market-driven approaches to ITE, which enable teacher-employers to procure multiple fast-tracked and employment-based programs at scale, and associated supports for schools and ITE students' transition that promote retention.
14. Maintain the two-year **equivalent** Masters degree as the appropriate qualification level for postgraduate ITE students, while promoting the wider adoption of fast-tracked and employment-based programs with condensed time for studies and earlier employment.

1. Reform area one: Strengthen ITE programs to deliver effective, classroom ready graduates

1.1 Establishing core content in ITE programs

The AITSL Board supports the concept of core content for ITE programs. The nature of that core content requires further exploration and consultation. There will be diverse views about the specific nature and content of evidence-based core content. It is vital that decisions regarding the core content are carefully considered and subject to robust debate. During these discussions, it is important to consider the balance between core content and the requirements for program flexibility, particularly considering the recent growth of employment-based programs.

1.2 Implications for the Standards and Procedures

The proposed core content for all ITE programs requires a number of changes to the Standards and Procedures, and potentially, the GTS. In line with the broader recommendations of this paper, a complete review of the Standards and Procedures is proposed to arrest the pattern of ongoing incremental changes.

The need for a major review of the Standards and Procedures is illustrated in the proposals for changes to the Standards and Procedures described in the core content section. The paper proposes standalone changes to Programs Standards 1 and 4, covering program outcomes, structure and content, to support its core content. However, the amount and type of core content requires more extensive changes throughout Standards 1 to 5. For example, it would make sense for *effective pedagogical practices* for literacy, numeracy and student support to be linked to existing Program Standards on the Literacy and Numeracy Test for Initial Teacher Education Students (LANTITE) and TPAs. The extent of changes also has implications for Standard 2 and its focus on program design.

1.3 Core content and the Graduate Teacher Standards

The Standards and Procedures require each GTS to be taught, practised and assessed, but are not specific enough about teaching practices and the evidence pre-service teachers are required to demonstrate to support the approach to core content in the discussion paper¹.

The core content described in the Reform Area 1 does not cover all the GTS and applies greater weight to some areas of the Standards. A risk with implementing the proposed core content is that a select group of GTS are prioritised over others, with implications for the Standards as a whole and more widely. For example, TPAs currently assess specific GTS chosen by providers that will not overlap with all of those described in Reform Area 1 and/or how they may be weighted. For this reason, all TPAs would need to be redeveloped and re-endorsed by the EAG to ensure they only assess specific GTS, teaching practices and types of evidence in a nationally consistent way.

In addition to this, more prescriptiveness for specific GTS could displace curriculum knowledge and some subject-specific content from ITE programs. This includes, but is not limited to, established teaching methods and assessments tied to different curricula and subject-specific content. These issues are best resolved through a wider review of the Standards and Procedures *and* the Teacher Standards, as opposed to overlaying the proposed reforms on top of current settings.

The implementation of core content need not imply an actual curriculum document. Another strategy to achieve the same goal is the development and promulgation of module outlines. For example, in 2020, AITSL contracted Macquarie University to develop three sample ITE program outlines to support Program Standard 4.2. The outlines provide examples of how ITE providers can meet the requirements in the Standards and Procedures to strengthen graduate teachers' capacity to teach reading instruction, by addressing evidence-based practice across the following elements: phonemic

¹ The only exception is Program Standard 4.2, which requires specific evidence-based practices in the teaching of literacy to be included in ITE programs covering primary and birth to eight years of age.

awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension and oral language. The program outlines can be found at <https://www.aitsl.edu.au/tools-resources/resource/sample-initial-teacher-education-program-outlines-reading-instruction>.

1.4 Recommendations to support reform area one

1. Further explore the:
 - a. nature and proposed content of core content for ITE programs,
 - b. relationship of the core content to the Graduate Teacher Standards.
2. AITSL to undertake a review of the Standards and Procedures.
3. AITSL to undertake a review of the Teacher Standards.

