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Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of an evaluation of School Centres for Teaching Excellence (SCTE) initiatives introduced by the Victorian Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) during 2011. SCTEs are partnerships of universities and schools designed to establish leading practice in providing quality pre-service teacher education, continuing professional learning and research opportunities. The initiative was funded through the Smarter Schools National Partnership on Improving Teacher Quality.

Over 2011 and 2012, seven projects were conducted involving 65 government schools, six universities and an estimated 1,017 preservice teachers. Some universities (La Trobe University, University of Melbourne and Victoria University) were involved in two distinct projects.

SCTE objectives

The objectives of the SCTE initiative are:

1. to explore options for the delivery of pre-service teacher education with a school-based focus and the ways in which pre-service teachers are immersed in effective professional practice; and
2. to improve teaching practice and professional learning in schools by building stronger partnerships between schools and universities.

Key questions

The key questions to be addressed through the evaluation are:

1. Do the models adopted by the SCTEs enhance the operation and effectiveness of pre-service teacher education particularly through increased immersion in professional practice and establishment of strong school-university partnerships?
2. What are the implications to be drawn from this initiative for future directions in teacher education and workforce policy?

Findings from the case studies

During 2012, evaluation staff made numerous visits to each site, interviewed program participants, including university staff, project coordinators, school principals and staff, and preservice teachers. The aim of this work was to developing accurate and concise summaries of the models being developed in each of the seven SCTEs.

Evidence gathered during the case study phase of the evaluation established that SCTE programs have:

- enhanced and strengthened existing partnerships between groups of schools and university providers of teacher education.
- enabled new partnerships to be formed
- enabled the creation of formal partnerships between teacher education providers and schools in situations where previously there has been close but informal relationships
- enhanced and strengthened existing site-based or ‘clinical’ models of teacher education
- hastened the development of new site-based or ‘clinical’ models of teacher education
- brought about significant change in teacher education curriculum (e.g. Monash, Gippsland)
- enhanced and strengthened existing school curriculum
- facilitated more flexible co-operation between universities and schools.
Findings from the surveys of school principals

In late 2012, online surveys of school principals involved in SCTE schools were conducted. The questions posed asked them to compare the quality of the provision they were able to make for preservice teachers, and the outcomes they believed to have been achieved during the SCTE program and before its introduction.

Responses from the Principals indicated that, compared to previously, within the SCTE programs, they had been able to provide a more collegial and supportive environmental for PSTs. They valued the closer relationships their schools had developed with universities, and were confident that both the PSTs and the schools had benefited from these relationships.

With regard to questions relating to the capacity of their schools to sustain a program of this type into the future, principals expressed confidence that the demands that participation in SCTE made on their staff were manageable, and that their schools had the physical resources needed to support continued participation.

Principals were unanimous in wanting their schools to continue their partnerships with universities, although more than half of them expressed concern this may not be possible without some funding provision.

Findings from the surveys of PST mentors

Mentors of preservice teachers in SCTE schools were contacted by email in late 2012 and invited to participate in an online survey about their experience with SCTE. Mentors were generally positive in their assessment of the benefits of participation in SCTE programs, although not quite as overwhelmingly positive as Principals.

A clear majority of mentors rated their SCTE programs as better able to provide opportunities for preservice teachers to experience the daily life of a teacher; and to develop the knowledge and skills required to face their responsibilities as teachers. They believed they had been better able to provide support to PSTs and to develop ongoing relationships with them. Furthermore, mentors reported that PSTs had enjoyed greater levels of collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers.

Follow-up surveys of graduates

In June-July, 2013, online surveys were administered to 2011 and 2012 graduates of teacher preparation programs who had registered with the Victorian Institute of Teaching over the past two years. There were two target populations: graduates of programs from SCTE sites, and graduates from other teacher preparation programs in the same set of universities.

The items on the survey covered the extent to which PSTs believed they had been given:

- the necessary knowledge and understanding required of teachers
- the opportunity to practise classroom skills
- the opportunity to practise skills beyond the classroom
- the knowledge and skills necessary to face the professional responsibilities of a teacher
- feeling part of a well-supported school community

Responses were generally positive in all of these areas, but: SCTE participants gave a greater proportion of positive assessments than non-SCTE participants. And, generally, 2012 SCTE graduates gave a greater proportion of positive assessments than 2011 SCTE participants.

A substantial set of survey items was designed to assess the extent to which graduates believed they had been prepared to attain the seven standards set out in Accreditation of
Initial Teacher Education Programs in Australia – Standards and Procedures (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership, 2011).

Their responses demonstrated that, in relation to these Standards, graduates of 2012 SCTE programs rated their programs as more effective in preparing them to meet the Standards than did graduates of 2011 SCTE programs. Furthermore, graduates of both SCTE programs rated their programs as more effective in preparing them to meet the Standards than did graduates of other programs in the same universities.

Conclusions

There is no single SCTE model, although the programs introduced on all the SCTE sites had much in common – most importantly they involved partnerships between universities and schools, and arrangements that allowed PSTs to spend extended time in schools.

In spite of the differences among programs, the study has provided abundant evidence that, across the board, the SCTE programs, as implemented in this project had positive effects:

- data gathered through site visits, observations and interviews led to predominantly positive appraisals,
- surveys of mentors and school principals confirmed the conclusions arrived at through interviews and observations, and
- the survey of graduates, conducted in mid-2013, present undeniable evidence that the SCTE programs introduced in 2011-2012 led to greater success in achieving a substantial range of outcomes.

While different programs were generated on different sites, there was clear evidence of successful outcomes across the range of programs. Some factors identified as contributing to this success were:

- Genuine commitment and ‘buy in’ of university and school staff
- A shared vision between stakeholders, especially the school and the university
- Strong leadership
- Enabling contexts and good relationships among the school and university partners
- A person in a coordinating role who has strong links and a presence in both the university and the schools.
- A strong presence of university staff on school sites
- Opportunities for PSTs to become involved in a range of activities beyond the usual school lessons
- Recognition and celebration of achievements
- Dissemination of information about the programs
- Clarity about instructional models in schools and universities
- Flexibility to modify ITE courses
1 Introduction and Background

This report presents the findings of an evaluation of School Centres for Teaching Excellence (SCTEs) Initiatives introduced by the Victorian Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) during 2011. The evaluation project commenced in October 2011, and focuses on the implementation of the initiative during the 2012 year. A follow-up survey commenced in June, 2013, gathered data on the perceptions of graduates from the various SCTE programs, informed by up to one and a half years of employment as teachers.

Pilot SCTEs are partnerships of universities and schools designed to establish leading practice in providing quality pre-service teacher education, continuing professional learning and research opportunities. The initiative was funded through the Smarter Schools National Partnership on Improving Teacher Quality. During the period of the evaluation, seven pilot SCTEs were involved in the evaluation. One pilot SCTE was conducted under the auspices of the Country Education Project (CEP), and involves three universities (University of Ballarat, La Trobe University and University of Melbourne) and three locations (St Arnaud, Tallangatta and Mansfield/King Valley, respectively).

1.1 The Australian and Victorian context

The Victorian Parliamentary Inquiry into the Suitability of Pre-Service Teacher Training (Parliament of Victoria, 2005) strongly supported the principle that Pre Service Teachers (PSTs) should experience immersion in schools during their training in order to fully understand and appreciate the demands of teaching. The Inquiry Committee observed that universities could improve delivery of teacher education by developing partnerships with schools. It recommended that teacher education courses should pay greater attention to:

- Heightening knowledge of the practical dimensions of teaching among pre-service and new teachers
- Improving the integration of practical experience into the structure and substance of teacher education courses; and
- Modelling effective teaching practices during teacher education

In 2008 the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) introduced the Smarter Schools National Partnership on Improving Teacher Quality (TQNP). A priority reform under this initiative was to improve teacher education. Commonwealth funding was allocated to the establishment of pilot centres in which universities and schools would set up leading practice partnerships according to evidence-based principles. In recent years, and even before the TQNP funding was made available, several Australian universities developed teacher education programs based on a ‘residency’ or ‘partnership’ model that encouraged PSTs to become part of a school community and develop ongoing relationships with their mentor teachers and other teachers at the school. In these models PSTs spend extended periods of time in schools so that they can experience the daily life of a teacher, learn to deal with everyday classroom situations of discipline and instruction and develop new understandings of their academic work that are grounded in practice. Such models mark a fundamental shift away from the idea of a mentor teacher as a ‘supervisor’ who merely observes the PST for short periods and offers helpful hints, towards that of a teacher-educator who shares with university staff full responsibility for the professional learning and development of the PSTs in their care. This clearly places new and major responsibilities on schools and mentors.
In 2011, the federal government through the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) launched the Standards and Procedures for the Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia.

The AITSL Program Standards strengthen the role played by school partners in teacher education programs. Program Standard 5: ‘School partnerships’, stipulates that providers of teacher education programs should establish ‘enduring school partnerships’, to deliver their programs, particularly the professional experience component. It calls for at least 80 days of professional experience in schools, and requires that providers provide detailed descriptions of planned experiences and related assessment criteria and methods, together with the supervisory and professional support arrangements. There is also a requirement that teachers supervising professional experience are suitably qualified and registered and receive appropriate support in coaching, mentoring and making judgements about whether the graduate standards have been achieved. (AITSL, 2011, p. 16).

From 2013, all teacher education programs seeking accreditation or re accreditation will participate in the national accreditation process.

1.2 Towards Victoria as a Learning Community (TVLC) and New Directions (ND)

The State of Victoria’s (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development) position paper, Towards Victoria as a Learning Community was released in November 2012. It followed the discussion paper New Directions for School Leadership and the Teaching Profession, released in June 2012. These papers set out the Victorian government’s vision and plans for a ‘third wave’ of school reform marked by local responsibility for system improvement complemented by rigorous accountability arrangements. Highlights include targeted improvements in all areas of school operations and governance, partnerships with a range of stakeholders, and improved access to quality, evidence based resources and support. Although the SCTE was designed and implemented before the introduction of these papers it is consistent with their content.

The recently released From New Directions to Action: World class teaching and school leadership (October 2013), articulates the Victorian government’s vision for teaching, fostered through career-long learning and development. Initial Teacher Education (ITE) is a major focus. One action to achieve the vision is the establishment of five new Teaching Academies for Professional Practice (Academies). This action builds on the strong evidence of the impact of School Centres for Teaching Excellence on pre-service education delivery in schools and universities.

1.3 History of SCTE

School Centres for Teaching Excellence (SCTE) is Victoria’s response to the national TQNP plan. It was developed with the aid of TQNP funding on the basis of lessons learned from successful examples of teacher education programs in Australia and overseas, several of which are documented in the review of the literature (Chapter 2 of this document). All of these examples emphasise the importance of longer term practicum placements for teachers, the closer involvement of schools and mentor teachers in the education of PSTs and the importance of integrating theory with practice.

In 2009 the DEECD supported a pilot program in which the University of Melbourne, in partnership with approximately 25 schools, delivered a Masters level teacher education program (the ‘M.Teach’). Following encouraging feedback from schools and a positive
The first intake for the SCTE pilot program occurred at the end of 2010, the second at the start of 2011. In 2012/13 there were seven SCTE Centres involved in the pilot program in Melbourne and rural Victoria. Each Centre consisted of a cluster of schools and one or more university. Across the Centres there were 65 schools, six universities, and 1,000 PSTs. Funding of $1.8 million was shared across the Centres.

According to information provided by the DEECD, the pilot program aimed to strengthen school-university partnerships in order to:

- Improve initial teacher education and the capacity of pre-service teacher to enter the profession
- Immerse pre-service teachers in school environments exhibiting leading professional practice, enabling them to better integrate theory with practice
- Increase the capacity in schools to provide effective practicum to pre-service teachers
- Improve the practice of current teachers
- Demonstrate, develop and share high quality teaching practice
- Increase research capacity of teachers and schools (DEECD, 2012).

### 1.4 SCTE Objectives

The initiative’s objectives are:

- to explore options for the delivery of pre-service teacher education with a school-based focus and the ways in which pre-service teachers are immersed in effective professional practice; and
- to improve teaching practice and professional learning in schools by building stronger partnerships between schools and universities.

The evaluation commenced in October 2011 and continued until June 2013.

### 1.5 SCTE Design Principles

The SCTEs operate according to the following design principles:

- facilitate strong school-university partnerships to deliver quality professional experience
- adopt an onsite learning approach
- foster a community of practice on pre-service education
- have a strong research focus
- utilise contemporary technologies
- contribute to system wide improvement in pre-service teacher education

### 1.6 Scope of the SCTE initiative

The seven pilot SCTEs involve clusters of schools in three metropolitan sites and five non-metropolitan sites, and partnerships with 6 universities, as outlined in Table 1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Metropolitan</td>
<td>Hume Central</td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Metropolitan</td>
<td>Point Cook</td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Metropolitan</td>
<td>Koonung</td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Literature Review

The DEECD’s School Centres for Teaching Excellence initiative reflects national and international trends in teacher education that have been gaining momentum in Australia and overseas in recent years. These trends stem from the research consensus that education systems seeking to improve student learning outcomes must look to the quality of teaching in their schools and, consequently, the nature and quality of the programs that prepare teachers for their work.

This literature review identifies some concerns and issues in teacher education that are relevant to and provide a context for the SCTE initiative. It documents some of the many reports into teacher education in Australia in recent years, noting that many of the recommendations have yet to be acted on. The Review draws on selected literature on international partnership and site-based models of teacher education. It concludes that evidence in the professional literature strongly supports the continuation of the SCTE model.

2.1 Background to the evaluation

The SCTEs are a timely initiative. There has been considerable debate in recent years about the most effective modes for preparing teachers and promoting continual professional learning (e.g. Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Levine, 2006). As a recent report on teacher education in Scotland (Donaldson, 2011) points out:

A recurrent theme over the years has been the difficulty in striking the right balance and connections between university experience and school experience in both undergraduate and postgraduate courses (p. 8)

A survey of final year teacher education students conducted by the Australian Council of Deans of Teacher Education for the Australian Government (Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST), 2006) showed that students rated the practicum as their most positive experience during their programs, and especially “experienced and enthusiastic supervising teachers and mentors” as the most important factor in gaining practical experience.

One of the main recommendations of the 2007 report, Top of the Class, from the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training was for the Australian Government to encourage a partnership approach to teacher education, induction and professional development. Similar recommendations were made by the report on teacher education from the Parliament of Victoria Education and Training Committee (2005) Step Up, Step In, Step Out, which called for more flexible design and delivery of teacher education including employment-based routes and developing partnerships with schools.

While there have been many recommendations to move in this direction (e.g. Levine, 2006; Freedman, Lipson & Hargreaves, 2008), more research is needed on how to do it. The move toward standards-based teacher education has aimed to encourage greater diversity and
experimentation among providers and to build stronger links between coursework and practice in teacher education. This move has often been coupled with more school-centred approaches to teacher education that aim to place pre-service teachers in more active roles in schools in learning how to teach. With more authentic responsibilities, combined with collegial support and good role models, pre-service teachers have greater opportunities to learn how to “think like a teacher”. This learning is also enhanced when new teachers are expected to demonstrate how they meet the performance standards expected of beginning teachers for registration.

The SCTE initiative recognises the importance of exploring options for achieving its objectives. No one knows the best way to integrate effective pre-service teacher education, continuing professional learning and research opportunities into each and every school. Implementation research (e.g. Fullan, 1991) indicates the importance of flexibility and the reality of “mutual adaptation” in successful change efforts. Effective implementation is a learning process. The evaluation offers an opportunity to increase understanding of how to make schools places where teachers learn, as well as students, by following different approaches to enhancing the effectiveness of pre-service teacher education and building stronger links between schools and universities.

2.2 Concerns and issues in teacher education

Numerous reports over the past 30 years have documented a range of concerns about the nature and quality of teacher education. Top of the Class: Report on the inquiry into teacher education (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training, 2007) was just one of many that recommended major changes. It noted that while there was insufficient research evidence to enable the Committee to come to any firm conclusions about the overall quality of teacher education in Australia, surveys of principals and recent graduates consistently pointed to the following as issues of concern:

- Aspects of the school-based professional experience components of courses
- The weakness of the link between ‘theory’ and ‘practice’
- The perceived lack of relevance of some of the theoretical components of courses
- The capacity of beginning teachers to deal adequately with classroom management issues, to perform assessment and reporting tasks and to communicate with parents. (House of Representatives Standing committee on Education and Vocational Training 2007, p. 8).

The 2007 national survey of school teachers and leaders, Staff in Australia’s Schools (SiAS) (McKenzie et al., 2008), reported that that more than half of early career teachers felt that their pre-service training was of limited help in several important aspects of teaching. Twenty-five to 56 per cent of primary school principals and 26 to 77 per cent of secondary school principals thought that graduates were well prepared or very well prepared. The 2008 Teaching and Learning International (TALIS) survey showed that 36 per cent of Australian teachers worked in schools where the school principal believed that a lack of pedagogical preparation hindered instruction in their schools. This view is shared by teachers who also tend to believe that schools are more effective than universities in preparing them for careers in teaching (Australian Secondary Principals’ Association, 2005).

The causes of these and other concerns have often been identified as insufficient funding and issues related to teacher demand and supply. But they can also be traced to some fundamental differences of opinion on how teachers should be trained, and even about whether they need to be trained at all—especially in universities. Such differences in ideology are reflected in
different approaches to teacher education in which the issue of ‘the theory-practice divide’
looms large.

It is not unexpected that the theory-practice divide remains the great unresolved issue
of formal education and consequently, of pre-service teacher education. (Eckersley et
al. 2011).

In 2004, ACER conducted an independent evaluation of the Bachelor of Learning Management
(BLM) degree at Central Queensland University (CQU), a program developed in partnership
with local schools and with a major school-based component. BLM graduates rated themselves
as better prepared for the demands of first year teaching than graduates from other Queensland
Universities. They reported significantly greater opportunities to link theory to practice, to see
models of effective teaching, and to receive feedback about their teaching from university
lecturers in the light of teaching standards.

BLM graduates were more likely to report that they had completed courses that gave them
- deep understanding of what they were expected to help students learn and how students
  learned it;
- skill in diagnosing students’ existing levels of understanding of the content to be taught;
- training in planning activities and selecting activities that would promote further
devolution; and
- methods of assessing the extent to which development had taken place.

The report identified a number of design features of the BLM course that contributed to the
positive results, including strong partnership between experienced schoolteachers and
university lecturers (Ingvarson et al., 2005).

In his study of teacher education programs in the US, Levine (2006) identified a ‘schism’
between the beliefs of those who believe teaching is a profession that calls for the intellectual
mastery of a large body of knowledge, and those who see the occupation as a craft like
journalism which is learnt mainly on the job. These divergences in belief between two camps
have resulted in very different understandings about the best ways to train teachers: the
‘professional’ camp argue for longer and more stringent academic preparation while the
claims of the ‘craft’ contingent have resulted in the deregulation of entry requirements into
teaching, the creation of multiple ‘alternative’ pathways, and a diminished role for university-
based teacher education programs.¹ The central question in this ‘white hot’ dispute is about
where teachers should be educated – in universities or in the workplace, i.e. schools (Levine,
2006, p.13).

Education leaders have attempted to resolve this debate by conceptualising a model of
teacher education that combines rigorous academic preparation with solid practical
preparation and training (Shulman, 1998; Zeichner, 2003; Levine, 2006; Darling-Hammond,
2006, 2010). Levine concluded that:

Student teaching and field work should begin in the first days of teacher preparation
and continue to its conclusion. What is learned in the university classroom should be
observed in the school room the next day. What is seen in the school should be the
subject of instruction at the university the following day. Designed as an

¹ In his Annual Report on Teacher Quality (U.S. Department of Education, 2002), Rod Paige, the Secretary of
State for Education in the Bush administration famously argued against ‘the burdensome requirements’ of
academic teacher preparation courses and the ‘regulatory barriers’ of teacher certification and licensure (see
Walsh, 2001 and response by Darling Hammond, 2002).
apprenticeship, field work should provide teacher education students experience in communities, families, and schools. Over the course of their programs, students should gain increasing responsibility in the classroom to the point of serving as full-scale teachers (Levine, 2006, p. 109).

On the basis of documented case studies of effective practice in teacher education (e.g. Darling-Hammond, 2006; Zeichner, 1993), Darling-Hammond concluded that the most powerful teacher education programs require pre-service teachers to work in the field throughout their entire program of study, examining and applying the concepts they are learning about in their coursework to practical situations, and working alongside experienced teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2010). This is the kind of thinking that underpins the SCTE model.

2.3 Reservations about ‘practical’ and ‘clinical’ models of teacher education

Despite growing enthusiasm for practical/partnership models of teacher education, and apparently universal agreement on the importance and usefulness of in-school experience for pre-service teachers, some writers and observers have cautioned going too far along the road to an ‘apprenticeship model’ at the expense of providing a solid professional grounding in educational theory and evidence-based research (Furlong et al., 2008; House of Commons, 2010; Department for Education, 2013). Clearly, as writers like Darling-Hammond and Levine envisage, the challenge is to get the balance right. This is highly relevant to SCTE, as the evidence generated from the present evaluation suggests that this Victorian model has achieved a successful balance between the respective contributions made by universities and schools together with the all-important integration of theory with practice. This may not be the case in some overseas models (see section on School Direct, Section 2.6 of this review). Furlong et al. (2008) fear that the very notion of a professional knowledge base for teaching - knowledge that teachers need to acquire before commencing their practice, is being ‘expunged’:

The essential contributions of higher education to professional formation – the consideration of research, of theory and of critique – all of these have been expunged as important components of professional education. While they may and do exist in some university-based courses, they are no longer seen as essential, and growing numbers of trainees now enter the profession with no engagement with these more complex and challenging forms of professional knowledge at all (Furlong et al., 2008, p. 317).

A related concern is lack of clarity about the term ‘clinical.’ Levine uses it to describe the development of a model of teacher education that would see teaching as a profession, similar to clinical psychology and medicine. He made five recommendations in relation to implementing this model:

1. Transform education schools from ivory towers into professional schools focused on classroom practice
2. Focus on student achievement as the primary measure of teacher education program success
3. Rebuild teacher education programs around the skills and knowledge that promote classroom learning: make five-year teacher education programs the norm.
4. Establish effective mechanisms for teacher education quality control
5. Close failing teacher education programs, strengthen promising programs and expand excellent programs by creating incentives for outstanding students and career changers to enter teacher education at doctoral universities (Levine, 2006, pp 103-104).

This view is reflected in much of the American literature (Alter & Coggshall, 2009; Elliot, 2010; Howey & Simpher, 2010; Howey, 2011; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 2010). It has, however, been challenged by some writers in England and in Australia who have expressed alternative, perhaps more nuanced opinions about the use of the term ‘clinical’. In response to the UK Education White Paper presented by the Education Secretary, Michael Gove, in November 2010, in which Gove announced that he would be shifting teacher-training from Higher Education institutions into schools as part of his ‘radical reforms’ of the education sector, Dr Alex Standish of the Institute of Education, University of London listed four objections to the clinical model advocated by Gove:

1. A ‘medical model’ is not appropriate for education. The word ‘clinic’ derives from *clinicus* meaning ‘one on a sick bed’, but the job of teachers is to educate healthy children. Teaching is about communication of knowledge, the methods of which are entirely different from those of a doctor or psychologist.

2. Teaching should not be reinvented as just a set of ‘how to skills’ that can be learnt on the job. Teaching practice needs to be informed by an extensive knowledge of educational theory, philosophy and culture.

3. Teaching cannot be reduced to a science. Teachers need to be intellectually equipped to make informed decisions, as autonomous professionals, on a range of matters including moral issues and curriculum selection.

4. Some evidence based research is reductionist. ‘Upon closer inspection, the so-called scientific approach to teaching pays little attention to pedagogical thought. It does not advocate that students study Vygotsky, Durkheim or Dewey to inform their practice. Rather it reduces pedagogy to classroom management and techniques. (Standish, 2010).

In Australia, Neil Hooley of Victoria University has observed that partnership-based models of teacher education do not necessarily entail an understanding of teaching as a clinical profession like medicine. Essentially his objections to this model are the same as those of Standish. Teacher training at Victoria University, he says, has implemented a partnership-model over many years, but the philosophy behind this model is one of ‘praxis and enquiry’ rather than clinical investigation and remediation (Hooley, 2011).

Like the cautionary remarks of Furlong and others with reference to privileging the practical elements of teacher education over the theoretical, these sentiments are highly relevant to the future of the SCTE model in Victoria and should be used to generate further discussion in the future, especially since not all SCTE centres profess to follow a clinical model. ²

² The terms ‘site-based’ or ‘school-based’ are used in this review to describe models like those observed in the Point Cook cluster that are not ‘clinical’ in the sense of practices taught at schools for which the MGSE is the university provider.
2.4 Government enquiries and reports

A report produced by the Australian Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee (May 2013), identified more than 100 inquiries and reports into education between 1979 and 2006. Most were generated by federal and state governments and by parliamentary committees. This report notes that all of these previous reports ‘have recurring findings and recommendations and that ‘the issues which they repeatedly identified persist’ (p.108).

Some of these reports and their key recommendations were:


- Teacher education entrants to be in the top quartile of academic achievement
- Practicums to include duties and tasks of beginning teachers
- Selection of appropriate supervising teacher with training and time allowance


- Review of teacher education courses
- Improved consultative arrangements regarding teacher education between the Commonwealth and states


- Initial teacher education courses to be a cooperative activity involving higher education providers, school employers and teachers

**Australia’s Teachers, an Agenda for the Next Decade** (Schools Council, 1990):

- Internships (6 to 12 months) for student teachers nearing completion of their training
- Experienced teacher to have responsibility for beginning teachers
- Ongoing training for beginning teachers provided jointly by employer and training institutions

**The Literacy Challenge** (House of Representatives Standing Committee on Employment Education and Training 1993):

- National recruitment campaign to attract high quality applicants to teaching
- Accreditation of initial teacher education programs

**Teacher Education in English Language and literacy** (Australian Language and Literacy Council, 1995):

- National guidelines for teacher employment to raise the standard of teacher entrants and retention, including a demonstrated expertise in English literacy, raising of entry requirements, and financial incentives compulsory English language and literacy study
- Induction and probation strategies

• Targeted practicums in a range of settings, including in relation to teaching of Indigenous students
• Strong link to schools for teaching students and teacher educators, with placements by highly accomplished teachers as teacher educators and teacher educators as school teachers

*Top of the Class: report on the inquiry into teacher education* (House of Representative Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training, 2007):

• A sound research base for teacher education
• National system of accreditation for teacher education courses
• Australian Government increase funding to universities for practicums and revised payment processes

*A Class Act: inquiry into the Status of the Teaching Profession.* (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 2008):

• National recruitment campaign to attract high quality applicants
• Accreditation of initial teacher training programs
• Development of induction programs nationally


Supervising teachers are not normally trained to support PSTs

Teachers undertake the supervisory role in conjunction with many other teaching duties

There are inconsistencies in defining program partnership arrangements

*Schools Workforce, research report* (Productivity Commission, Canberra, 2012):

• Guidance on evidence that training providers are expected to use to demonstrate that graduates meet Graduate Teacher Standards

*Teaching and Learning – maximizing our investment in Australian schools,* Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee (May 2013)

Every one of these reports recognises the importance of the practicum in teacher education, and the need for stronger links to be forged between universities and schools. Most also advocate better support for supervising teachers, including mentoring training, and that pre-service teachers should spend extended periods of time in schools. As the report produced by the Australian Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee (May 2013), notes, most of the recommendations of the various reports are ‘recurring’. This reflects the fact that authorities have been slow to act on them. One major advance of recent years is in the area of accreditation of teacher education courses, which is now occurring under AITSL. Another is the practical and successful application of the SCTE design principles in the SCTE schools, as these principles address a substantial number of the various reports’ findings.
2.5 Quality of entrants into teaching

In 2012, the Australian federal government introduced demand-driven funding for undergraduate education at public universities. Each university now sets its own entry standards and decides how many students it will enrol in each course. The report of the Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee (May 2013), noted that ‘a natural consequence of this policy has been a further drop in entrance requirements for teaching courses at some institutions. It also noted, however, that as of 2013, national course accreditation standards will apply to all courses due for accreditation or reaccreditation. These standards include a requirement that graduates from teacher education programs will need to demonstrate that they have attained the level of proficiency required for a Graduate under the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. The standards also require that entrants to teacher education courses have personal literacy and numeracy levels in the top 30 per cent of the population either prior to commencing studies or prior to graduating.

Doubts about the quality of entrants to teacher education courses continue to surface, however. The report of the Australian Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee (May 2013), expressed ‘surprise’ at the wide range of entrance requirements for teacher education courses in Australia. It contrasted the rigour of the graduate programs at the University of Melbourne, where students must achieve at least second class honours in their undergraduate studies, with courses in other universities that accept students with ATAR scores as low as 43, and with other course providers that offer ‘alternate’ entry points where some students may not have even completed year 11 and 12. (Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee, May 2013, pp. 54, 55).

In 2012 Ingvarson expressed concern that, under the new demand-driven system, Australia is running down its teaching infrastructure. Citing Finland, which selects all of its future teachers from the top 25 per cent of the student cohort in terms of academic achievement, he noted that in Australia less than 50 per cent of offers are made to students from the top 30 per cent. In Victoria, in 2012, only 30 per cent of offers were made to Year 12 applicants with ATAR scores above 70 and only 2 per cent of offers were made to applicants with ATAR scores of over 90, less than half the national average. ‘Alarmingly’, says Ingvarson, over 33 per cent of teacher education offers to undergraduates in Victoria were to Year 12 students with ATAR scores below 60. This places them in the lower half of academic achievement for the cohort. (Ingvarson, 2012).

2.6 International research on partnership and site based modes of preparation for teaching

2.6.1 The United Kingdom

In the UK, the idea that schools and universities or colleges should work together in various forms of ‘partnership’ to provide teacher education can be traced back, at least as far as the McNair Report of 1944, but along the way there has been much debate and contestation, the elements of which Menter et al. summarised as:

- struggles for ‘positioning’ and the ownership of teacher education;
- attempts to define teaching as a profession – and to establish whether teaching has a distinctive intellectual knowledge base;
- debate over teachers’ terms and conditions, as well as pay, and the role of teachers’ unions;
• the emergence of professional bodies to uphold professional standards and to control entry into the profession;
• the economics of teacher supply and demand (Menter et al., 2010, p. 17).

England and Wales are the only places in which partnerships between schools and HEIs are institutionalised at a national level as a core principle of provision. National regulations specify the structure of all courses and as part of partnership arrangements, student teachers are required to spend a large part of their training programs in schools (up to two thirds for secondary teachers). (Furlong, 2005, p. 33; 2008, p. 308).

Edwards and Mutton (2007) commented that these government requirements seemed to have been premised on an assumption that shared understandings and commitments about training teachers and the nature of professional learning already existed. However, as the Modes of Teacher Education (MOTE) evaluation project (Furlong et al. 2000) revealed, many partnerships fell well short of these expectations, with most being neither collaborative nor complementary. These writers saw schools’ willingness to continue with the traditional HEI-led arrangements as being largely due to their reluctance to adopt changes that would disrupt their current organisational and teaching practices. Schools did not consider how partnership arrangements might work to their own advantage.

Furlong et al. identified three ‘typical’ models of partnership in England and Wales that developed after 1992. In the first, the schools and HEIs implemented programs in which each type of institution had a complementary but separate role and there were few or no attempts to bring the two dimensions together. The second ‘collaborative’ (and apparently more aspirational than actual) model prevailed among teacher educators who saw the two types of institution as possessing equally legitimate but different bodies of professional knowledge. For this kind of model to succeed, teachers and lecturers needed opportunities to work and plan together on a regular basis. Quoting Macintyre (1990, 1994), Furlong et al. explained that:

> Teachers were seen as having an equally legitimate but different body of professional knowledge from those in higher education. Students were expected and encouraged to use what they learned in school to critique what they learned within the college or university and vice versa. It was through this dialectic that they were expected to build up their own body of professional knowledge. (Furlong, 2005, p. 33).

Furlong’s third model, described as a ‘reality’ model was essentially the status quo in which courses were designed and led by HEIs with schools being used as ‘resources’. Typically, in this model, it was the HEI that defined the learning program for student teachers and the school that delivered the practicum. Contact between the school and HEI was mainly about administrative and management matters to do with student placements.

Furlong et al. suggested that from the early 1990s onwards, a certain ‘creative tension’ between these three concepts developed which, despite the challenges involved, led to the current national and international recognition of the importance of partnerships in teacher education:

> We would suggest that it is because of this creative tension that school-university partnerships have come to be seen, internationally, as such an important strategy in supporting the systemic reform of both teacher education and schools themselves. (Furlong et al. 2005, p. 34).
2.6.1.1 **The National Partnership Project (UK) 2001-2005**

When they evaluated the National Partnership Project (NPP) in 2005, Furlong et al. found that it was closely related to a number of already existing TTA generated initiatives designed to support the involvement of schools in teacher education. The NPP, which was organised on a regional basis, with a Regional Manager and Regional Partnership Committee in each of the nine government school regions, had a budget of £1,700,000, but the NPP evaluators estimated that, taken as a whole, the total budget for different types of partnership initiatives was about £6,000,000. Many of the schools (about 168), were already ‘Designated Training Schools’ (DES), with Advanced Skills Teachers whose role was to promote and develop partnership models in their own and ‘outreach’ schools.

The chief features of the NPP and other partnership models across the UK were found to be:

- partnerships remained voluntary as far as schools were concerned. In principle, the partnership relationship was unequal and potentially unstable;
- there was substantial variation between teacher education courses in terms of course structures and working practices of partnership, e.g. some HEIs reported visiting schools only once during a placement, while others made much more frequent visits;
- some partnerships had negotiated a common preservice education curriculum and working arrangements between schools and HEIs while others had not;
- in some partnerships the school teachers had chief responsibility for assessing student teachers, in others assessment was done mainly by the HEI;
- schools varied in their commitment to the concept of a partnership model of educating pre-service teachers: some were enthusiastic supporters, some were apathetic, some were opposed;
- some senior school staff now had teacher education as part of their job descriptions, and the NPP had provided new career opportunities for these people;
- a regional perspective on teacher education was developing: ‘For the first time all providers of teacher education in a particular region were required to work together – schools, HEIs, GTP providers, SCITTS. It also brought LEAs into the picture in a formal way for the first time’;
- each regional steering committee had set up initiatives at the local level designed to respond to local need.

Although the NPP was cut short in 2005, Furlong et al. note that under this model of partnership, schools and teachers were learning to accept a much stronger role in teacher education than under past arrangements: ‘More and more teachers and schools are now taking their role seriously; and they are recognising the benefits for themselves individually, for their schools and for the profession as a whole from doing that.’ (Furlong et al. 2008, p. 42).

Noting the ‘relative superficiality’ of most English ITE partnerships, Edwards and Mutton believe that change needs to go deeper, so that common goals and understandings focused on the ‘developing trajectory’ of pre-service teachers’ professional learning are forged between the various members of the partnerships. These writers noted that, although the ‘management’ aspects of the relationships between schools and HEIs remained constant, some partnerships were providing opportunities for participants, especially school ITT coordinators, to ‘try out new ‘identities’ in which the focus was on professional learning. The best chance of success for such developments, they claimed, was for schools and HEIs to

---

3 See also Furlong, McNamara, Campbell, Howson & Lewis, 2008; Campbell, McNamara, Furlong, Howson & Lewis, (2007); Furlong, Campbell, Howson, Lewis, & McNamara, 2006.
work less as ‘closed systems’ with their own separate agendas and more as open ‘networks of distributed expertise’, in which the differences between school and university goals and ways of working become less of a barrier and more of an opportunity to work creatively to advance the professional learning of all participants (Edwards & Mutton, 2007, pp. 514-515).