2. Reform area two: Strengthening the link between performance and funding of ITE

The performance categories in the Discussion paper require clarity on the purpose and use of the proposed metrics as well as an explanation regarding the omission of some data sources. It is unclear why the TPA has not been included as the defining measure for classroom readiness, particularly given the Panel is required to use measures such as the TPA to strength the link between performance and funding of ITE (NTWAP, page 14). Building on the success of TPAs seems sensible, acknowledging that further refinement and tightening is required.

There is also an opportunity for detailed consideration of how the ATWD can be best utilised to support the implementation of performance measures.

To enable a strengthened link between performance and funding of ITE, all ITE providers must be able to demonstrate, at a nationally consistent level, that their ITE graduates are 'classroom ready'.

The AITSL Board previously recommended (in its submission to the Quality Initial Teacher Education Review) that performance measures are identified to evaluate classroom readiness, create a profile of a successful ITE program and determine the quality of a program. Changes are required to Program Standard 1 (outcomes) and Program Standard 6 (evaluation, reporting and improvement) in the Standards and Procedures for this reform area to succeed. AITSL has drafted an initial proposal of measures that can be considered to measure the performance of ITE (**Attachment A**).

In support of this work, AITSL suggests that TEEP consider research on Massachusetts' reviews of ITE providers and their performance (Comb, M., Cowan, J., Goldhaber, D., Jin, Z., & Theobald, R., 2022). The research uses multiple measures drawn from ITE providers, teacher performance and value-added for teacher effectiveness to determine scores that act as predictors of graduates' (and student) performance once in the classroom. **Attachment B** shows how the criterion level ratings of different domains of program review are related to one another.

The research also identifies important caveats for performance measures, including graduate sorting and select-type biases, which TEEP should consider due to the potential for funding implications for ITE providers based on performance.

AITSL has heard from stakeholders that there is significant, rich research not referred to in the Discussion paper that would benefit the work of TEEP and the acceptance of its final report.

2.1 Implications for the Standards and Procedures

The TPA is a hallmark outcome of TEMAG and is the most robust measure of classroom readiness. It should be used to measure a program's performance and impact. TPA outcomes are essential to measuring a program/provider's performance. Concerns over the potential variability of outcomes between TPAs can be addressed through the national moderation and benchmarking of TPAs.

Strengthening the authorising environment to allow for changes to the Standards and Procedures is also required to support the use of performance measures. These changes would allow for national

moderation of TPAs, with consequences for providers using TPAs that do not assess graduates to the nationally agreed standard. Moderation activities can confirm the comparability of passing standards across TPAs, ensuring that completion rates can be a true and equal measure of classroom readiness. In collaboration with the EAG, AITSL has identified required changes to enable national moderation of TPAs (**Appendix C**).

Further changes to the Standards and Procedures may allow for greater use of performance measures in the accreditation of ITE programs. A strengthened authorising environment may allow for the refinement of accreditation processes, requiring accreditation panels to focus more on evidence-based practices (inputs) into ITE programs and performance measures (outputs). These changes may also allow for tighter quality assurance, oversight and transparency in ITE. Program accreditation outcomes and performance measures may also be used to support funding changes such as transition funding.

These proposed changes and a strengthened authorising environment would be further enhanced by implementing a national Teacher Education Quality Oversight Body (TEQOB) (as noted in 1.4.1 of the Discussion Paper).

2.2 Establishing a national Teacher Education Quality Oversight Body (TEQOB)

In the response to the Quality Initial Teacher Education Review, the AITSL Board proposed the establishment of a national TEQOB.

TEQOB would be established to independently monitor, evaluate, and report on the quality of all ITE programs along with overseeing the quality of TPAs and entry to ITE.

It is proposed that the body be established as a joint initiative between state and territory governments and the Australian Government. The composition of the body would include a chair and at least 8 members. Membership would be decided by Education Ministers based on a skills matrix including experts from AITSL, TRAs, teacher educators and deans, employers and principals, Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency and the Australian Children's Education & Care Quality Authority. Additionally, there is scope for the membership and functions of the TPA EAG to be absorbed into TEQOB. The body would operate under a set of clearly defined Terms of Reference.