2.6.1.2 School centred initial teacher training (SCITT) and Employment Based initial teacher training (EBITT)

In December 1999 the DfEE invited schools to volunteer to become Training Schools. Fifty-four schools were accredited from September 2000, each school receiving up to £100,000 for an initial period of three years. Twenty-eight schools were accredited the following year and since that time the number of SCITT places has increased. A review conducted by the UK Parliament’s Children, Schools and Families Committee (House of Commons, 2010) found substantial evidence of the ‘success’ of the SCITT model. ‘It has been well received by Ofsted and by trainees themselves’ (p. 25). However the Report expressed disappointment that the in 2007/2008 the SCITT route accounted for only 4 per cent of teacher training places, and recommended that the number of these places be increased (House of Commons 2010, Para 47, p. 25).

This report was less enthusiastic about the quality of the various employment based routes (EBITT) into teaching that were operating across the UK in which training was mostly practical and school based. While the reviewers welcomed such programs ‘as a means of attracting high calibre career-changers into teaching’, it noted that ‘wider research’ 4 pointed to concerns about the overly practical nature of this route into teaching:

Some teachers trained via new ‘school based routes ‘don’t know what they don’t know’. If more teachers are trained through such…routes this deficit could apply to a larger portion of the profession. We believe there is a danger of a self-perpetuating cycle of teacher ignorance if training is cut off from the [higher education institutions’] expertise, training experience and research which is not available to schools (School of Education, University of Northampton, quoted in House of Commons, 2010 p. 26).

The report recommended that ‘all employment-based trainees be entitled to complete a Professional Post Graduate Certificate of Education as part of their initial training’.(House of Commons, 2010, p. 26).

2.6.1.3 Teaching Schools

In 2011 the UK government set out some new proposals to ‘reform’ Initial Teacher Training in a policy paper: Training our next generation of outstanding teachers: an improvement strategy for discussion (Department for Education 2011). The paper envisaged an important and growing role for ‘teaching schools’ in leading ITT partnerships and bringing groups of schools together to train teachers. Teaching school ‘alliances’ are expected to take responsibility for:

- assessing the needs of trainee teachers and ensuring appropriate provision to meet them;

---

• ensuring that all trainee teachers observe outstanding teaching and undertake detailed
discussion and reflection with outstanding teachers on the observed teaching and their
own teaching so that they work with and learn from the best teachers;
• managing a range of high-quality, school-based training experiences and professional
development activities (including those at Master’s level) into which trainee teachers
will be fully integrated, such as peer learning sessions and demonstration lessons;
• encouraging greater involvement in ITT across the alliance by showing how
supporting trainee teachers can contribute to pupil learning and professional and
leadership development for teachers, and supporting their partner schools in
improving the quality of their ITT provision;
• ensuring all teaching staff working with trainee teachers across the alliance provide
high-quality, school-based tutoring and coaching, including the provision of
appropriate training and ongoing support linked to other coaching and mentoring roles
such as newly qualified teacher (NQT) induction and early professional development,
and are helped to use these roles to develop their own practice;
• assessing trainees against the qualified teacher status standards;
• demonstrating a clear commitment and capacity to respond to local, regional and
national priorities in training;
• making a long-term commitment within the alliance to training an agreed number of
trainee teachers, including the provision of substantial school experience opportunities
for people interested in becoming teachers;
• working strategically with an accredited provider on the management and leadership
of the ITT partnership to ensure joint planning so that schools and universities
maximize the integration of school and centre-based training and determine which
partner is best placed to provide key aspects of the training programme, and
• working with an accredited provider on the selection and recruitment of high quality
Every school in England is eligible to apply to become a Teaching School. Applying schools
need to meet stringent criteria, including excellent leadership and a proven track record in
improvement. In 2013 the National College for School Leadership, which is responsible for
designating teaching schools, reported that the total number of teaching schools in England
on 10 April 2013 was just over 360. It was also reported that:
• almost 1 in 10 schools nationally, representing 1 in 8 pupils, had already joined a
teaching alliance;
• about 2000 Specialist Leaders of Education – a new role designed to support other
middle and senior leaders and deliver improvement across all schools – had been
appointed;
• the first teaching schools reported in 2012 that they and their alliance partners had
been involved in the delivery of over 10,000 placements;
• the total number of teaching schools in England is set to rise to about 500 teaching
The rapid increase in the number of teaching schools reflects the British governments’
commitment to school based teacher education. Announcing an extra £10 million on 21
March 2013, to ‘boost the quality of teacher training the Education Secretary of Education, Michael Gove, outlined his vision for a school led teacher education system, stating:

Teaching schools are leading the teaching profession. They are at the forefront of driving and delivering change. They are recruiting and training new entrants to the profession, identifying leadership potential and providing support for other schools.

The best people to teach teachers are teachers. School-led systems put schools, school leaders and teachers firmly in the driving seat.

Gove was supported by the Chief Executive of the Teaching Agency and National College for Teaching and Leadership who declared:

The people who know how best to raise standards in our schools are outstanding leaders and teachers,-not officials in Whitehall.

Our best schools are already well on their way to leading the system. Many of our teachers are making the most of their freedoms and are revolutionising the way they deliver initial teacher training, leadership, development and school improvement.

Teaching schools are all rated by Ofsted as ‘outstanding’. (Department of Education, 2013, pp. 1-2).

**School Direct**

School Direct (SD) was initially proposed in the 2011 Department for Education Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Strategy Paper referred to in the foregoing section of this Review. Now in its second year of delivery, the SD model, a partnership between a ‘lead school’ and other ‘partner schools’ and an accredited ITT provider, is expanding. School Direct ITT providers are accredited to provide ITT courses leading to QTS and can be HEI (university) or non-university led. If the lead school is accredited as an ITT provider it can act as both the lead school and the partner-provider.

The defining feature of School Direct is that, in accordance with government education policy, it is school led and delivered. Schools request SD places from the NCTL. They can choose any type of ITT provider to work with. The lead school is responsible for securing agreement of the respective roles and responsibilities of the ITT provider and partner school, including the distribution of funding and the schools in which the training will take place. In line with the Secretary of State’s ITT criteria, all accredited ITT providers must ensure that partners establish a partnership agreement setting out the roles and responsibilities of each partner.

In 2013 the SD model offered two types of training places: the School Direct Training Programme (tuition fees), which is funded by the trainees, who may receive a bursary from the National College for Teaching and Leadership, and the School Direct Training Program (salaried). The SD (tuition fees) leads to the award of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and some courses may also lead to the award of a Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE), delivered in partnership with an ITT provider that is also a degree awarding body. SD (salaried) is only for high quality ‘career change’ graduates with at least three years’ work experience. It replaces the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) which closed in the academic year 2012/2013. Trainees on this programme are employed as unqualified teachers at an SD lead or partnership school. No trainee is required to perform more than 90% of the duties normally required of a teacher. They must undertake at least 60 days of training activity per year (National College for Teaching and Leadership, 2013, pp. 4-9).
School Direct lead schools recruit trainees and decide which types of places they wish to offer. People who wish to train as teachers under the SD model apply to the lead school. Schools are responsible for interviewing and selecting trainees, but all candidates must meet eligibility and entry criteria as well as the entry requirements of the school’s chosen provider (National College for Teaching and Leadership, 2013, p. 13).

Because School Direct is a relatively recent development, there is little scholarly literature about it. Most criticism and comments to date centre on the practical difficulties relating, especially, to teacher recruitment and supply.

In March 2013, the university ‘think tank’ million+ convened a round table in the House of Commons to discuss the impact of the SD programme on teacher education in England. The roundtable comprised over 30 participants, including MPs, members of the House of Lords, Head Teachers, representatives from Teach First and university education departments. All participants supported the idea of schools playing a major role in teacher education, but there were concerns about ‘undermining’ the role of universities. Major concerns were expressed about Ministers’ decision to remove the requirement for teachers to have a professional qualification (courses deliver QTS, but not necessarily PGCE).

Roundtable participants also referred to wider concerns, in particular, the decision by Ministers to remove the requirement for teachers to have a professional qualification. This has set England apart from other countries…for example, trainees who only gain Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) rather than a Postgraduate Certificate of Education PGCE or BEd/BA will not have a portable qualification and will not be employed as teachers in Scotland or in Wales (or in many other countries) (Million + March 2013, p. 1).

Roundtable members were concerned that the SD programme was being progressed too rapidly, without evaluation or proper attention to the role of universities in teacher education. Participants pointed out that, given likely uncertainties about student numbers, universities would find it difficult to predict staffing needs from year to year, and that school led provision would be ‘unlikely’ to deliver sustainable, high quality teacher supply across all subject disciplines to meet national requirements (million +, July 2013, p. 2).

In July 2013 the Select Education Committee of the House of Commons received over 50 submissions in response to its inquiry about developments in 2013 related to:

- School Direct, and
- Proposals for a College of Teaching

Again, most of the submissions addressed practical issues related to the rapid ‘roll out’ of School Direct. The British Educational Research Association (BERA) expressed ‘grave concerns’ about the rapid roll out of the programme, including likely effects on university staffing, increased numbers of casual university teaching staff, and consequent negative impact on research.

---

5 Including Victoria

6 The proposed ‘Royal College of Teaching’ is envisaged as a professional body for teachers that will give the teaching profession status and influence similar to established professions like law and medicine.
As we see the international evidence growing for encouraging an evidence base for teacher development it seems almost perverse to be weakening the university research capacity in education. (House of Commons, 2013).

The University of Cambridge’s Faculty of Education said that it had declined to participate in SD with other institutions from more distant parts of England for reasons of ‘quality assurance’. The University of Oxford, while expressing strong support for school-based teacher education, warned of threats to teachers’ professionalism if the school-university partnership became unbalanced:

The major concern we have about SD is that the model of the teacher which underlies this version of a school-led approach is a limited and restricted one that understands teaching as a craft rather than as a profession… The model is in stark contrast to the understanding of the nature of teaching in the 21st century that is being pursued elsewhere in the UK …or in other nations where teaching quality has been recognised as outstanding. The prime example is Finland, where entry to teaching is through a programme of five years of study leading to a Masters’ degree. (House of Commons, 2013).

On 29 July 2013, million+ told the Education Select Committee that the system of planning teacher training in England had ‘broken down’. Chief Executive of million+, Pam Tatlow had this to say:

Ministers say that schools should lead the commissioning of teacher training, but it is clear that this will not guarantee the number of trained teachers that will be needed by schools across the country in the future.

By the end of next year, 3000 fewer teachers are likely to have been trained, risking a crisis in teacher recruitment at the very time that the school population is rising (million + 2013).

2.6.2 The USA

The move towards partnerships between higher education and schools in the USA started in the 1980s, when a number of major reports criticised traditional approaches to teacher pre-service education (Carnegie Taskforce on Teaching as a Profession, 1986; Goodlad, 1984, 1988; The Holmes Group, 1986; The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). These reports and others prepared the ground for the introduction of various models of school-university partnerships across the USA (Allexsah-Snider et al., 1995). In contrast to England and Wales, where such partnerships were institutionalised through legislation, the movement towards closer cooperation in teacher education between universities and schools in the US was mostly localized: the more significant and influential programs include the Stanford Teacher Education Program (STEP), which is operated by the Stanford University School of Education, and includes a practicum of 16 hours per week, and the Boston Teacher Residency Program (BTR), which is run by Urban Teacher Residency United (UTRU).

In the BTR, PSTs, supported by their mentors, complete a year-long in-school assignment during which they are expected to teach 50 per cent of a full teaching load, and to teach every day. In an evaluation of the Boston Teacher Residency and the Academy for Urban School Leadership in Chicago, school administrators rated UTR graduates’ skills and competencies highly. The evaluation found some evidence of higher retention rates among UTR graduates compared with graduates of other programs. It also noted that the experience of mentoring had developed the knowledge and skills of veteran teachers who had undertaken that role. The mentor-teachers also reported a sense of professional renewal. For some, it had even contributed to their decisions to remain in teaching (Berry et al. 2008).
Two other major US models of teacher education programs that emphasize close and collaborative school-university partnerships are the Professional Development Schools (PDS) and Teachers for a New Era (TNE).

2.6.2.1 Professional Development Schools (PDS)
Since the 1990s, the PDS movement, led by the Holmes Group, has grown across the USA. It has enjoyed wide support from governments, teacher unions and professional associations. Bullough and Kauchak (1997) pointed out that unlike in the UK, where school-university partnerships were institutionalized through government decrees, the PDS model is localised and led, mainly, by consortia of universities. There is no one model of a Professional Development School, but some common features and practices across PDS sites have been identified as:

- The courses are usually offered on site or there is provision for extended field-placement;
- Teacher education is conceived and delivered as a joint venture between schools and universities;
- Participants have extended roles (e.g. university faculty may provide joint workshops for a whole school staff, school teachers may make significant contributions to teacher education programs);
- University faculty members generally offer an on-site course or seminar for cooperating teachers;
- Schools offer on-site support for student teachers;
- Student teachers take part in school in-service and staff meetings, and
- A climate of experimentation and inquiry prevails (Brisard et al., 2005, pp. 81-82).

Stevens (1999) found that, from a principals’ perspective, having a number of student teachers on campus could have certain negative aspects, e.g. principals were sometimes reluctant to place student teachers in the ‘best’ classes, for fear of disrupting their education. Other ‘challenges’ experienced by individuals involved in developing PDS models have been identified in the literature. They include:

- Conflicting perspectives that can surface between the value teachers and university staff place on different kinds of professional learning.
- Evidence that schools and universities view and value research differently.
- The need to develop a shared vision
- The difficulties involved in resolving the ‘tension’ between ‘structuring the partnership to the extent that the partners feel constrained and uncreative, or leaving it so undefined that no one knows or cares about it.

Some possible ways of addressing these challenges are:

- The formation of joint planning teams and committees/advisory bodies to facilitate shared decision making
- A team based organisational structure with representation of teams of teachers, university staff, and PSTs
- ‘Boundary Spanners’, defined as ‘intermediaries who commute literally and figuratively between the schools and the university [and] play a critical role in the development of a successful partnership
- Informing and involving key stakeholders by providing opportunities of various kinds for dissemination of information, communication and the celebration of achievements.
• Experimental or trial status: i.e. providing time and space for experimentation through, smaller scale pilot programs in preference to attempting large scale institutionalisation:

• Incremental change through staged implementation

• Enabling contexts: the pre-existence of sound relationships between stakeholders is an important factor in developing the new partnerships.

• Reward structures and funding: if program implementation depends entirely on the commitment of individuals in the absence of adequate support and rewards, it will fail. Commitment on its own is not enough.

• Institutionalisation (sustainability): institutionalising PDS models depends on the availability of stable funding and the existence of ‘some formalized agreement’ between schools and universities. A key test of institutionalisation is whether they can survive the loss of a key individual. (Brisard et al, 2005, pp. 85-86).

2.6.2.2 Teachers for a New Era (TNE)

*Teachers for a New Era (TNE)* is funded by the Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation and Annenberg Foundation. A key principle of the program is that education should be understood as ‘an academically taught clinical practice profession’. As well as a respect for evidence, this principle entails close cooperation between colleges of education and practice schools, appointment of master teachers as clinical faculty in the college of education and a two year residency induction period for graduates, during which graduates would be followed and provided with mentoring and support. Four institutions were selected to receive a share of the $5 million TNE funding over a period of five years starting in 2002-3 (Carnegie Corporation, 2001).

Programs selected for support under TNE must follow the principles outlined above, particularly the understanding of teaching as a clinical practice profession and the partnership model.

An evaluation of the TNE program (Kirby, McCombs, Barney & Naftel, 2006), showed positive results for the institutions involved, but, as noted in a Report prepared by Ure for the Australian Learning & Teaching Council, ‘at this stage little research evidence has emerged about the influence of this model on learning outcomes for preservice teachers (Ure, 2009).

The TNE model informed the development of the Master of Teaching at the Melbourne Graduate School of Education.

2.6.2.3 National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

In 2010, a report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning7 commissioned by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education declared:

> The education of teachers in the United States needs to be turned upside down. To prepare effective teachers for 21st century classrooms, teacher education must shift away from a norm which emphasizes academic preparation and course work loosely linked to school-based experiences. Rather it must move to programs that are fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with academic content and professional courses (NCATE, 2010, p. ii).

---

7 The Panel comprised US state officials, P-12 and higher education leaders, teachers, teacher educators, union representatives, and critics of teacher education (NCATE, 2010, p. ii).
The Blue Ribbon Panel Report cited many examples of effective clinically based programs of teacher education in the US, including partnerships between schools, universities, districts and other key stakeholders, but it also identified a need for a comprehensive, nationwide system under a common set of principles, as opposed to the existing ‘cottage industry of path-breaking initiatives’ (NCATE, 2010, p. ii). By 2012, eight US states: California, Colorado, Louisiana, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Oregon Tennessee and Kentucky, had agreed to work together in a NCATE-led Alliance for Clinical Teacher preparation.

2.6.3 Finland
In 2000, Finland emerged as the top-scoring OECD nation on the international PISA assessments. Since 1979, preservice teachers in Finland have been required to complete a three years bachelors degree and a two years master’s degree: primary school teachers obtain a master’s degree in educational studies while secondary teachers obtain a master’s in their chosen subject specialty. Teaching is a sought after career, with only 10-15 per cent of applicants being selected for access to teacher education courses. Interviews, aptitude tests, and, for some universities, an optional skills demonstration, are all part of the application process. Among all categories of teacher education, only about 120 students are chosen out of 2000 applicants (Anderson, 2010). Reinforcement of the highly selective nature of teacher recruitment and selection in Finland, which results in a teaching force of exceptionally high calibre, is provided in this Twitter comment from Sahlberg, leading Finnish educator and international expert on teacher education: ‘Want to be a primary teacher in Finland? Be prepared! 8,400 applicants, just over 400 seats this year.’ (Sahlberg, 2013)

While Finnish universities enjoy autonomy in curriculum design, guidelines are provided by the Ministry of Education and agreed to by the Deans of Faculties of Education. Practicums, supervised by university and school teachers, are conducted in all of the five years of study, and theory is closely linked with practice. On the basis of their experiences in schools, PSTs are encouraged to develop their own personal practical theories, which they then theorize within a wider research context (Jyrhama et al., 2008).

In designated university training (‘normal’) schools, the teachers, who have a higher status than teachers in other schools, have special responsibilities for the supervision and mentoring of student teachers. These teachers often participate in research and development. Trainee teachers also participate in team teaching, with teachers during the practicum (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2006; UNESCO, 2003; EURYBASE, 2009 reported in Caldwell, 2010).

2.6.4 Australia
Surveys of Australian teacher education students, graduate teachers and principals confirm anecdotal evidence over many years that the practicum is the most useful and positive aspect of teacher education courses (Department of Education Science and Training (DEST), 2006; Townsend & Bates, 2007; Kleinhenz et al., 2007), but despite these findings, problems with the practicum, particularly the specific arrangements of practicum places, continue. Two major factors contribute to these problems (1) cost and (2) the present over-supply of pre-service teachers. Some universities find it hard to place students and schools are ‘swamped’ with requests for practical placements (Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee, 2013).

Watson et al. (2008), quoting Walkington (2007), noted that the problem of insufficient practicum places available in Australian schools could be a symptom of ineffectual partnerships between universities and schools. They also argued that simply placing PSTs for longer periods of training in schools would not result in improved learning opportunities:
There is a strong case for professional experience to involve more than experiencing the norms of a typical classroom. Time spent in school should provide opportunities to engage with student learning, drawing on theoretical classroom practice. Teacher education courses that are predominantly practice-based run the risk of being unproductive processes of classroom socialization. Entirely practice-based programs may simply induct student teachers into the ‘tricks of the trade’. (Watson et al., 2008, p.4)

One of the main recommendations of the Report of the House of Representatives Standing Committee into Teacher Education (2007) was for the Australian government to encourage a partnership approach to teacher education and professional development. Similar recommendations were made by the report on teacher education from the Parliament of Victoria Education and Training Committee, *Step Up, Step In, Step Out* (2005) which called for more flexible design and delivery of teacher education courses, including developing partnerships with schools.

In Victoria, the Parliamentary Inquiry into the Suitability of Pre Service Teacher Training courses (Education and Training Committee, 2005), concluded that preservice teachers should spend more time in schools to help them become more familiar with classrooms. Ure (2009), in her study of practicum partnerships for the Australian Learning & Teaching Council, noted that supervising teachers are not normally trained to supervise PSTs and that they typically undertake the role in conjunction with many other teaching duties. Ure identified four models of teacher professional learning:

- Partnership and collaborative learning
- Reflective learning
- Clinically applied
- Pedagogical content focused.

While generally supportive of models that supported the integration of theory and practice, Ure noted that concerns have been raised about ‘inconsistencies’ in defining partnership program frameworks, and about the quality of communication between university providers of teacher education and schools (Boz & Boz, 2006; Hastings & Squires, 2002; Sorrensen, Houtt & Philpott, 2002) in Ure 2009, p. 13).

In 2008, the Council of Australian Governments agreed to the Smarter Schools – Quality Teaching National Partnerships to improve teacher and school leader quality and to sustain a quality teacher workforce. All states and territories agreed to implement facilitation reforms that included:

- New pathways into teaching
- Better pathways into teaching
- Indigenous education pathways

Commonwealth funding was made available to encourage schools and universities involved in training teachers to develop and implement models of best practice in pre-service education. In 2009, the Victorian DEECD and the Melbourne Graduate School of Education initiated a program to develop a Masters level pre-service education program, the *Master of Teaching (M. Teach)*. This program involves partnerships between the university and about 25 schools. Experienced teachers in the schools provide PSTs with mentoring support and the university supplements this with support from ‘Clinical Specialists’ employed by the university. The SCTE initiative builds on the success of the MGSE program and those of other universities such as Victoria University, Edith Cowan University, and the University of
Canberra that provide extended opportunities for pre-service teachers to undertake professional practice in schools.

As noted above, however, there is still considerable variance in teacher training courses offered in Australian universities. In her submission to the Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee (2013) Professor Cherednichenko of Deakin University drew attention to the need for greater national ‘cohesion’ between providers of preservice teacher education in Australia.

We actually need some sort of systemic, structural way of continuing to build the relationships between schools, systems and universities so that we are all aligned…We are all in it for the same reason, but I do think there are a lot of competing interests that go on. (Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations Committee, 2013, p. 61).

In 2011, the federal Government through the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) launched the Standards and Procedures for the Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia. The national accreditation process has three elements:

- The Graduate Teacher Standards that make explicit the knowledge skills and attributes expected of graduates of nationally accredited programs
- The Program Standards, which describe key expected of teacher education programs offered in Australian universities
- The accreditation process, which sets out a nationally consistent process to accredit programs.

The Program Standards strengthen the role played by school partners in teacher education programs. For example, Program Standard 5: ‘School partnerships’, stipulates that providers of teacher education programs should establish ‘enduring school partnerships’, to deliver their programs, particularly the professional experience component. It calls for at least 80 days of professional experience in schools, and requires that providers provide detailed descriptions of planned experiences and related assessment criteria and methods, together with the supervisory and professional support arrangements. There is also a requirement that teachers supervising professional experience are suitably qualified and registered and receive appropriate support in coaching, mentoring and making judgements about whether the graduate standards have been achieved. (AITSL, 2011, p. 16).

From 2013, all teacher education programs seeking accreditation or re accreditation will participate in the national accreditation process.

2.7 Evidence of the effectiveness of partnership and clinical models of teacher education

Attempting to link teacher effectiveness with student learning outcomes is notoriously difficult; so many factors affect student learning and no student’s achievement is totally attributable to one teacher:

Study after study has reported limitations in the existing research. With regard to university-based teacher education, a Michigan State University meta-study found “there is no research that directly assesses what teachers learn in their pedagogical preparation and then evaluates the relationship of that pedagogical knowledge to student learning or teacher behaviour (Wilson et al. 2001 in Levine 2006 p. 18).
Despite many uncertainties and a poor research base, however, evidence is accumulating, that graduates of teacher education programs that follow a clinical, partnership approach are effective, and that connections can be made between PST’s experiences of learning and working in programs that follow this approach and their later success in improving the learning of their students (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb, & Wykoff, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005, Ronfeldt, 2012). A study of teachers in New York City found that some teacher education programs, notably those that operate in the clinical mode, have more positive effects on student learning than others (Boyd et al., 2008). Darling-Hammond noted that the findings of this study are similar to those of researchers who have conducted case studies of effective programs (e.g. Darling-Hammond, 2006; Zeichner, 1993), concluding that the most effective programs are those that ‘teach candidates to turn analysis into action by applying what they are learning in curriculum plans, teaching applications, and other performance assessments that are organized around professional teaching standards (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 40).

2.8 Implications for SCTE

This Review has identified numerous enquiries and reports on teacher education in Australia over at least the past thirty years that confirm anecdotal and other evidence of concern about the quality of teacher education courses. Much of this concern has centred on the practical experience component of courses, which is a major element addressed by the SCTE initiative. The review also noted concerns about variations in the quality of entrants into teaching and the wide range of entrance requirements for teacher education courses in Australia. This should be borne in mind when considering the implications of research on the effectiveness of courses, as effectiveness will depend not only on the quality of the courses offered, but also on the capacity of pre-service teachers to benefit from their training.

Evidence drawn from the experiences of overseas countries, especially the UK and the USA, shows that the principles and beliefs about teacher education on which SCTE is based are widely shared among educators. Prominent writers and researchers like Darling-Hammond, Shulman and Levine in the US, and Furlong and Menter in the UK agree that the most powerful teacher education programs are those in which rigorous academic preparation is combined with solid practical training and experience so that theory becomes fully integrated with practice.

The literature also shows, however, that making these principles operational is a multi-faceted, complex task. Understandings, interpretations and implementation tend to vary according to government policies, local and industrial contexts, personalities, and prevailing views about who ‘owns’ teacher education. The UK experience of mandating partnerships between schools and universities seems to have had limited success. The evaluation literature shows that while progress was made, schools varied in their commitment. Some were enthusiastic supporters, some were apathetic, some were opposed, programs varied. The main implication for SCTE here is that while mandates may succeed in creating an appearance of collaboration and some cosmetic changes, mostly related to management and administration of the practicum, real change will not happen without genuine commitment on the part of the major stakeholders.

Against this, however, is the concern that if adopting the SCTE model were to be totally voluntary, and especially if incentives were few, schools and universities might well revert to older, familiar models. Other shortcomings of an entirely voluntary system are fragmentation and duplication as different partnerships experiment with different ideas and principles, often in ignorance of what is happening elsewhere. This is illustrated by experience in the US,
where, in 2010, NCATE called for a comprehensive nationwide system under a common set of principles as opposed to the existing ‘cottage industry’ of individual initiatives.

The literature also points to the need to be clear about certain key terms and issues involved in the SCTE model. These include understandings about what constitutes ‘extended’ practical experience for preservice teachers in schools, what are the elements of a ‘clinical’ model and the notion of ‘partnership’ itself. It cannot be assumed that all stakeholders share common understandings: true commitment to a certain vision of ‘a partnership model’ of preservice teacher education will only be achieved when everyone, within and across clusters of schools and universities, knows exactly what such a model means and entails.

Furlong et al.’s evaluation of the National Partnership Program in England and Wales and Brisard’s discussion of Professional Development Schools in the US are particularly useful in identifying some of the features, challenges and means of overcoming challenges in their countries’ experiences of implementing school-based partnership models of pre-service teacher education. Despite many variations between individual cluster models, these researchers found that the most positive feature of successful programs was that of a common vision where teacher education was delivered as a joint venture between schools and universities. Achieving this meant facing up to certain challenges. These included (1) overcoming the ‘disruption’ effect where schools resisted taking more responsibility for pre-service teachers for fear of disturbing the smooth running of their schools (2) convincing teachers and schools that teacher education was part of their role (3) resolving different views about teacher preparation held by teachers and university staff, and the relationships between theory and practice; and (4) convincing teachers and schools that they could play a useful role in research. Some practical ways of overcoming such challenges included: developing and implementing sound communication strategies; setting up representative joint planning/management and other teams to facilitate shared decision making, ensuring ‘enabling contexts’, especially the pre-existence of sound relationships between stakeholders; and aiming for incremental change through staged implementation.

This literature review has shown that the SCTE principles and design have a firm basis in national and international research and experience. It also suggests that three important conditions will be necessary for the model’s sustainability: first, adequate reward structures (e.g. higher salaries and promotion opportunities for key school personnel, second, funding for time and infrastructure (e.g. time allowances for coordinators and mentors and dedicated technology and learning spaces in schools); and third, the need for a ‘boundary spanner’ (equivalent to SCTE coordinator) in each cluster. This role should be carried out by a senior person who would provide educational leadership and take chief responsibility for the coordination and management of the program in each cluster, working across university and school sites.

Bearing in mind these pre-conditions for sustainability, the literature, almost without exception, validates the work of the DEECD, universities and schools over the life of SCTE so far. It strongly supports the continuation of this important initiative.
3 Methodology

After a series of preliminary meetings and site visits in late 2011, the key evaluation activities took place during 2012. Data were gathered about the way in which the SCTE programs were implemented (reported largely in Chapter 4), and about the outcomes achieved (reported largely in Chapter 5).

A follow-up study in mid-2013 sought information about program effectiveness from two groups of graduate teachers:

- those who had graduated in 2011 or 2012 from teacher preparation programs that were part of the SCTE project; and
- those who had graduated in 2011 or 2012 from teacher preparation programs that were not part of the SCTE project in 2011 or 2012, but were provided in the same set of universities.

This was designed to enable comparisons of program effectiveness between SCTE and non-SCTE programs that were not confounded by differences in university intakes.

The key questions to be addressed through the evaluation are:

- Do the models adopted by the SCTEs enhance the operation and effectiveness of pre-service teacher education particularly through increased immersion in professional practice and establishment of strong school-university partnerships?
- What are the implications to be drawn from this initiative for future directions in teacher education and workforce policy?

3.1 Evaluation phases

3.1.1 Phase 1: Familiarisation with SCTEs and initiation of case studies (2012, continuing into 2013)

The focus in this period was to become familiar with each of the SCTEs and the approaches and practices that each is adopting. It was important to build a clear understanding of the ways in which each cluster is implementing the design principles for establishing SCTEs.

Work over this phase was aimed at developing accurate and concise summaries of the models being developed in each of the seven SCTEs.

In achieving these purposes, strong and regular communication channels were established with each cluster. Each cluster was visited to interview key personnel in the schools, the regional offices and the relevant university.

The summaries of each SCTE site (Chapter 4) describe the nature and strength of the school-university partnerships, as well the operation of each model, including opportunities for school-based learning and mentoring, collaborative planning and teaching, methods for linking coursework to practice and ensuring program sequencing and coherence.

3.1.2 Phase 2: Preparation of survey instruments and interview protocols (first half of 2012)

The work completed in Phase 1 laid the foundation for developing instruments and conducting the main data gathering in Phase 3 later in 2012. The instruments were of two kinds – interview protocols and survey instruments, and are reproduced in Appendix 1.
These protocols and instruments were designed to address the first key question for the evaluation:

Do the models adopted by the SCTEs enhance the operation and effectiveness of pre-service teacher education particularly through increased immersion in professional practice and establishment of strong school-university partnerships?

The data collections involved six groups, as follows.

- Principals of schools involved in the SCTE program.
- Mentor teachers in schools involved in the SCTE program.
- University staff involved in the SCTE program.
- SCTE Coordinators, who may or may not be university staff.
- Teachers who completed their training in 2011 and 2012, including the SCTE experience, and are in their first or second of teaching. These teachers were surveyed in June, 2013.\(^8\)
- Teachers who completed their training in 2011 and 2012, but not as part of SCTE programs, and are in their first year of teaching. These teachers were also surveyed in June, 2013.

The two groups of graduate teachers are provisionally registered teachers undertaking induction programs in Victorian schools. Given the experience they will have had in their first year of teaching, these teachers are in a good position to reflect back on their pre-service program and to answer questions about its operation and its effectiveness in preparing them for their teaching responsibilities.

The instruments (interview questions and survey questions) are reproduced in Appendix 1. They include:

- An interview schedule used to interview selected School Principals in SCTE schools.
- An interview schedule used to interview selected mentors of PSTs in SCTE schools.
- An interview schedule used to interview SCTE Coordinators in SCTE schools.
- An interview schedule used to interview selected university staff involved in SCTE programs.
- A survey questionnaire administered online to all Principals in SCTE schools.
- A survey questionnaire administered online to mentors of PSTs in SCTE schools.
- A survey questionnaire administered online to 2011 and 2012 graduates of teacher preparation programs who had gained employment as teachers in 2013.

3.1.3 Phase 3: Main data gathering period (Second half of 2012)

Interviews were conducted throughout 2012 and into 2013. Surveys of School Principals and Mentors were conducted online in November, 2012.

3.1.4 Phase 4: Data analysis and preparation of draft report (January 2013 to June, 2013)

This period was devoted to data analysis and preparation of the draft report for review and feedback. The structure of the draft final report was agreed in advance. The draft report was submitted on June 24, preliminary written feedback received on July 11 and the details confirmed at a meeting on July 17,

\(^8\) An initial attempt to survey graduating PSTs in late 2012 was unsuccessful because of difficulties in gaining email access.
3.1.5 Phase 5: Final data collection and preparation of draft report (June to August, 2013)

The final data collection (the online survey of 2011 and 2012 graduates) commenced on June 13, 2013 and continued into August, 2013. A final reminder was sent to participants on July 17 (the first week of Term 3) and the survey kept open until the end of the following week (July 26). Analysis of the final survey commenced on July 30 and the reporting of the survey completed over the next two weeks. This material was incorporated into the revised draft report and the final report submitted on August 16.

3.2 Case Study Focus

As noted, descriptive accounts of each of the seven SCTE sites were assembled over 2012 and 2013 by means of site visits, formal and informal interviews, attendance at meetings and inspection of documents, including regular progress reports from site leaders. The purpose of this work was to gain an understanding of how the SCTE design was being implemented on each site. In order to retain focus, team members used the following list of questions as a guide. The Interview schedules and surveys reproduced in Appendix 1 also reflect these foci.

Background
- How did the project begin?
- Was it a new initiative, or was it a further step in a process already underway?
- To what extent is it a departure from previous practice?
- Is the whole of the teacher preparation in the university involved in SCTE, or only a part of it? If it is a part, how much of the university’s program is involved?
- Numbers of PSTs and staff involved.

Partnerships and Collaboration
- Approaches to building partnerships and collaboration?
- What do these look like? - Who is involved, when and for what purpose/s? (Within schools, across schools, school/university, university to university.)
- How are these working? What are the features of effective partnerships and collaboration? Do these change under different circumstances?

Course Quality
- What elements of the approach are ensuring course quality?
- How is it the same/different from traditional programs?

Practicum Models
- Practicum logistics: running more than one model; numbers of PST’s in one school; numbers of universities in one school

Mentoring
- How is mentoring being used in the pilots?
- Skills of the mentor and support for skill development
- Effectiveness

Assessment Quality
- Ensuring quality assessment?
- What are the conceptual structure/principles guiding that is occurring in the centres?
- How is ICT being used to assess the PSTs
Research
  What plans are in place?
  What progress has there been to date?

Use of technology
  What is being used and how?
  How does this enrich the program? For PST’s, school staff? School overall?
  University?

Infrastructure
  Use of open learning spaces (as opposed to traditional learning spaces) and implications; physical room to accommodate PSTs in large numbers
  How are learning spaces being redesigned and improved to accommodate teaching teams?

Sustainability and costs
  Cost breakdown, practicum, mentors, university, school; start-up costs vs. ongoing costs
  Efficiency and effectiveness of approaches.

These questions provide a framework for generalisations made later and set out in Chapter 6.

3.3 Survey Details

Three surveys were administered to principals of participating schools, to the mentors (or supervising teachers) of preservice teachers in those schools and to graduates of teacher preparation programs currently employed in teaching positions.

In late 2012, all Mentors and Principals in schools participating in the SCTE program were invited to participate in an online survey.

In June, 2013, all teachers who registered with the Victorian Institute of Teaching in 2012-2013 were contacted by email and invited to participate in an online survey.

Details of the surveys and their content follow.