TRAs would retain their legislative power to accredit ITE programs under the proposed body.

The body would:

- report annually to TRAs and Education Ministers
- provide updates on its activities
- publish the outcomes on the reviews into the quality of ITE programs, and evaluations on any specific areas of concern
- seek further information from providers
- report publicly on all activity in an annual report.

2.3 Recommendations to support reform area two

4. Instruct the ATWD Oversight Board to identify, collect and analyse key metrics to measure the performance of ITE programs against each category, including using the TPA as a key metric for measuring classroom readiness.
5. Strengthen the authorising environment to allow changes to the Standards and Procedures to support the implementation of performance measures.
6. Implement a **single national moderation** process for TPAs, with consequences (see **Attachment C** for proposed national moderation activities).

7. Explore changes to accreditation processes to allow for the linking of program accreditation and performance to funding.
8. Establish a Teacher Education Quality Oversight Body.

3. Reform area three: Improving the quality of practical experience in teaching

3.1 Implications for the Standards and Procedures

As currently implemented, Program Standard 5 may function as a barrier to providing PeX that better meet the needs of preservice teachers who are entering from diverse entry points. The most significant barrier for placements occur when a PST is currently employed under AAT and is reluctant or unable to leave their employment to complete a placement in another setting. Further impacts of AAT as discussed in sections 3.2 and 4.2 of this paper.

Reform area 3 provides further scope for AITSL to amend the Standards and Procedures and Accreditation Guidelines to require stronger integration between what is taught in a program and what is practiced during placements. In addition, there is a role for AITSL to create a national framework for quality professional experience placements. TEQOB, as identified in section 2.2 of this paper, could play a role in monitoring and reporting on the quality of placements.

While the proposal for system-level agreements is linked to Program Standard 5.1, TEEP has focused on how employers and regulators partner with providers and schools to support quality PeX placements. Strengthening and tightening PS 5.1 will allow for stronger expectations for partnerships between providers and schools.

AITSL can also provide guidance on ensuring supervising teachers provide structured support to PSTs during placement. However, AITSL is not in a position to determine if and how financial incentives can be used to ensure supervising teachers have the time and capacity to provide quality support.

3.2 Supervising teachers and Professional Experience

The Discussion paper notes the impact of supervising teacher workloads on quality professional experience placements and the implications for increasing numbers of pre-service teachers who are employed under AAT and conditional accreditation.

The Discussion paper recognises the increase in supervising teacher workloads, and associated issues regarding capacities and capabilities. Further, the paper notes that many teachers “do not feel they have the time to mentor ITE students beyond their existing teaching demands” (p 55).

The workload issues may result, in part, from mismatched partnerships and varying quality of supervision and support provided by teachers. AITSL is undertaking two projects designed to support a more structured approach to addressing supervising teachers’ concerns over workloads and the time it takes to provide meaningful and high-quality support to PSTs. In the first instance, AITSL is leading *NTWAP Action 14 Develop national guidelines to support early career teachers and new school leaders including mentoring and induction* (Action 14).

Secondly, after the completion of Action 14, AITSL will explore the development of national standards for mentoring/supervising pre-service teachers. The purpose of the standards is to make explicit the skills, knowledge, attributes, and expectations required of teachers to support pre-service teachers. The broader strategic goal of the standards is to embed the role of supporting pre-service teachers in the career pathway of teachers.

AITSL proposed the development of mentoring standards following the completion of an [Environmental Scan of Mentoring Programs](#). The Scan identified that there are mentoring programs operating for pre-service and early-career teachers across most states and territories. There is, however, considerable variation in the expectations of mentors, their role, the mentoring processes expected, the pre-requisite experiences and qualities, the training available and the resources to

support them. Effectively this range creates a disparity in mentoring experiences for pre-service and early career teachers, leading to variation in the rate of development of their teaching quality and effectiveness.