3.3.1 The Principal survey

The questions asked of Principals addressed a wide range of issues, focussing on the principals' experience with the SCTE program in 2012, and its impact on themselves, their staff and their schools. Key areas addressed in the survey were:

Compared to their previous experience,

- How well do they believe they have been able to provide a collegial environment for SCTE preservice teachers and their mentors in the school?
- How well do they believe they have been able to provide a variety of experiences for SCTE preservice teachers so that they could develop and practise a range of skills?
- How well do they believe SCTE preservice teachers in their schools and their mentors came to see themselves as colleagues?
- To what extent has SCTE enabled the school and university staff to come together as partners in providing teacher preparation?
- Has the school benefited from its participation in SCTE?
- Have there been costs (particularly in terms of finance and workload) associated with the school’s participation in SCTE?
A copy of the questions included in the survey is included in Appendix 1. As the survey was administered online, the copy reproduces the exact content of the questionnaire but not the exact formatting.

### 3.3.2 The Mentor Survey

The questions asked of mentors addressed a wide range of issues, focusing on their experience in mentoring within the SCTE program in 2012, and seeking their assessments of how it compared with their experience in mentoring prior to SCTE. Key areas addressed were:

*Compared to their previous experience,*

- How do they rate SCTE preservice teachers' knowledge about teaching, students and subject content?
- How well do they believe they have been able to provide SCTE preservice teachers with opportunity to develop and practise a range of skills?
- How well do they believe they have been able to provide SCTE preservice teachers with the knowledge and skills they need to deal with the responsibilities they will face as teachers?
- How authentic has been the school experience the PSTs have enjoyed?
- How closely have mentors and university staff been able to work together?
- How effective they believe the SCTE program has been in preparing its participants to become successful teachers?

In addition to the typical analysis of survey responses by item, the mentor survey was constructed to enable the creation of scales to assess the mentors' assessments of the extent to which the experience they had been able to provide for graduates had matched a number of the principles upon which the SCTE project had been designed.

The scales generated are

1. Knowledge of Pedagogy and Subject Content (9 items)
2. Opportunity to Practise Teaching Skills (5 items)
3. Real-Life Experience in a School (7 items)
4. Common Purpose between School and University (6 items)

These details, along with data on the measurement properties of the scales, are included in Chapter 5. A copy of the questions included in the survey is included in Appendix 1.

### 3.3.3 The Graduate survey

The target population was all graduates of Victorian Teacher Education programs in 2011 and 2012 who were in teaching positions. As well as these teachers, the email list used to gain access contained graduates who had not obtained teaching positions, graduates and teachers arriving in Victoria from interstate or overseas, and experienced teachers who had registered with the intention of returning to teaching after an absence. Initial survey questions were used to filter out those respondents who were not part of the target population. As a result, we were able to compare the self-reported preparedness of graduates from SCTE programs to the self-reported preparedness of graduates from other programs in the same universities.

The questions asked the graduate teachers to appraise their teacher preparation program, around a structure developed from the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers
The respondents were asked to appraise their teacher preparation in relation to the Graduate Standards, as follows:

**Professional Knowledge**

1. Know students and how they learn
2. Know the content and how to teach it

**Professional Practice**

3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning

**Professional Engagement**

6. Engage in professional learning
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/ carers and the community

In addition to the typical analysis of survey responses by item, the graduate survey was constructed to enable the construction of scales to assess the graduates' assessments of the extent to which they had been prepared to meet each of the seven AITSL Professional Standards for Teachers.

1: Know students and how they learn (8 items)
2: Know the content and how to teach it (6 items)
3: Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning strategies (7 items)
4: Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments (3 items)
5: Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning (6 items)
6: Engage in professional learning (4 items)
7: Engage professionally with colleagues, parents and others (5 items)

This enabled the project to report on each of the AITSL Standards separately. These details, along with data on the measurement properties of the scales, are included in Chapter 5.

A copy of the questions included in the survey is included in Appendix 1. As the survey was administered online, the copy reproduces the exact content of the questionnaire but not the exact formatting.

### 3.3.4 Reflections on the graduate survey

The graduate survey was undertaken with graduates of Victorian teacher education programs who had a minimum of half a year's teaching experience. This meant they had time to experience the life of the teacher, in most cases far removed from the classmates, supervising teachers or mentors and the university staff with whom they had spent their teacher preparation. This gave them time to reflect on the quality of their preparation and to develop a more informed perspective than would have been the case had we followed our original plan of surveying them in the latter stages of their courses. For this reason, their responses to this survey provide the most valid assessments of course quality that could have been achieved.

The assistance provided by the Victorian Institute of Teaching was invaluable. By approaching all teachers who were newly registered in Victoria, we were able to access the broadest possible sample of teachers who had completed their courses in the time-frame of interest. Although the survey made no mention of School Centres of Teaching Excellence (which may have been unknown to graduates of other programs), we were able, by the inclusion of appropriate questions about the university and the course that they had
completed, to identify SCTE graduates and to compare their responses with those from graduates of other programs in the same universities. This gave the comparisons a validity we would not otherwise have been able to achieve.

A large part of the survey asked respondents to make judgments about how effectively they had been prepared to achieve the professional standards required of them (the AITSL Standards). This section of the survey was developed from previous work conducted at the Australian Council for Educational Research, which had been based on the previous Victorian Institute of Teaching Standards, with which the AITSL Standards have much in common. The judgments made by respondents to the survey and the comparisons made from them have added validity because they reflect the qualities that teacher preparation programs nationally are required to demonstrate.

As is reported in Chapter 5, the scales used to assess the extent to which programs are successful in preparing their students to reach the AITSL Standards have high reliability and the capacity to distinguish clearly (and sometimes sharply) between programs. This is sound evidence of validity and suggests that these scales, with further development, could play an important role in assessing and monitoring the quality of graduates from teacher preparation programs across Australia.
4 Descriptive Accounts

4.1 Basic Information about SCTE

Participation

SCTE began in 2011 at relatively short notice, and much of the work that was underway in 2011 was in preparation for full implementation in 2012. Changes in university coursework requirements, for example, have an elaborate and sometimes lengthy approval process, and could not always be implemented immediately. Changes in practicum requirements often require rescheduling or relocation of classes, and likewise cannot always be implemented immediately. Typically, the preservice teachers participating in SCTE programs were a minority in 2011, but the numbers increased significantly to become a majority in 2012 (see Table 4.1, which sows the number of PSTs participating in SCTE programs as a percentage of the total number of PSTs in the participating universities.

Table 4.1. Preservice Teachers Participating in SCTE, 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participating in SCTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>382 of 856 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>635 of 900 (71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of increase from 2011 to 2012 varies across the seven sites, reflecting the nature of the existing program prior to the commencement of the SCTE program, as shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Participation by SCTE Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Increase (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo</td>
<td>La Trobe</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+ 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Bay</td>
<td>Deakin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+ 350%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koonung</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gippsland</td>
<td>Monash</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>+ 479%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Education Project</td>
<td>Ballarat/ La Trobe/ Melbourne</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>+ 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Cook</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Central</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Melbourne University and Victoria University, the existing programs (M Teach at Melbourne and four-year BEd at Victoria), were built on principles largely consistent with the aims and purposes of SCTE, including close school partnerships. For these programs, SCTE provided an opportunity to build on and improve arrangements that were already in place. The impact of SCTE at these sites has been to enable them to enrich and improve the existing programs, rather than to introduce new programs. Thus the figures in Table 4.2 reflect an essentially “steady state” in terms of numbers participating at these sites.

The Monash University (Gippsland) program has involved the redeveloping and rewriting of existing courses to include partnerships with school and community organisations. This commenced in 2011 and has continued into 2012, until, at last report, a total of eight core courses have been so transformed, and a remote placement program of teaching practice has been established (full details are provided in Table 4.4). The dramatic increase in
participation indicated in Table 4.3 reflects the fact that by 2012 there were sufficient of these courses available for all Monash Gippsland PSTs to experience this aspect of SCTE (the courses were introduced for final-year students only in 2011).

At the Bendigo, Northern Bay and CEP sites there have been proportionally large increases from, in each case, a smaller base.

Table 4.3 shows the types of programs in which PSTs have been enrolled in 2011 and 2012. They are spread across three program types (four-year BEd, Graduate Diplomas and Master of Teaching), with the greatest increase occurring with the four-year BEd programs at Gippsland and Northern Bay.

**Table 4.3. Enrolment Composition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four-year B Ed</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>+ 108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Dip</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>+ 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Teach</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>+ 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>+ 66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2 Loddon-Mallee Region/ La Trobe University (Bendigo Cluster)**

**4.2.1 Overview**

Under the Bendigo Education Plan, which commenced in 2005, four new 7-10 secondary colleges were built in the city. The design of the new schools is considered by some to be revolutionary. Traditional classrooms have been replaced by open areas. Each school has four ‘Small Learning Communities’ (SLCs) that are clustered around a landscaped open area. Each SLC is occupied by 100-115 students. Where practicable, teachers teach in multi-disciplinary teams. The SCTE program, introduced in 2011, was viewed as a natural progression from these developments, but the initiative brought important changes in the arrangements for training PSTs and in the relationships between partner schools and the university.

The schools involved are Weeroona College, Eaglehawk Secondary College, Crusoe College and Bendigo South East College. At La Trobe University (Bendigo campus) there are four teacher education courses that have a secondary teaching component: the Bachelor of Education, Primary/Secondary; the Bachelor of Education, Physical and Health Education; the Bachelor of Physical and Outdoor Education; and the Graduate Diploma in Education (secondary). The university produces approximately 180 secondary teaching graduates each year. The majority of secondary PSTs are in the Graduate Diploma of Education (approx. 100). Of these, approximately 25 per cent are participants in the SCTE program. In 2011 and 2012 the PSTs (SCTE) were evenly distributed across the four schools. Each school had between 6 and 9, made up of both multi-disciplinary and single-discipline groups.

The most obvious difference between the new model of teacher training and the traditional one was that Pre-Service Teachers (PSTs) spent two days of every week in the schools, observing classes and teaching under the supervision of an experienced, fully registered teacher. They also had a block placement of 4 weeks in Semester 2. This was believed to result in greater immersion in professional practice for participating PSTs.

In 2013, however, this arrangement has changed. A La Trobe senior lecturer said that the PSTs found it ‘difficult to balance’ the lessons they prepared for the school students: ‘The
classes moved quicker or slower than they expected so their lessons were messed up.’ (This ‘problem’ was not reported by university staff, PSTs or mentors in other SCTE cluster schools. Presumably, if or when it arose, it was dealt with in the mentoring processes.) Also, according to this respondent, the schools placed ‘enormous pressure’ on the PSTs to spend extra time – in some cases up to 4 days a week in schools. They were expected to attend staff meetings and teach ‘extra’ lessons. This caused their workload and stress levels to increase. From the university’s perspective it was administratively difficult to run a range of preservice practicum experiences ‘for everyone’. But, the senior lecturer said, the lesson that allowing PSTs to spend more time in schools is beneficial has been ‘well learnt’. Now all students spend more time (a total of 10 weeks) on practicum in schools.

The other ‘lesson’ derived from SCTE was about team based placements where cross disciplinary PST teams worked cooperatively with similarly grouped teams of teachers. This team based placement approach has been retained in the 2013 structure. The actual extent of team based teaching during the practicum experience varies, and depends on the context.

All core classes were and are held at the university. In 2012 Expert Mentors from the schools formed part of the lecture series. Method classes in Science (Biology, Chemistry and Physics) ran in the schools. This is continuing in 2013, and Visual Arts method classes are also held in schools. With the cessation of SCTE funding, however, the position of Expert Mentor, which was formerly funded through SCTE largely ceased. Mentoring, supervision of PSTs and administrative and coordination activities that were formerly done by Expert Mentors is now carried out by the practicum coordinator.

Formal mentoring, however, continues and is generally provided on a one to one basis. Support is also provided on an informal, collegial basis involving various teachers. The nature and extent of this support varies with schools, teaching subjects and individuals. The senior lecturer reported that more teachers seemed to be ‘putting up their hands’ to become mentors since the introduction of SCTE. He thought this was because they felt more supported by the school and the university.

4.2.2 Partnerships and Collaboration

In 2011 and 2012 PSTs developed closer relationships with the schools than existed under the traditional model of teacher training. Principals noted that many PSTs found time to come to the schools outside of the two required days. They had developed good relationships with staff and students and were prepared to help with extra-curricular activities. PSTs and mentors interviewed shared this view. One PST stressed that she liked coming to the school on additional days, because she felt an increased sense of ‘belonging’ She also said that she preferred to work on her assignments at school than at home, partly because of family distractions, but also because she had ready access to students and teachers. In 2013, however the senior lecturer from La Trobe indicated that some PSTs had found these ‘extra demands’ too difficult to cope with. Principals, mentors and university staff reported that the already high levels of collegiality among the principals and staff of the four schools and university staff involved in the SCTE program increased in 2012 as the SCTE concepts became more familiar and more accepted. But some PSTs experienced increased stress as their workloads increased due to extra demands being put on them at the schools.

In 2012, the appointment of a full time SCTE coordinator (fully funded through SCTE) was reported to have greatly improved communication among the four schools, and between the schools and the university. This was seen as particularly important in the new open classroom environment of the ‘Bendigo Model’ where teachers and PSTs were exploring new and innovative pedagogies based on team learning and teaching. In this situation it is essential for
the university to have current knowledge of what is being achieved in the schools under the new model, and of the benefits and challenges. The reflective approaches of the training and mentoring program were helping to enrich the school programs and add to the knowledge base that underpins the university’s courses.

In 2013, however, the position of SCTE coordinator was discontinued due to the imminent cessation of SCTE funding. The effects, in terms of weakened contact between schools and the university, were being felt:

> We developed an incredibly productive relationship with schools over the past two years. All our talk about what could be done better – we did it! A huge amount of goodwill was created. But now the relationships are weakening. We are not now having the regularity of contact. Over time this will weaken further (Senior lecturer, La Trobe University, March 2013).

### 4.2.3 Course quality

In 2011, with the introduction of SCTE, new course structures replaced the traditional model of placements. Changes had to be made quickly and some of the concepts were unfamiliar to many of the participants. In 2012 the situation, initially, was seen to be much improved, as everyone involved was more familiar with the 2 day a week site-based model and the thinking behind it. More time was spent at the start of 2012 in familiarizing people in the schools with the SCTE concepts. La Trobe University staff and the SCTE coordinator, who was based at the university, visited the schools regularly and talked to staff and principals. However this changed with the new practicum arrangements and discontinuing of the SCTE coordinator position in 2013.

The multi-disciplinary approach is especially important in the open classroom arrangements at Bendigo because this is the approach that is followed by teachers who work in teams. A multi-disciplinary team of about 6-9 PSTs at each site shares a small staffroom with 8-9 teachers. Staff rooms are not discipline-based. There is one team of PST teachers at each school. In 2012, all members of each PST team, in addition to teaching in their disciplines, attempted to work collaboratively on one project on a common theme. Projects varied across the 4 schools, but all were in common areas, such as how to develop higher order questioning skills, or games based learning. The plan was for the PSTs to apply their learning from this project in their own teaching and to give presentations to staff as part of their assessment. The multi-disciplinary approach was not seen as ‘artificial’ since this was the mode in which teachers at the four schools were attempting to work anyway. It was hoped that the closer relationships among the university and the four schools would enhance course content and delivery, bringing the theory into line with the practice.

The multi-disciplinary team approach is continuing in 2013 and has been extended to all courses offered by La Trobe, Bendigo campus. However the senior lecturer reported that much of the expected closer cooperation between multi-disciplinary teams of teachers and PSTs did not eventuate because the associated integrated curriculum projects ‘didn’t happen’. This was largely because of the extra workload such projects entail on school staff and PSTs and the lack of common planning time that was needed to make them viable.

Largely as a result of SCTE, the university has tried to better integrate developments in schools with their programs. As previously noted, all four secondary schools in Bendigo are

---

9 The Bendigo SCTE cluster spent $206,856 on staffing, 2011-2012. Much of this was used to support the position of the SCTE coordinator.
designed and operate on an open plan model. This has led to the development of new teaching approaches that are being investigated in an ARC funded research project (see 4.2.7 below). As a response to changes in school curriculum organisation and teaching methodology that are evolving from the open plan arrangements a topic on teaching in open plan areas in schools has been introduced into the university curriculum, and there is a stronger emphasis on personalized learning. This is an important example of the advances and benefits to both school and university curriculums that can result from closer cooperation and consultation within strengthened partnerships.

4.2.4 Practicum models

In 2011, as a direct result of participation in SCTE, the university changed from a traditional ‘block placement’ model of practicum to a more extended site-based model in which PSTs spent more time in schools. In 2011 and 2012, PSTs in the SCTE cohort (called ‘P2s’), had a 25-30 days placement on a 2 day a week model from mid-term 1 to the end of term 2. They also had a 20 day (4 week) block placement in Term 3. This meant that SCTE cohorts spent a total of 50 days (10 weeks) practicum in schools. Non-SCTEs had 2 block placements of 4 weeks each, (total 8 weeks). In 2013, as a result of the observed beneficial effects of the extra time in schools, all PSTs in all pre-service teacher education courses at La Trobe Bendigo will spend 10 weeks on practicum in schools.

4.2.5 Participation

In 2011 and 2012 SCTE was limited to the 4 Bendigo schools. This meant that the numbers in SCTE were limited, as not all PSTs could be trained in these schools due to distance and other limitations. Originally it was planned to expand the program beyond the 4 schools, but in 2012 a decision was made to stay with just 4 schools to allow the new concepts to ‘settle down’. The SCTE coordinator noted: ‘We need to build on what’s there and consolidate the partnerships.’

In 2011 there were 25 PSTs in the SCTE program of a total 180 in all courses (14%). In 2012 there were 30. In 2011 all SCTE PSTs were in the Graduate Diploma program. In 2012 Bachelor of Physical Education and Health Education were also in the SCTE program. In 2013 there is no specific SCTE cohort or program. This was partly because the administrative requirements for organising different types of practicum over widely dispersed schools were found to be ‘too complex’ and because the disadvantages of attempting to do so were seen to outweigh the advantages.