Through the analysis of mentoring programs in high performing jurisdictions, the Scan identified the characteristics of mentoring programs required to provide high quality effective support to new practitioners.

3.3 Recommendations for to support reform area three

9. Instruct AITSL as part of a broader review of the Standards and Procedures to:
 - a. review the program standards to allow for flexible placements that meet varied and diverse PeX needs including employment based and condensed programs
 - b. revise the Accreditation Guidelines to require stronger integration between what is taught in programs and what is practised during PeX.
10. Develop and implement a structured approach to address the needs and concerns of supervising teachers, such as workload issues and mismatched partnerships through a complete revision of the Standards and Procedures and the development of mentoring standards.
11. Define stronger national expectations using Highly Accomplished and Lead teachers to support supervising teachers and their schools in the implementation of PeX.

4. Reform area four: Improving postgraduate ITE for mid-career entrants

4.1 Proposal for a national success framework

The Discussion paper proposes a national framework to assess the success of mid-career changer programs and coordinate alternative 'regulatory arrangements' with TRAs to fast-track mid-career changers into the classroom.

It is unclear how a framework could be used to share and reinforce the success (or otherwise) of such programs. This is because the proposed performance measures and funding changes will provide greater incentives and will be a more authoritative measure of ITE program quality than the proposed framework. There are also issues of fairness with promoting certain programs over others in a framework without addressing other supports that help to ensure their success, such as scholarships and targeted funding for schools.

4.2 Addressing issues related to Alternative Authorisation to Teach

There is a clear connection in the TEEP paper between alternative regulatory arrangements ²and fast-tracking mid-career changers into the classroom. The application of AAT is emphasised in NTWAP Action 5 with its focus on resolving issues associated with AAT, conditional (accreditation) or provisional teacher registration.

Every jurisdiction is experiencing increased use of AAT. The regulatory arrangements that govern AAT differs across each jurisdiction in Australia. In NSW, Conditional Accreditation is a form of registration that is awarded to the teacher and is not limited to a specific employer or school setting. In other jurisdictions, AAT is a form of permission or limited authority to teach that is restricted to a particular school setting and is governed by specific requirements. Traditionally, these arrangements were used to address short-term absences of teachers in specific subject areas. However, the current teacher shortage is stretching the application of these arrangements.

The AAT allows PSTs to begin their teaching career before graduating and increasingly, prior to their final placement. This has led to significant challenges in ensuring PSTs and providers are meeting the requirements for professional experience under Program Standard 5 of the Standards and

² Referred to in this paper as Alternative Authorisation to Teach (AAT).

Procedures. In many instances, experienced teachers are obliged to undertake some of the responsibilities of PSTs (on AAT) to enable them to complete their program. This increases the workload of supervising teachers.

A major challenge is the requirement for PSTs to take leave, most likely unpaid, from their employment to complete their required placements in another school setting. As mentioned in the previous section, this is an area that requires changes to rules around PeX to minimise the potential negative impacts of AAT. AITSL can suggest potential changes to the Standards and Procedures to support these alternative regulatory arrangements without disrupting program requirements.

4.3 Implementing market-driven approaches to ITE

The AITSL Board supports the expansion of market driven approaches to address teacher shortages and encourage mid-career changers into teaching inclusive of all teacher employers. The procurement approach involves teacher-employers, working with ITE providers to procure programs that:

- address specific geographic and subject areas teacher shortages, such as STEM and regional and remote schools, and
- fast-track teachers' studies and their employment.

Under a market driven approach, a teacher employer could procure a two-year equivalent postgraduate ITE program that fast-tracks 12 – 18 months of professional studies in education. It could also procure programs that include 6-12 month paid internships/residencies to fast-track students' employment towards the end of their studies. These programs are variously referred to as being 'fast-tracked' and 'employment-based' but should not be confused with scholarships for existing programs. This model can also be applied in the final year of an undergraduate ITE qualification.

Victoria has a well-developed market driven approach to ITE. Starting in 2020, the Victorian Department of Education initiated a process for ITE providers to submit proposals for innovative programs in response to forecast increases in demand for school and early childhood teachers. An important objective for the initiative was overall increases in student numbers, including in hard-to-staff and priority areas, which ensured scalability was prioritised at the outset. If such initiatives are not scalable, they risk ongoing teacher shortages and equity issues.

Victoria's initiative is in its third year and now includes three innovative ITE programs at the early childhood level, in addition to eight existing secondary level programs. Students can also receive scholarships and assistance with relocation costs for certain programs and placements, while schools can receive targeted funding for casual relief teachers and other purposes. Such types of targeted support increase the likelihood of success for these programs, their placements, and students transition into teaching more than any single intervention or initiative could deliver on its own. Other states and territories have also adopted similar supports to encourage uptake of their programs.

In terms of scale, New South Wales is the next largest with its FASTStream, Mid-Career Transition to Teaching and Grow Your Own programs. A pilot of Teach for Australia, which operates in a number of jurisdictions, will also run in New South Wales public schools in 2024. However, as states and territories increasingly deploy similar initiatives and types of support, a key challenge will be to ensure that teacher supply issues and students are not simply moved between jurisdictions – with little to no real or 'net' impact on teacher supply.

4.4 The length and structure of postgraduate qualifications

Finally, the Discussion paper comments on proposals to return to one year post graduate teacher education programs. The current economic environment with high employment is seemingly not conducive to attracting people into the teaching profession. However, economic cycles of high employment and teacher shortages have occurred before and it is particularly important during these times to retain the elements of teacher education that adequately prepare people to be teachers.

In line with the overall success of the Standards and Procedures and the resultant professionalisation of the teaching profession, the AITSL Board supports the conclusion in the Discussion paper that: “a Masters degree [remains] the appropriate qualification level to provide postgraduate ITE students with the appropriate level of pedagogical, disciplinary, content and practical knowledge”. The models discussed in 4.3 can offset the impact of a longer program (in terms of full-time equivalent study) on teacher supply and the willingness of PSTs to enroll.

AITSL recommends the expansion of flexible delivery options to reduce the financial barriers of post graduate study.

These include employment based and/or condensed Masters models.

a. Employment based models

These models use different combinations of academic study with employment. They allow employers to have earlier access to a teaching cohort and enables students to access structured on-the-job training. These options provide an opportunity for students to be paid either through AAT or as a paraprofessional.

The models require support and resources from providers and employers. As noted previously, revisions to the Standards and Procedures, particularly in relation to the requirements for professional experience would reduce some of the barriers to implementation. In addition, the GTS could better describe the Standards best suited to academic delivery and those best suited to workplace delivery. These options can be used in combination with AAT in all jurisdictions, noting that the proposed amendments to the Standards and Procedures will better support this option.

There is also a pathway for people with an honours degree in a cognate discipline such as Education to enrol in a one-year Master’s program. Although the numbers may be small, this is an attractive pathway for some students.

b. Condensed Masters models

These models compress two years of equivalent full-time study into 15 – 18 months’ duration. A number of these programs already exist for specific cohorts. The programs are intense and require preservice teachers to undertake a summer trimester but can benefit some students and employers. This option would be assisted by a review of the Standards and Procedures and Teacher Standards to better recognise and support employment-based pathways.

4.5 Recommendations to support reform area four

12. Review and change Program Standard 5, as part of a wider review of the Standards and Procedures, to ensure each jurisdictional approach to Alternative Authorisation to Teach aligns with the Standard’s supervision and assessment requirements for the Graduate Teacher Standards (where relevant).
13. Promote better implementation of market-driven approaches to ITE that enable teacher-employers to procure multiple fast-tracked and employment-based programs at scale, and associated supports for schools and for ITE students’ transition that promote retention.
14. Maintain the two-year equivalent Masters degree as the appropriate qualification level for postgraduate ITE students, while promoting the wider adoption of fast-tracked and employment-based programs with condensed studies and/or earlier employment.