4.2.6 Mentoring

In 2011 there was no specific mentor training. This was identified as a ‘big issue’ for 2012. Mentors participated in a two-day DEECD mentor training program (*A Learning Guide for Teacher Mentors* 2011) In 2012, a position of responsibility with time allowance of 120 minutes per week, was created in each SCTE school for an ‘Expert Mentor’ who worked throughout the year with all mentors in the SCTE program, providing feedback and encouraging communication. One of the SCTE Coordinator’s key roles was to liaise with the Expert Mentors, meeting with them at least once a fortnight. This was described as a ‘key shift’ that was attributed to SCTE and is funded by it.

Expert Mentors and the SCTE co-ordinator were incorporated into the lecture program at the university. Topics included: differentiating the curriculum, personalised learning, 1 to 1 learning; working in a team based environment; a day in the life of a teacher in open-plan learning environments; teaching and learning in open-plan learning spaces; and inter-disciplinary teaching.
In 2012, the funding appointment and training of the Expert Mentors in each school was regarded as ‘a major development’ and the DEECD program for mentors was seen as a practical and useful tool for mentor training in the schools. This changed in 2013 when lack of SCTE funding meant that the time allowance could not be maintained and the position of Expert Mentor was discontinued.

4.2.7 Research

Funding has been obtained from the Australian Research Council to support a study that will evaluate the Bendigo open-classroom model of teaching and learning. The project will include a detailed study of ‘personalized learning in open spaces’. This will be relevant to the SCTE model of PST training.

In 2013, a Masters student is writing a thesis: ‘Intended and unintended consequences of team based placements.’ The student has surveyed all SCTE PSTs and is comparing the traditional block practicum placement model with the 2 day a week model. The thesis will examine the integration of university based learning with school based learning in both models. It will also investigate issues relating to mentoring and critical reflection on practice. The university is also conducting a small scale research project to determine the perspectives of: (1) expert mentors; (2) mentors, and; (3) PSTs. The purpose of this research is to determine elements of a model that will improve the integration of university and school based learning.

4.2.8 Use of technology

Use of technology is a priority in the four schools. As new and highly innovative learning environments they are all are well equipped in this respect. Teachers were described as having ‘a good working knowledge’ of ICT’s pedagogical and other (e.g. administrative, planning, assessment and reporting) uses. All PSTs are encouraged to extend their existing knowledge in this area, e.g. by incorporating it into their practice, and to share it, especially with those teachers who are less accustomed to working with technology. The DEECD provided netbooks for all PSTs involved in the program. School based training has been provided for PSTs in the use of the netbooks and the Ultranet.

4.2.9 Infrastructure

In the Bendigo schools, multi-disciplinary teams of PSTs share learning and preparation spaces with teams of teachers. They have full access to all school facilities, including technology, and are encouraged to use the facilities. Lectures and tutorials are held at the university. Some method lectures are held in the schools. In 2011 and 2012 the SCTE coordinator’s office was at the university. This changed with the termination of the coordinator position following cessation of SCTE funding in 2013.

4.2.10 Sustainability and costs

The role of SCTE Coordinator was funded by SCTE and was seen as crucial to the program’s success. With a hurried start to SCTE in 2011, the coordinator’s role was, of necessity, largely one of ‘troubleshooting.’ In 2012 the main role was supporting partnerships, especially the school-university partnership. This included feeding back the PST and school experiences to the university, and providing increased opportunities for reflection on practice as part of the theoretical studies. In 2013 the coordinator position no longer exists and the effects, particularly in terms of supporting and maintaining relationships and partnerships, are already being felt.
SCTE funding also supported the Expert Mentor positions and teacher release for mentor training. Some support was also given to Bendigo Senior Secondary College to enable it to consider how the model might be made to work in that (quite different) setting. This is no longer the case and the effects are already being felt as the time for mentors to meet with mentees and other stakeholders such as university staff, has been significantly reduced.

The future sustainability of SCTE in this cluster has always been seen largely in financial terms. Without the funding it is not clear how the program can be maintained in the long term.

4.2.11 General

In 2012 the SCTE model appeared to be enhancing the operation and effectiveness of PST education in the Bendigo cluster. In particular, the PSTs developed a closer and more authentic relationship with their schools. There were closer and more productive partnerships among the participating schools and between the university and the schools, so that a community of learning and practice was created.

The project created opportunities for the university to modify course content to suit the changed teaching environment of the Bendigo Education Plan, to re-think its assessment structures, and to design assessment tasks to reflect PSTs’ real experiences in schools over a longer term. Links between theory and practice were made more explicit and more meaningful for PSTs.

There were administrative problems for the university in setting up the SCTE program in 2011 and 2012. These related mostly to timetabling issues: lectures for the SCTE group of PSTs could not be held while they were at schools, and university staff needed to be timetabled so that they could be in schools to support PSTs two days a week. It was extremely difficult to structure timetables in ways that would allow two (traditional and SCTE) programs to run successfully.

In 2013 the university decided not to run different practicum models for different groups of PSTs, so the two day per week SCTE model was discontinued. Other major changes were the suspension of the SCTE coordinator position and the position of Expert Mentor, both of which had been supported by SCTE funding.

The La Trobe senior lecturer reported three ‘learnings’ from SCTE:

1. Continuation of team based placements for PSTs:
   We found that this worked. The social learning was strong; the PSTs gave each other strong support and helped each other in a large variety of ways. They have formed strong and continuing networks. We have anecdotal evidence that they still interact online with the people they went on prac with over the two years. We’ve never experienced that before.

2. Advantages of PSTs spending extended periods of time in schools:
   We realise the benefit of PSTs spending longer periods of time in schools. We used to have one 4 week block of 5 days each semester. Now we have 5 weeks of 4 days per semester. Same number of days, but more weeks. This applies to all PSTs.

3. University programs more in tune with developments in schools:
   We have tried to better integrate what we do here with what happens in schools, e.g. we’ve introduced a 2 week topic on teaching in open plan areas in schools and there is
now a stronger emphasis on personalized learning and the use of data. Three years ago this was not happening. The university is now much more responsive.

4.3 Barwon-South-Western /Northern Bay Cluster (Deakin University)

4.3.1 Overview

Northern Bay College is a new school formed at the beginning of 2011 from the amalgamation of nine schools: 5 separate primary schools, Norlane High School and Corio Bay Senior College. To an extent, it is appropriate to read this case study in the light of this context. The SCTE project is one of a number of developments occurring throughout the school and the context of the setting is important. The school serves a disadvantaged community: for example, many parents have not themselves experienced higher education and student aspirations have been quite low.

Many of the structures of the school have been undergoing modification throughout the time in which the SCTE has been running and this has created opportunities for PSTs which may not always be available. The college is moving to a 5-campus structure, with four P-8 campuses and a Senior College from 9-12, with a separate Year 9 learning community which opened in 2012. This entails closing some campuses and providing new buildings.

Innovations in teaching and teacher training include the use of flexible learning spaces and team-teaching, a move away from the traditional approach of one teacher with a class of students. The college has also participated in the pilot Teach for Australia pathway into teaching funded by the federal government under the Teacher Quality National Partnership.

There was a prior relationship between the Cox Road campus and Deakin University (Geelong) through the development of the Grad Dip (Applied Learning), which was already there and already becoming a more residency-based program. The college also saw the SCTE program as a means to develop the capacity of their current staff as well as the PSTs.

Deakin University was also looking to align its PST education with school improvement initiatives. The university wanted a closer relationship with the school and greater opportunities for their PST students to learn by assisting with real issues in schools, such as literacy. One intended outcome is that PSTs are seen as resources (rather than just seen for their deficit in teaching knowledge), as they come with experience and capacity, and that they can be a key resource for school improvement. This is particularly relevant in the case of Deakin’s Grad Dip (Applied Learning) as the majority of participants in the program are career-changes who come to teaching from other industries, who generally have greater life and work experience than school leavers or recent graduates, and who have to go through a selection process to participate in the Diploma.

4.3.2 Partnership and collaboration

The Northern Bay cluster SCTE is a partnership between one school with several campuses and the Geelong campus of Deakin University. In 2011, 10 pre-service teachers (PSTs) from Deakin’s Applied Learning grad dip (secondary) course participated in the SCTE program, from a total of about 80 PSTs undertaking the course (12.5%). In 2012-13, over 200 PSTs from 5 different Deakin (Geelong) courses were placed at Northern Bay.
A steering committee has been established with members from each stakeholder group including the SCTE Coordinator, school campus principals, university staff and a pre-service teacher. The committee currently meets once a month.

The partnership goes beyond simply placing PSTs in the school and creating a closer working relationship between university lecturers and teachers: it is embedded within school improvement initiatives and there is a specific aim to enhance student aspirations towards a higher education pathway. The partnership has extended to the college’s students, with students from years 6-11 gaining access to Deakin University once a week as part of the Aspire program.

The partnership between school and university, with a focus on student aspiration and school improvement areas, has resulted in the PSTs being seen as an additional resource in the school. PSTs are presented with the opportunity to participate in these focus areas and the PSTs themselves are an integral part of the collaboration. As noted in more detail elsewhere, PSTs have been responsible for creating new units and programs that have been integrated into the curriculum and continued beyond the time that those PSTs spent at the school. The relationship between PSTs and teachers has in some cases gone beyond that of mentoring and supervision to a partnership in which the teacher has also learned from the PST. The integration of PSTs enabled them to make further contributions: in the case of the Year 9 team, new in 2012 and focussed on students spending time in the community, some connections to local organisations were made through PSTs and partnerships were formed that are ongoing.

The school and university has also partnered in the development of Masterclass programs, featuring talks by teachers and lecturers and practical demonstrations with students, filmed for ongoing use in university course modules (further discussed below).

4.3.3 Course quality and design

Deakin’s Graduate Diploma of Education (Applied Learning) for secondary teachers is aimed primarily at mature-age students with industry experience (average age is in the 30s) and there is a selection process. Students are required to do 45 days (in 2 blocks) at school, plus an additional 15 days, 60 days in all. The additional 15 days are presented as being voluntary but there is an expectation that students will commit to them. Many PSTs become so involved that they go beyond even the voluntary additional component of the course. There is also an expectation that students who commit to Northern Bay will spend the full 45 days at the one school, although they may spend time at different campuses and in different year levels on each of their two blocks.

One of the focus areas of the program for Deakin is to ensure that new teachers understand the daily issues schools face, rather than simply, for example, doing a lecture on literacy and then putting the PST in a school, with no context – the SCTE is a continuation of the school/university partnership aimed at providing that context. The partnership is also aligned with the schools improvement plan to build capacity. PSTs are involved with building pathways for high-achieving school students, raising their aspirations to enter higher education, and also working in partnership with the local Aboriginal Co-operative in raising indigenous students’ literacy and numeracy with a cultural focus.
The SCTE Coordinator position is seen as pivotal and strengthens the partnership between the school and university. As an example, in one instance, it became clear that PSTs undertaking the Deakin P-6 course were not well prepared for the team-based method of teaching being used at the school. The coordinator was able to report back to the university and lecturers in that course then visited the school and spent time in the open space, with teachers and students. As a result, some aspects of the P-6 course have been changed to reflect the changed teaching practices on the ground.

PSTs are also given the opportunity to shadow principals, sit in on meetings etc. (e.g. 1 PST is on the SCTE steering committee), to give them an opportunity to see what goes on at a broader level than the classroom, to appreciate the issues schools face and to raise awareness of available networks such as the DEECD regional office.

The SCTE is developing a series of Masterclass programs, jointly delivered by the university and teachers at the school. The first one involved some of the PSTs (doing the Primary Graduate Diploma) learning about the college Independent Reading Program from a literacy coach and other school and university staff. Following the Masterclass discussion, the PSTs then ‘saw it in action’ with a group of Year 9s – sitting in on conferences between students and teachers about the student’s reading. The cohort of 2012 PSTs also experienced Masterclasses as they have developed. Masterclasses are being filmed with the intent of using them in future course modules for PSTs.

4.3.4 Practicum models

The program generally involves two blocks of approximately 4 weeks at the College plus approximately 1 hour a week at the College on a Friday across the year, rising to 3 hours on a Friday in Term 4 (plus planning time). PSTs are required to do 45 days (in 2 blocks) at a school, plus an additional 15 days, 60 days in all. The extent and timing of the practicum (in 2 blocks) was the same as that undertaken in other schools by Deakin PSTs on the same course. The additional 15 days can be taken in a variety of ways. The major difference is in the experience itself. PSTs receive an induction into the school and are treated as colleagues and teachers within a staff team. They are expected to contribute towards one area of school improvement. In the Year 6-8 and Year 9 settings, teams of PSTs work in the same space with teams of teachers. PSTs have indicated that this gives them an opportunity to plan lessons together and to discuss their experiences with peers (who in many cases were themselves part of the same events, although each PST undertakes different tasks at various times so they are not always working as a team).

The school provides an initial induction (for example, a three-day observation at the end of Term 4, and prior to placement). PSTs visit the school and separate campuses, view classes being taught and have a session with the principal and with campus principals where they are given information on the school and its expectations of them. In an interview with PSTs, they noted that they were treated as teachers with an expectation that they would participate in the life of the school and that they would assist in areas that had been identified for school improvement.

Northern Bay College operates with teams of teachers up to Year 9. There are open learning spaces and teachers present classes in teams, so there is already a structure in place that lends itself to the approach being developed for PSTs in the SCTE.
PSTs are placed in teams and work with teams of teachers. For example, at the Hendy Street Campus (P-8) in 2012, a team of 5 PSTs worked with years 6-8 (about 100 students) in an open learning environment alongside a team of 5 teachers. The school is moving to a system whereby the additional money that used to be paid to teachers to take a PST is now pooled amongst a team of teachers and used for PD.

The team approach is quite different from the previous model at Northern Bay, where a PST coordinator at each campus would indicate what PSTs were available and interested individual teachers would agree to take a PST for a block placement. The team approach means that responsibility for PSTs is shared, although there is a team leader who plays a coordinating role for the team.

The school is attempting to change traditional cultural perceptions of PSTs, to view them as resources (rather than just seen to have a deficit in teaching knowledge). To the extent that this is successful, the PSTs are seen to be an advantage rather than an additional demand on time and resources.

In addition to PSTs being seen as resources, teachers were becoming more involved in assisting the PSTs with their study. In this way, there is a reciprocal relationship. While PSTs are expected to contribute to partnership, the teachers also worked with the PSTs on the assignments required by their course. So for example when the PSTs were given an assignment on assessment, the whole teaching team (in Year 9) worked on developing assessment rubrics alongside the PST team. In this way, the practical requirements and theory of the course are being integrated with the school experience. Teachers would also view assignments, review CVs, act as referees for PSTs and even suggest positions for which they could apply.

**Vignette 4: Raising student aspirations**

In 2011, Northern Bay College identified a need to provide higher-ability students in years 8 and 9 with a program aimed at raising their aspirations, and the PSTs were asked to design and run this program with support from a team of teachers. This started as a one-hour session on a Friday afternoon across the year. Its success led to it being increased to three hours and embedded in the curriculum, to continue as a program in 2012. Three of the PSTs continued to lead the program throughout Term 4. The program included taking the students to Deakin University to experience life as a university student and attend some lectures. Through the program, the students were given new opportunities, the school benefitted from the skills and resources of the university and PSTs, and the PSTs were able to plan and lead activities for the same students over an extended period.

Called the SPIRE program, it is now featured in the college prospectus as ‘aimed at enhancing opportunities for secondary school students to gain entry into university.’

As one interviewee noted:

‘PSTs ran the SPIRE program which connected high achieving kids to the university. The feedback from the kids was that they wanted to know what it was really like to be at uni, and because the PSTs had such a good relationship with them they were able to listen to that feedback and they got the uni student groups involved and took the kids to accommodation, and mess halls etc., and talk to uni students about their experiences.’
4.3.5 Mentoring

The term ‘Mentor’ and the nature of the traditional role implied by that term has been questioned within the SCTE. Part of the structure of the SCTE is to have teams of teachers and PSTs working together on a project (or projects) over the year. The term ‘Mentor’ implies a single person in much the same role as a teacher supervisor, a role which attracts additional funding for the supervisor. Where there is a team approach to a program being delivered at the school, the question of who writes the reports for students becomes problematic, as well as who writes a report for the PST.

In general, the term ‘Mentor’ is seen to be singular and is therefore constraining. Teachers have shared professional knowledge, which they hold in common and which forms part of the history and knowledge of a Community of Practice (COP), which should include PSTs as well as in-service teachers. This is not to say that the relationship component of a mentor is undervalued – such rapport is fundamental to the operation of the team.

There is still some work to be done around selection of Teacher Educators and the team structure for supporting PSTs. This has raised questions such as what makes a good teacher educator, how mentors are selected, and whether all teaching staff should see themselves in that role. No professional development has been provided for mentors as yet, although the university is looking into providing courses that will include credit towards a Masters in Teacher Education. In Term 4, 2013, a mentor training program is planned. The program focuses on AITSL standards and is intended to provide additional support to, and build the capacity of, mentors. A handbook has also been developed for the use of mentors.

In the new Year 9 building, starting from 2012, PSTs joined the new team of teachers from the second week of term. Each PST had two subject areas and tended to spend time working with individual teachers in those subject areas. Most subject areas consisted of a day doing theory in class and a day out in the field, so on any given day many students would be out of the building. The teachers developed a template at the beginning of the term which they used to provide feedback directly to the PSTs. Lesson plans were viewed by the Lead Teacher, who provided detailed feedback. Teachers also provided feedback on university assignments for the PSTs.

Interaction with the teachers and PSTs went both ways – another aspect of the relationship that the term ‘mentor’ does not encompass. In one example, an experienced teacher, who had done his own planning for most of his career, was so impressed with the background of one of the PSTs and the unit she created that he invited her to come back and work with him to revise that unit for his use the following year, and they included the students in the revision as well, which was a considerable departure from that teacher’s previous methodology.