Attachments

A. Table of metrics and data sources

| Data | Source | Availability |
|--|---|---|
| ITE Student data per provider (program data) | | |
| Student enrolment numbers | TCSI/ATWD | Yes |
| Student perceptions of ITE Courses for ITE students in varying program types (Teaching Quality, and Overall Quality) | ATWD / Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT - survey) for ITE graduates linked to ITE tertiary Collection of Student Information Data (TCSI) data | Yes |
| Graduate Employment Outcomes (% of those working full time or part time in schools) | ATWD / QILT survey data for ITE graduates linked to ITE program (HESDC) | Yes |
| Basis of admission and percentage of those with ATAR > 70 (from those admitted with ATARs) | from those admitted with ATAR (TCSI) for all those with a recorded ATAR - ATWD linked to outcomes - ATWD | Yes |
| UG Completions after 6 years – completion numbers and rates | TCSI/ATWD | Yes |
| Post graduate completions | TCSI/ATWD | Yes |
| TPA completions and pass/fail rates by jurisdiction | AITSL Annual reporting | Yes Update would be required to get pass/fail data per ITE Provider ³ |
| LANTITE avg number of attempts and pass/fail rate per provider | TBC | TBC ⁴ |
| Graduate program satisfaction | ATWD / QILT survey data for ITE graduates linked to ITE (HESDC) | Yes |
| Percentage of graduates who gain provisional registration | ATWD – ITE data linked to registration data | Yes |
| Percentage of graduates who are registered or gain approval to teach before completion | ATWD - ITE data linked to registration data, e.g., conditional accreditation or permission to teach. | Yes |
| Percentage of graduates who become employed as teachers | ATWD – ITE data linked to registration data QILT | Yes Yes |
| Graduate data (outcomes) | | |

³ AITSL to liaise with TRAs to access data

⁴ A proof-of-concept study would need to be done to get this data.

| Data | Source | Availability |
|--|--|---|
| Percentage of provisional teachers who move to full registration within 2 years | ATWD | Yes |
| Employment outcomes and status of graduates in first 5 years of teaching | ATWD QILT and ATWD Survey linked to ITE data | Yes |
| Geographical spread of graduate employment | ATWD Survey linked to ITE data | Yes |
| Subject and stage spread of graduate employment | ATWD Survey linked to ITE data | Yes |
| Percentage of graduates who remain registered teachers and in teaching for 5 or more years | ATWD survey | Yes |
| Induction experience for prov registered teachers – early career teachers in first five years | ATWD Survey | Yes |
| Employer satisfaction data | QILT survey data ATWD – linked to ITE program | Yes |
| School leader's views on prov registered teachers' preparedness for teaching | ATWD | No Additional question required in ATWD Teacher survey |
| Graduate quality and preparedness for teaching | ATWD | No |
| Teaching out of field | ATWD | Yes– current analysis provisional and in development |
| Further education pathways for teachers plus rationale | TCSI ATWD | No Yes – ATWD would need to be expanded to collected data on pathways into ITE – e.g., Teach for Australia |
| Additional Provider data | | |
| TPA National Standard Setting outcome (TPA does/does not meet national standard) | AITSL | TBC ⁵ |
| Implementation of changes to the accreditation standards and procedures, such as reading instruction during an accreditation cycle | AITSL Annual Reporting | TBC ¹ |

¹ AITSL to liaise with TRAs to access data

⁵ AITSL is the custodian of the Standards and Procedures. AITSL needs the authorisation to amend the Standards and Procedures to conduct standard setting to collect this data.

B. Table from *State Ratings of Educator Preparation Programs: Connecting Program Review to Teacher Effectiveness*. Comb, M., Cowan, J., Goldhaber, D., Jin, Z., & Theobald, R., 2021

| Domain | Criteria | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | C7 | C8 |
|-------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| The Organization | Organizational structure demonstrates sufficient capacity to carry out responsibility and decision making for educator preparation programs. | 0.215 | 0.180 | 0.093 | 0.130 | 0.033 | -0.262 | -0.023 | -0.021 |
| | Systems/structures that support collaboration within departments and across disciplines improve candidate preparation. | 0.489 | -0.143 | 0.062 | -0.091 | 0.129 | 0.007 | 0.164 | -0.109 |
| | Budget supports ongoing sustainability and allocates resources according to organizational goals. | 0.121 | 0.243 | 0.194 | -0.154 | -0.011 | -0.042 | 0.178 | 0.041 |
| | All candidates, regardless of program or delivery model, have equitable and consistent access to resources. | -0.004 | 0.156 | -0.182 | 0.567 | -0.011 | -0.136 | 0.091 | 0.021 |
| | Recruitment, selection, and evaluation processes result in the hiring and retention of effective faculty and staff. | 0.374 | 0.019 | -0.092 | 0.195 | 0.221 | -0.197 | 0.023 | 0.068 |
| | Faculty/instructors and staff engage in professional development and work in the field that has clear application to preparing effective educators. | -0.007 | 0.327 | 0.191 | -0.136 | 0.196 | -0.018 | 0.102 | -0.251 |
| Partnerships | Partners make contributions that inform Sponsoring Organization's continuous improvement efforts. | 0.038 | -0.002 | 0.461 | 0.020 | -0.395 | -0.077 | -0.028 | -0.013 |
| | Partnerships improve experience for preparation candidates and outcomes for PK–12 students. | 0.043 | 0.012 | 0.081 | 0.489 | -0.037 | 0.239 | -0.123 | -0.092 |
| | Sponsoring Organization responds to district/school needs through focused recruitment, enrollment, retention, and employment (e.g., placement agreement with local district) efforts. | -0.043 | -0.008 | 0.435 | 0.199 | -0.140 | -0.102 | -0.045 | 0.245 |
| | Sponsoring Organizations evaluate partnerships on an ongoing basis, sustain those that are effective, and take steps to improve those that are not. | 0.162 | 0.225 | 0.050 | -0.145 | -0.198 | 0.317 | -0.190 | 0.024 |
| Continuous Improvement | The consistent and ongoing use of internal and external evidence, including elementary and secondary education data, informs strategic decisions that impact the Sponsoring Organization, the education programs, candidates, and employing organizations. | -0.196 | 0.637 | -0.129 | 0.097 | 0.027 | -0.063 | 0.004 | -0.077 |
| | Sponsoring Organization acts on feedback solicited from internal and external stakeholders (including candidates, graduates, district and school personnel and employers) in continuous improvement efforts. | 0.359 | 0.097 | -0.104 | 0.101 | 0.016 | 0.146 | -0.117 | -0.029 |
| Candidate | Recruitment efforts yield a diverse candidate pool. | -0.185 | 0.144 | 0.039 | -0.017 | 0.286 | 0.241 | 0.153 | 0.317 |
| | Admission criteria and processes are rigorous such that those admitted demonstrate success in the program and during employment in a licensure role. | 0.070 | 0.016 | 0.071 | 0.105 | 0.446 | 0.141 | -0.027 | 0.228 |
| | Candidates at risk of not meeting standards are identified throughout the program (in pre-practicum, during coursework, and while in practicum) and receive necessary supports and guidance to improve or exit. | 0.240 | 0.052 | -0.022 | -0.007 | 0.597 | -0.019 | -0.146 | 0.006 |
| | Waiver policy ensures that academic and professional standards of the licensure role are met. | 0.004 | -0.031 | -0.022 | 0.005 | -0.092 | 0.078 | 0.776 | -0.041 |
| Field-Based Experiences | Practicum hours meet regulatory requirements as per 603 CMR 7.04 (4). | 0.021 | -0.089 | 0.005 | -0.094 | 0.072 | -0.158 | -0.024 | 0.812 |
| | District partners are involved in the design, implementation, and assessment of field-based experiences. | -0.001 | -0.102 | 0.609 | -0.078 | 0.064 | -0.072 | -0.018 | -0.031 |
| | Responsibilities in field-based experiences build to candidate readiness for full responsibility in licensure role. | 0.585 | -0.270 | 0.010 | -0.061 | 0.084 | 0.181 | -0.015 | 0.082 |
| | Candidates participate in field-based experiences that cover the full academic year. | 0.101 | -0.016 | -0.109 | 0.047 | 0.044 | 0.745 | 0.106 | -0.153 |
| | Field-based experiences are embedded in program coursework. | 0.133 | 0.031 | -0.037 | 0.127 | -0.326 | 0.132 | 0.483 | 0.100 |
| | Supervising Practitioners and Program Supervisors receive training, support, and development from the Sponsoring Organization that impacts candidate effectiveness. | -0.125 | 0.508 | -0.026 | 0.026 | 0.056 | 0.118 | -0.091 | 0.006 |
| | Field-based experiences are in settings with diverse learners (e.g., students from diverse ethnic, racial, gender, socioeconomic, and exceptional groups). | -0.108 | -0.135 | 0.279 | 0.473 | 0.148 | 0.108 | 0.047 | -0.224 |