PSTs have indicated a high level of satisfaction with the practicum they experienced. They noted that they had been asked to teach from their first day and they were expected to participate as teachers in the school. They strongly endorsed the team approach. As a team of PSTs they were able to plan together and to support each other by discussing their experiences. Working with a team of teachers at the school allowed them to view different methods of teaching and to be observed by different teachers. After every school day they spent time with a teacher receiving feedback, which they considered to be excellent. As they were working in a space with about 100 students in three year levels (6-8) they were also able to experience working with different student groups.
The PSTs also noted that working in a disadvantaged setting had opened their eyes to the nature of disadvantage, and they had received PD from the school in this area. They had also learnt a lot about behaviour management, something they felt they had not received through the university component of their course.

4.3.6 Use of technology

The College is made up of several different campuses, catering to different year levels. In this sense, each campus has its own personality and culture, within that of the College as a whole. This also applies to areas such as the use of technology. In 2012, the new Year 9 building opened on the senior campus. The lead teacher in the Year 9 team was new to the school and had experience in ICT pedagogy, so she led the development of ICT at the Year 9 level, purchasing whiteboards and organising professional development in that area over the year. The staff team all participated in the PD, including the PSTs who were onsite at the time.

One PST based at the Year 9 campus used his prior experience to develop a unit in robotics. The unit was so popular amongst students that the PST ran it every term, refining it each time. Some students did the course more than once and the PST was able to extend their skills each time, as well as catering for students new to the unit. Although the PST is no longer there, teachers in the team were also able to learn from his expertise so that the unit could continue to run.

4.3.7 Sustainability and costs

Interviewees did note an issue regarding the level of expectation placed upon PSTs. The basic 45 day practicum is an expected part of teacher education courses and in the traditional model PSTs are given the opportunity to gain hands-on experience in schools. The work PSTs do is unpaid, and many of them were involved beyond even the additional 15 days preferred by Deakin. The school sees PSTs as a resource and has acknowledged the impact they can have: PSTs have developed and run new courses and extra-curricular programs. School leaders were increasingly aware that not all PSTs are able to put in a high level of additional time commitment: many have families or job commitments as well; nor do they all have the life experience and expert knowledge of the career-changers in Deakin’s Applied Learning program.

The College recognised that expectations of PSTs needed to be reasonable. One interviewee noted that, in previous experience, ‘a lot of PSTs just want to observe and constantly seek assurance that they’re doing okay.’ This was a consideration in the ongoing development of the SCTE program.

The SCTE model requires a project coordinator. This role is paid for jointly by the school and the university (Using SCTE funding for the duration of the pilot), and the coordinator has a desk at both workplaces. The coordinator is responsible for placing all PSTs (including from other courses and universities) in the school and thus supplies a useful administrative role for the university. The coordinator also acts as a mentor to the PSTs and as a single port of call should issues arise and this has strengthened awareness of PST needs at both university and school level.

It is firmly believed that an SCTE Coordinator with links to the school and university is an effective method of coordinating PST placement across all campuses, including placement of PSTs from other universities. The school is paying more attention than previously to the
provision of a school-wide policy regarding PSTs and to changing the culture amongst staff so that PSTs are seen as a resource rather than a burden, and working in teams eased the pressure of additional responsibility on individual teachers.

The pivotal role is that of the school/university-based coordinator and the importance of this role is seen in its principal-level salary and full-time position. To the extent that the coordinator administers the placement of PSTs, which is a role already required and funded by universities, there may be scope for that traditional role to be incorporated in the new coordinator role. Some funding would also need to come from the school, as the potential of the position is primarily in the coordinator’s dual employment at both school and university. To the extent that the school sees PSTs as a resource and a benefit, and able to assist in the targeting of areas identified for school improvement, the school would need to find a way to resource the coordinator role into the future.

Deakin University’s School of Education is undertaking a full review of the PST professional experience arrangements in the light of learning from the SCTE model. Adaptations of the model have expanded to the Surf Coast in 2013 and there is an intention to extend to seven schools in Warrnambool from 2014. Northern Bay itself is a cluster of campuses under the umbrella of a single school. Extending the SCTE model to a cluster of separate primary and secondary schools would require a high degree of collaboration between principals in order to achieve an effective cluster arrangement. The model may also be problematic in dense population areas such as Melbourne where schools tend to be more competitive and partnership models may be more difficult to establish.

4.4 Eastern Metropolitan Region/ University of Melbourne (Koonung Cluster)

4.4.1 Overview

The SCTE was introduced into a well-established network of schools with a history of working together. The Melbourne Graduate School of Education’s (MGSE) Master of Teaching (M Teach) program has been operating successfully in this network of schools since its inception in 2008.

The schools involved are Koonung Secondary College, Box Hill High School, Mount Waverley High School, Greythorn Primary School, Ringwood Heights Primary School, Box Hill North Primary School and Mont Albert Primary School. Other universities (predominantly Deakin and Monash) also place PSTs in the schools, but the Melbourne University candidates tend to make up about 90% of the total PSTs in the SCTE cluster. In 2013 the coordinator of the SCTE in the Eastern Metropolitan Region reported that the project had ‘solidified’ the relationship between the Melbourne Graduate School of Education and cluster schools:

SCTE has provided the exposure, the profile, the encouragement and the money to enable innovative thinking on the part of all involved (SCTE coordinator EMR cluster).

Fifty to 55 PSTs per year are involved in the program. They spend time in both primary and secondary schools, where they are encouraged to participate fully across all facets of the
schools’ operations, including sporting, camps, excursions and other extra-curricular activities.

Koonung Secondary College is the lead school for the cluster, and takes ‘the lion’s share’ of PSTs.

A feature of the program is that mentor teachers are encouraged and funded to complete the first unit of a new Masters program developed at the MGSE— the Specialist Certificate in Clinical Practice. This focuses on teachers developing their skills as mentors, and was described by the SCTE coordinator as ‘our big ticket item.’ Casual relief time is paid for and the staff are free to attend lectures and to complete the assessment using the schools as their research base.

### 4.4.2 Partnerships and Collaboration

The SCTE coordinator has played a major role in helping the SCTE partner schools to develop cooperative collaborative relationships. SCTE cluster schools now increasingly share facilities and expertise. Staff in cluster schools have exchanged visits, e.g. teachers in the Art faculties at Box Hill HS and Koonung SC have developed an on-going relationship and have developed plans to cross-mark and cross-teach. This is leading to some curriculum changes in both schools.

Regular meetings of SCTE cluster stakeholders (including principals, Teaching Fellows, and Clinical Specialists) have been held since the inception of the project. These started as once a term then went to once every term and a half. In 2013 they co-reported that they were ‘starting to peter out a bit’ as the programs became more self-sustaining and gathered their own momentum.

Stronger relationships have also been developed between teachers in secondary and primary schools in the cluster. Team teaching occurred in 2011 and more took place in 2012-13. PSTs visited Ringwood Heights Primary School and the other primary schools in the cluster (Box Hill North, Mont Albert, Greythorn), to observe, share and team teach. They participated in learning walks at cluster schools and shared reciprocal professional development. Staff from the Arts faculty at Koonung visited Box Hill High School to view facilities. The Science building at Box Hill HS was made available for teachers and PSTs to work with primary and secondary groups.

These developments have improved existing relationships and transition arrangements between all cluster schools.

The SCTE project is contributing to the development of a culture of learning and collaboration at Koonung Secondary College. Teachers who are studying for Masters degrees (part of which are funded under SCTE), make presentations to the whole staff. The SCTE coordinator described these presentations as ‘professional conversations of high quality’. External visitors (local and international) have been invited to the school to share expertise, stimulate discussions and exchange ideas.

### 4.4.3 Practicum Models

School experience is organized under the M Teach model. PSTs spend 2 days each week in schools and undertake one block placement of four weeks. In 2013, the M Teach students
from Melbourne University have spent two days a week (Thursdays and Fridays) in the school. In Semester 1 2013 they worked at Koonung SC. In semester 2 they plan to go to other schools, including primary schools.

PSTs are encouraged to be fully involved in the life of their host schools. They have participated in such activities as camps, excursions, sports carnivals and professional PD offered to staff.

The PSTs reported that they greatly appreciated the collegiate approach of teachers in the school: ‘The teachers are great we can jump in on any classes and they are always prepared to answer questions and provide advice,’ said one. They believe they have already learnt a lot from observing classes. Importantly, they have also developed relationships with students and teachers. ‘I’ve also talked to kids, built relationships. The kids know me’.

### 4.4.4 Mentoring

In schools, PSTs are supported by a Clinical Specialist from MGSE and a school-based Teaching Fellow as well as their formal mentor. Mentoring is seen as a group effort. Teams of teachers work with the PSTs. Seminars are held at the university and at the schools. Seven out of eight seminars are delivered in schools, including Box Hill High School and Mount Waverley Secondary College. The quality of the mentoring that they receive is enhanced by their mentors completing the Masters unit and bringing innovative research to the relationship.

Some trials have been initiated to develop a new, more collaborative model of mentoring, based on a ‘team’ approach. In this approach the mentor and mentee are aligned within a Learning Domain or KLA and they move between other teachers, classes, and year levels.

Increasing emphasis is now (2013) being placed on enabling PSTs to use data to improve student learning. This was seen as a ‘big shift’ that was attributed in large part to the quality of mentoring and the improving professional knowledge of mentor teachers. Under the SCTE model the qualifications of mentors have been substantially upgraded. At the conclusion of SCTE funding almost 50 teachers will have completed the first unit (mentoring) of the Masters degree in Clinical Teaching (Specialist Certificate in Clinical Teaching) which was funded under SCTE. This popular and sustainable course is now being offered in an on-going capacity by MGSE. Teachers who have completed the unit share their expertise with colleagues in professional teaching and learning teams in cluster schools in a variety of ways, including the presentation of seminars and whole curriculum days to staff groups. Teachers see this as being of continuing benefit to school curriculum and the teaching and learning culture.

The new mentor teachers for 2012 and 2013 were drawn largely from the pool of Clinical Certificate graduates. The pool of mentor teachers is thus continually rotated and replenished. ‘All of this has made the ripple flow outward. Without SCTE it would never have happened’ (SCTE Co-ordinator 2013).

Some challenges continue in finding suitable people to take on mentoring roles. There is little support for the idea of making mentoring a compulsory component of the work of Experienced and Expert Teachers. Another major challenge is time. SCTE funding has
enabled some time release for teachers to participate in the MGSE mentor training program, but mentors have no time release for the actual mentoring of PSTs.

### 4.4.5 Assessment

PSTs undertake the full range of assessments for the M. Teach degree. MGSE sets out assessment guidelines and takes responsibility for all theory, assignments and examinations. Assessments of practice are mainly a school based responsibility. ‘The university takes notice of us. We have terminated a number of PSTs on grounds of unsuitability for teaching’ (SCTE Coordinator).

All assessment tasks are designed to demonstrate that candidates meet the required graduate professional standards for teaching. The SCTE Coordinator described the PST assessment workload in the M Teach as ‘huge’: ‘The clinical placements are a great feature – but trying to do all the assignments in a year and a half is very stressful.’

### 4.4.6 Research

In 2013, the SCTE coordinator reported that research was ‘not a major focus’ of the project in the cluster. Nonetheless, through their collaborative partnerships, MGSE lecturers and tutors, teachers in SCTE cluster schools, and PSTs all see themselves as consciously participating in and contributing to research based knowledge on teaching and learning.

### 4.4.7 Use of technology

The PSTs generally see themselves as proficient in their use of technology. All were aiming to make maximum use of technology in their teaching. Some felt they could ‘influence’ their mentors and other teachers in this aspect, but they were mainly anxious to learn more about educational applications. All PSTs have access to their school’s intranet and other resources. A newly established ‘Teaching and Learning Centre’ (see below) is equipped with state of the art technological resources and equipment.

### 4.4.8 Infrastructure

In 2013 a designated teaching and learning space ‘The Teaching and Learning Centre’ is being constructed at Koonung SC for the use of all schools in the cluster. The Centre will have special equipment such as cameras and AV equipment that will facilitate activities like demonstration teaching and teachers providing feedback on each other’s teaching practice. SCTE funding has contributed to this initiative, but no schools in the cluster have infrastructure specifically dedicated to SCTE. PSTs are encouraged to work with teachers in their classrooms and to share staffrooms and other spaces, facilities and resources. There appear to be no limits on this sharing. It will become a bookable space for all activities that hinge on teaching and learning and teacher training.

### 4.4.9 Sustainability and costs

The SCTE funding has been put to good use in supporting the coordinator position and to support teachers from across the cluster undertaking studies in mentoring at MGSE. This has resulted in increased collaboration, improved professional knowledge and expertise, and a higher level of shared professional commitment and optimism among staff in cluster schools. From 2013 it is expected that the new Teaching and Learning Centre will work towards ensuring the sustainability of established project initiatives. The SCTE Coordinator noted that
‘the quality of conversations among teaching staff and PSTs is fantastic! It’s research driven and pedagogically focused’.

Koonung SC has employed more than 30 graduates over the years of the M Teach (started 2009). This is expected to continue.

Information gathered so far strongly suggests that the model is sustainable in the long term. However challenges continue in finding suitable placements for the growing number of PSTs and ensuring that no unsatisfactory placing or mentoring arrangements occur because of expedience. Continuing improvement and development will be contingent on sufficient funding being made available, and a recognition of the time and significance that should be attributed to the PST and mentor teacher relationship. Continuation of the role of project coordinator will be crucial.

4.5 Gippsland Region/ Monash University (Gippsland Cluster)

4.5.1 Background

Dr Simone White was appointed Professor, Associate Dean and Head of School at the Gippsland Campus of Monash University, taking up her appointment at the beginning of 2011. With her career interest in teacher education research and preparing teachers for diverse settings (e.g. small schools, rural schools, schools in low SES settings) and university-school partnership building, the Monash–Gippsland SCTE project was consistent with the opportunities and partnerships in the local La Trobe Valley as well as the broader Gippsland community.

Monash Education has four campuses in diverse locations. The Gippsland campus is a regional campus and the teacher preparation programs offered there have typically had close relationships with a small number of schools, both urban and rural. In some ways, this provided a favourable situation for the types of teacher preparation programs envisaged by the SCTE project.

4.5.2 Partnerships and Collaboration

The project has received strong support from the Regional Office throughout. The Acting Regional Director Ms Karen Cain gave public support to the project and encouraged schools and staff to participate. More recently the acting Assistant Regional Director Ms Sharon Adams became involved and is attending meetings and generally providing support in line with the second implementation phase of the project.

The implementation of the SCTE program has been developmental and incremental, with the setting up of partnerships completed in 2011 and PST involvement in projects established in four schools (see below). By the end of 2012, during which specific subjects in the Bachelor of Primary Education and Graduate Diploma (Primary and Secondary) courses will be conducted in schools in conjunction with projects in those schools as detailed below.

In 2011, partnerships were explored and piloted with two schools: Albert Street Primary School (Moe) and Commercial Road Primary School (Morwell). Details of this collaboration follow.
4.5.3 Course quality and design

The Monash–Gippsland SCTE has aimed to improve teacher preparation through renewal of teacher education curriculum and narrowing the perceived theory-practice divide between content delivered at university and the needs of schools and their communities. This SCTE has also endeavoured to engage with the diverse needs of the broader Gippsland Region by developing a new rural professional experience model that is aimed at showcasing the Gippsland community to graduate teachers who may not have considered a rural career before.

The focus in the Monash-Gippsland SCTE is on developing teacher education curriculum that is delivered in schools, involves school and university staff as partners, and enables PSTs to build longer-term relationships with local schools.

The key work has involved the matching of core teacher education curriculum units with the needs of local schools and the community. This work focused on aspects of teacher education curriculum such as content matching, assessment, timetabling, allocation of resources, professional learning of teachers and teacher educators. The curriculum changes developed and trialled in 2011 were fully implemented in 2012 and have continued into 2013. All the evidence suggests that the changes flowing from the Monash participation in SCTE are now permanent.

The first curriculum initiatives originating under the SCTE project were implemented and evaluated in 2012

EDF1306: Spaces of Difference. This unit focuses on preparing teachers to work with diverse learners. A key partner in this project is the Morwell cluster schools and it also includes a key partnership with The Smith Family. Pre-service teachers are clustered across seven schools and work in the learning club program – an after-school tutoring program. Every Wednesday afternoon for a semester, PSTs come together with school students in a caring environment to assist the children with their learning and development.

EDF3306: Primary Literacy – This unit focuses on PSTs’ understanding of the early years literacy needs and language development. With a $25,000 grant from the National Australia Bank for the purchase of iPads, PSTs spend one morning per week at a local primary school working on the development of literacy skills, particularly oral language. All classes are held in the school, and are conducted by the lecturer-in-charge, assisted by one or more school staff members, who relate issues of theory to the local context and conditions. Most of the time is spent working with individual children on activities chosen and developed to assist with their specific learning needs. Assessment is based on the PSTs’ reporting and analysis of these activities, and their ability to relate these experiences to the issues of theory covered in the classes.

It is a tribute to the energy, enthusiasm and expertise developed in the course of this project that these two initiatives have been the springboard for an explosion of curriculum innovation and development at Monas Gippsland, as evidenced by the subject and placement partnerships that have been developed (these are outlined in Table 4.4). Impressions from a visit to one of these subjects are described in Vignette 2.