C. Proposed national moderation and standard setting for TPAs

1. Authorising environment and national standard setting

AITSL needs the authority to amend the Accreditation of initial teacher education programs: Standards and Procedures. This will enable the EAG to make any changes to maximise the validity of TPAs. A strengthened authorising environment will enable the EAG to:

- implement an endorsement period for TPAs
- require evidence of the ongoing validity of the TPA through biennial reporting
- develop and implement a national standard setting exercise to determine whether the standard of performance representing *borderline satisfactory* in a TPA is consistent across all institutions
- impose conditions and consequences for providers that do not demonstrate that their TPA is consistent with the standard of performance representing *borderline satisfactory* after the national standards setting exercise.

2. Levers that emerge from Standard Setting

2.1 Options for TPAs that do not demonstrate the consistent borderline satisfactory standard of performance

- An initial recommendation is made to the provider to join a TPA that does meet the consistent borderline satisfactory level of performance (preferably one of the two consortia/collective)
- If providers choose not to join a TPA, their endorsement period is extended for 12 months to refine their TPA and resubmit to the EAG
- If providers still do not meet the EAG requirements and refuse to join another TPA, then the EAG will formally recommend that the provider loses their endorsement status.

2.2 Biennial reporting for ongoing endorsement of TPAs

The Standards and Procedures should be amended to require submissions to the EAG every two years. Submissions should demonstrate that:

- effective measures are in place to ensure the TPAs are scored accurately across the whole of an institution's cohort (e.g., Marker training, check marking, double marking). The effectiveness of these measures should be illustrated by way of documented procedures, minutes of meetings and statistical data.
- a sound standard-setting procedure is in place to ensure that the standard of performance in the TPA corresponding to 'borderline satisfactory' has been established and exemplified by:
 - the task description
 - scoring rubrics
 - properly annotated student TPAs.
- Student performance in every future year is judged in accordance with the borderline satisfactory standard of performance.
- There is a program of review and evaluation during and after each cycle involving questionnaires and meetings to identify any improvements in the TPA and its administration.

The EAG may also request evidence of random sampling of providers within each collective/consortia.

2.3 Consequences for TPAs following the biennial submissions

- If the EAG is satisfied with the procedures described in the submission, providers continue to be endorsed.
- If the EAG is not satisfied, providers are given 12 months to meet the quality ongoing endorsement requirements outlined above. Following resubmission in 12 months, the EAG will make a formal recommendation about their endorsement status.