The SCTE is a significant part of the initial teacher education program at Monash Gippsland. In 2012, all 65 Graduate Diploma students are participating in the SCTE program, along with one full year (90 students) in the four-year Primary Bachelor of Education program.
There is clear evidence that the development of coursework has been highly successful, and one of the SCTE-developed courses, *EDF3306: Primary Literacy* (Ms Kelly Carabott) was awarded a commendation from the Office of the Vice-Chancellor for outstanding quality, receiving exceptional course ratings that placed it in the top 1 or 2 percent of Monash courses. This is clear evidence that the SCTE has been a springboard for course development of exceptional quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Units</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>PSTs involved 2012</th>
<th>PSTs involved 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDF 3306 Literacy in education</td>
<td>Albert Street Primary School Latrobe Community Health</td>
<td>Weekly university lectures and tutorials take place at Albert St Primary School. PSTs spend an hour a week working with individual P-2 children on oral language, reading, writing, and multiliteracies in conjunction with teacher educators and school staff.</td>
<td>65 Grad Diploma students 55 fourth-year students 12 school staff</td>
<td>45 Grad Diploma students 50 fourth-year students. All school staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF 1306 Spaces of difference</td>
<td>Morwell Park P.S Morwell P.S Churchill P.S Churchill North P.S Lumen Christi Smith Family</td>
<td>PST’s work with individual children from p-6 in a learning club which operates after school hours. Each PST plans individual experiences with each child. Combination of school based and university lectures</td>
<td>65 Grad Diploma students 90 fourth-year students</td>
<td>95 Grad Diploma students 70 fourth-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF 4236 Computers in Education</td>
<td>Commercial Road Primary School</td>
<td>There will be a school based component of the unit where PST will work in conjunction with teacher educators, school staff and children.</td>
<td>30 second, third &amp; fourth-year students</td>
<td>30 second, third &amp; fourth-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF 3619 Sports Education</td>
<td>Lumen Christi College Churchill North Yinnar South Narracan Churchill Hazelwood North Thorpdale</td>
<td>Local Schools attend Churchill leisure centre where PST run a variety of sports for the children to participate in.</td>
<td>30 second &amp; third year students</td>
<td>30 second &amp; third year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF 3303 Integrating the Curriculum 1, Creative Exchange</td>
<td>Trafalgar Primary School - Monash Arts Partnership</td>
<td>PSTs attend Trafalgar Primary School where they participate in art, drama and music with the children at the school.</td>
<td>65 Grad Diploma students 55 fourth year students</td>
<td>45 Grad Diploma students 50 fourth year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Units</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>PSTs involved 2012</td>
<td>PSTs involved 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF2301: Multiliteracies</td>
<td>14 metropolitan and rural Primary schools:</td>
<td>PST attend a number of schools where the classroom teachers demonstrate and discuss how they integrate technology in their classrooms</td>
<td>120: Grad Diploma &amp; third-years students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDF3311: Understanding Space and Place</td>
<td>Commercial Rd – Monash University Wetlands Sustainability project</td>
<td>Preservice Teachers complete an internship at their school attending school 2 days a week each week and also having extended practicum times (3,4,5 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 third-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote and Rural placement</td>
<td>Orbost, Orbost North, Metung, Nungerner, Toorloo Arm, Nowa Nowa, Swifts Creek, Mallacoota Primary schools, Cann River College</td>
<td>Students complete their 3 week placement in rural/remote schools. They are placed in pairs at the school. A weekend conference will be held for the PST and interested principals, in the middle of the placement for reflection and mentoring</td>
<td>13 third-year students</td>
<td>6 third-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gippsland Internship</td>
<td>Gippsland and metropolitan schools.</td>
<td>Pre Service Teachers complete an internship at their school attending school 2 days a week each week and also having extended practicum times (3,4,5 weeks)</td>
<td>55 fourth-year students</td>
<td>55 fourth-year students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vignette 2. Observed during a class in the unit *EDF3306 Primary Literacy* (Monash Gippsland SCTE)

We are in Morwell (Albert St) Primary School. It is around 10-15 on a Wednesday morning. From one room emerge 65 preservice teachers, excited and, in some cases, a little anxious. They spill into a spacious area adjoining two classrooms.

In a classroom nearby there is one teacher with a class of 25 prep children. “Now,” she says, “it’s time to meet your buddies.” They spill out into the common area, looking anxiously around for the familiar faces of their “buddies.” Every one of them looks excited, and there are squeals of delight as they find their buddies. Very soon, preppies and buddies are re-united, and they skip away excitedly to various corners of the common space, where little workspaces have been set up for them.

Except for one little preppie, who stands in the doorway, looking devastated. She can’t see her buddies anywhere. Tears are welling in her eyes, and it seems that we are just moments away from the opening of the floodgates. But just in time, her two buddies appear at the door, searching anxiously. Within a moment her frown has turned into an excited smile, and she rushes to her two buddies. I watch the two PSTs as they walk to their workspace, with a delighted little girl skipping happily between them.

This is the fourth week of term, and their fourth meeting. Clearly, strong bonds have been formed between the preppies and their buddies. They will meet for another nine weeks; each week with a new activity planned for the children by their buddies.

It’s an exciting time for the children. Every week they have the undivided attention of two (sometimes three) adults who always come armed with interesting and sometimes even exciting things to do. The thought occurs to me: This is just what their regular teachers would love to be able to do, if only it were possible.

And it’s an exciting time for the preservice teachers, too. If only teaching could always be like this!

But it won’t be. Soon they will face the realities of life in a school – 20 or more youngsters, all wanting what they need, and what you cannot give them – your undivided attention.

Will their experience in *EDF3306 Primary Literacy* equip them to deal with real classrooms in the real world? If they have learned something about how little children think and learn, if they learned how important they are to young learners; if they have experienced the joy of seeing little children grow and develop, even for a semester; then I think the answer is a resounding “Yes.”
4.5.4 The Practicum

Teaching practicum arrangements have not been altered at this stage, except for the (faculty-wide) introduction of the Rural-Regional-Remote placement programs. The benefits of internship are achieved through the coursework-in-school arrangements, which greatly increase the actual amount of time spent in schools.

In addition, Monash Gippsland has developed a new model of Rural-Regional-Remote placement for its teacher education programs. Preservice teachers have certain expenses paid to enable them to take up school placements through the Gippsland area as far away as Lakes Entrance. It is, of necessity, a voluntary program, and while not restricted to PSTs in the SCTE, it is consistent with its aims, and SCTE PSTs are encouraged to participate.

4.5.5 Infrastructure

The major change flowing from the introduction of SCTE is in the delivery of the teacher education curriculum, a large portion of which is being delivered in schools, with schools. The needs will obviously differ according to the subject and the mode of delivery. In the case of Unit EDF3306 Primary Literacy (described above), the key infrastructure constraint is space. To run this program in its current form requires a space large enough for the whole group (65 PSTs, university staff and class teachers) to meet, and space for 20+ prep students to break up and engage with 2-3 PSTs each. These need not be different spaces, but nevertheless, it would be more than some schools could provide.

Running a program in this way needs to involve local schools at levels well beyond that of the usual teaching practicum requirements. In the case of Primary Literacy the benefits to the school (40+ prep students receiving the complete and considered attention of 2 or more enthusiastic adults on a regular basis for a semester) are such that it should not be difficult to interest more schools. The program could be made available on a wider basis, provided the school infrastructure is sufficient.

4.5.6 Sustainability and costs

A part-time appointment has been made for SCTE Liaison. The appointee is also employed part-time as an Education lecturer at Monash, so the additional time has enabled her to move to a full-time appointment. She is now intimately involved in every aspect of the program, including its administration as well as having a very active role in the delivery of the program. Mentoring is a serious focus of interest for her, and further mentor training sessions are planned in 2012.

Key players (in the university, the Regional Office and the participating schools) remain confident that that the SCTE model is sustainable in the long term. At present there is strong reliance on the project-funded SCTE Liaison Officer, without whom it would have been difficult to get the program off the ground. Should the funding cease, there will be a need to maintain a position of that nature and alternative sources of funds would need to be obtained.

4.5.7 Feedback

Significant efforts have been made over the duration of the SCTE project to promote the SCTE model for teacher preparation, and the school and university staff who have been involved with the program are enthusiastic supporters, and have been responsible for the program extended over 2012 and 2103 to the extent that it this is now the way in which courses are taught in the Monash Gippsland programs.
Participating staff are in no doubt that the introduction of the SCTE model has enhanced the operation and effectiveness of PST education at Monash Education in the Gippsland community.

Positive feedback has been received from all involved. This is evidenced by

- The willingness of staff to “jump on board”
- The positive appraisals from PSTs that have brought university-wide recognition to the courses and staff involved with the program;
- Testimonials such as that provided by a PST in the interview documented in Vignette 3 (on the next page).
Tell me about yourself?

I am a mature aged student who has returned to university after studying a Bachelor of Arts degree and working with the local council.

What were you thinking about the course before Orientation week?

I had a general understanding and personal thoughts on what the course would involve. I envisioned that we would learn how to plan lessons, gain tools for managing classrooms and we would go out on placement. This would be our practical experience and we would have to learn ‘on the job’ and I would attend university for my lectures. The placement would be where I would learn how to teach.

After discussion concerning the school university partnerships and the increase in school based units what are your thoughts now?

I feel very fortunate and extremely excited by the new school based component of our course. I believe that through this component I will gain a true insight into the reality of teaching and will immediately gain a sense of what teaching is about and not have to wait till placement comes. It will be beneficial to be able to learn about new things and then be able to apply them directly in the classroom. As preservice teachers we will be able to implement what we learn in classes and be supported by our teacher educators, other preservice teachers and teachers. It is like a ‘safety net’.

I was happily surprised to see how much theory we will be learning as I believe it gives the course a greater depth and will give graduates a higher level of understanding needed for teaching.

I was excited to hear that teachers can really make a difference and that we will be provided with the right ‘tools’ and supported throughout the course to be the best educators we can be. The enthusiasm and passion shown by the teacher educators made me feel inspired and excited to be part of this course.

What do you see as the perceived benefits?

I feel that I will be better equipped as a teacher by the end of the year as I will have had more school experience which has been supported by university staff. They will be able to support and guide us as we plan and work with individual children.

What are you excited about?

I am excited about getting into the classroom and being able to try new things and be challenged as I develop into a teacher in a supportive environment.

I am also excited about being able to work one on one with individual children to build on my teaching skills in a focused way. On placement it could be overwhelming with a whole grade and then trying to plan for all of the children. The school based component allows for more focused work.

What are your concerns?

I was concerned about gaining enough experience to become an effective teacher, through this model I feel confident that I can develop into and become a teacher who can make a difference.
4.6 Country Education Project/Ballarat, Melbourne & La Trobe Universities (CEP Cluster)

4.6.1 Overview

The Country Education Project (CEP) was established in 1977 as part of the Commonwealth Schools Commission Country Area Program. In 1994 the Victorian State Government introduced system-wide changes to school funding and the CEP was established as a non-profit community organisation to represent and support improvements for rural education.

The Rural Educators Network (REN) was established by CEP in 2007 to support rural schools in the recruitment and retention of quality teaching staff. The REN had four key components:

- facilitating partnerships between school clusters and universities to enhance the learning provision of rural young people;
- promoting the teaching opportunities that exist within rural Victoria;
- supporting new graduates in rural teaching roles, and;
- providing ongoing professional development for rural staff.

As such, many rural school clusters have been in operation for some years, and links with universities have also been established over time. The rural SCTE builds on strong links already developed through the REN in the Hume and Grampians regions. The rural SCTE focused on four key areas:

- supporting groups of teacher trainees to be involved in a “rural education experience”;
- supporting the provision of professional development for cluster staff, university staff and teacher trainees in identified school improvement areas.
- the opportunity to undertake research and data collection to enhance learning provision within the rural cluster.
- the development of an online web-based communication approach that would allow for online delivery of learning; the provision of professional development; as well as the opportunity for the three partnerships to share information, and discuss common areas of interest.

4.6.2 Partnerships and collaboration

There are three universities involved in the rural SCTE and four school clusters totalling 21 schools, as shown in Table 4.5 below. In total, 17 primary schools and 4 secondary schools are participating.

The rural SCTE operates at two distinct levels. At the school/university partnership level there are, in essence, three distinct clusters. They each differ by geographic location and partnering university. At this level, there are arguably three distinct SCTEs. Each university is adapting its own practicum model and working with the school clusters to support PSTs in the rural school setting.

Melbourne Graduate School of Education (MGSE) is partnering with two clusters within the Hume Region, which are seen as one group for the purposes of the SCTE program. MGSE had already been involved with these clusters through the CEP for two years prior to the start.
of the SCTE program so some relationships with the schools in the cluster had previously been established.

Similarly, the University of Ballarat has had a connection with the St Arnaud school cluster for about five years. Participation in the SCTE program is the first time the university has had a formal association with the CEP. At the University of Ballarat, one positive outcome of the SCTE pilot has been the collaboration between primary and secondary coordinators at the university, where previously the programs had been entirely separate.

Table 4.5: Rural SCTE school/university partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>PSTs 2011</th>
<th>PSTs 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Cluster</td>
<td>University of Melbourne (MGSE)</td>
<td>Whitfield PS, Moyhu PS, Myrrhee PS, Greta Valley PS, Edi Upper PS</td>
<td>5 M Teach (primary)</td>
<td>8 M Teach (secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Valley Cluster</td>
<td>University of Melbourne (MGSE)</td>
<td>Mansfield PS, Merrijig PS, Jamieson PS, Mansfield SC</td>
<td>4 M Teach (primary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallangatta Cluster</td>
<td>Latrobe University</td>
<td>Tallangatta SC, Tallangatta PS, Tallangatta Valley PS, Eskdale PS, Kiewa Valley PS, Bethanga PS, Mitta Mitta PS, Talgarno PS</td>
<td>6 M Ed (P-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Arnaud Cluster</td>
<td>Ballarat University</td>
<td>St Arnaud PS, St Arnaud SC, Donald PS, Donald SC</td>
<td>8 B Ed (primary)</td>
<td>7 Grad Dip (secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grampians Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of the overall rural SCTE, CEP has facilitated meetings between the universities and schools and between all three clusters of universities and schools. A notable outcome of the rural SCTE program, schools and the universities were provided with the opportunity to meet face to face, to plan, share ideas and provide feedback. One stakeholder noted that the formality brought to the partnership by the SCTE pilot has led to benefits such as the planning days and the willingness of, and a sense of obligation on, school and university stakeholders to devote time and effort to the relationship. Through CEP facilitation, individual clusters were required to develop and document a partnership plan which included the involvement of PSTs, areas of curriculum focus, professional development and research focus and development. Where this was achieved, stakeholders reported that learning opportunities and outcomes within the cluster were enhanced.
The large rural cluster, made up of groups geographically distant from each other, made collaboration challenging. The overall partnership was focussed more on the opportunities and shared interest in research and professional development and concerns around the aspirations of rural youth and the professional isolation of teachers in small schools and rural areas. The focus on PSTs and practicum models tended to be more suited to the individual university and the cluster with which they were partnered.

4.6.3 Practicum models

The focus of the CEP case study has been at the level of the CEP partnership rather than the individual courses provided by the universities, as these remained quite separate. It takes some time for universities to make significant changes to their practice. As such, the SCTE program was piloted using small numbers of students who had agreed to participate, and the program ran alongside those being undertaken by the majority of students. In some cases, changes were being piloted.

For example, feedback from the Mansfield schools concerning the regular 2-day-a-week-in-schools design has seen MGSE redesign that element specifically to cater for the issues arising in the rural cluster. The dominant issue for MGSE PSTs was the distance involved in driving to their practicum school every week. Travel and time away from families in that setting had proved problematic given a heavy workload as well. MGSE altered the format for the rural cluster in 2012 to allow PSTs a week off school visits every third week and to provide a short block placement. This enabled PSTs to spend more time with school students, as part of their course requirement included a course in designing personal learning. Personal learning is also a focus of the Mansfield cluster in the SCTE.

One aspect of the clustering of schools is the opportunity for PSTs to participate in classes at each school. Also there may be the need to teach several year levels in the same classroom in smaller schools, which can be a challenge and offers PSTs another opportunity to improve their skills.

The rural clusters felt it important to provide the PSTs with an introduction to the local community as well, through a ‘whole of community’ immersion approach, to give them a sense of what it is like to teach in a small rural school, and to live in a small rural community.

Schools have noted the importance of an induction to the cluster so that the PSTs gain an understanding of the different issues facing different schools within the cluster. PSTs have also reported that their experience is improved if they have an opportunity to contact the cluster well before their first official day, to gain information about the schools and other pertinent issues (such as maps and directions, accommodation, and what to expect regarding access to shops, phone networks and the internet, and so on).

Where reported, there was a sense that current methods of PST assessment did not reflect the breadth of experience and knowledge gained, though the involvement of teams of PSTs within rural clusters was generally seen to have benefits for the schools and PSTs involved.
4.6.4 Mentoring

The clusters forming the rural SCTE came together, facilitated by CEP, to consider ways each cluster might learn from the others, and ways in which they might cooperate as a state-wide partnership.

In considering a closer, more formal partnership with the universities, schools focussed on making use of their cluster arrangement to provide PSTs with a richer experience of the local community. There is a recognition that both PSTs and graduate teachers in a rural setting, and experienced local teachers and principals, require extensive support, both personally and professionally, in what otherwise can be a professionally isolating experience. The provision of mentoring, particularly for graduates, can be difficult in very small schools and there has been discussion about providing a mentor from another cluster school to ensure some support is provided.

While some of these discussions are beyond the intended scope of the SCTE pilot, they provide an indication of how partnerships may develop beyond the SCTE focus to provide greater networks, connections and professional opportunities for both graduates and experienced local teachers, with the support of the universities.

Professional development can be difficult to organise for geographically dispersed teachers. In 2012, MGSE suggested partnering with Latrobe University and the University of Ballarat in the provision of a course on ‘Teaching as Clinical Practice’, with a focus on the provision of feedback (a form of mentoring) to students, PSTs and other teachers. The intent was to adapt a new course to a blended learning mode, with part face-to-face delivery and part online-based delivery. The course was intended to be assessed and would count towards a post-graduate qualification. There was also the potential for university cross-accreditation. This course was made available at reduced cost (as a pilot) to all clusters in the rural SCTE. In the event, only five teachers were able to participate in the PD, partly because the face-to-face sessions were in Melbourne, partly because of the challenges related to releasing teachers in small schools where it can be difficult to find replacements.

The University of Ballarat has noted that the closer relationship with schools has resulted in a greater awareness within the partnership of the need to ensure that mentors are willing and able participants in the practicum program. Mentors in some cases also indicated that they would have preferred additional support to better manage their involvement with PSTs.

4.6.5 Research

The involvement of three universities in the rural SCTE, facilitated by the CEP, led to the development of a research project into youth aspirations and the way these are affected within rural settings. If successful, the research may be the target of an ARC grant application.

The research involves lecturers from all three universities, school staff from each of the clusters (from about 10 schools in total), and PSTs from at least one university where there is a research component as part of their course (MGSE). There was a focus on building the capacity of cluster school staff in the area of research skills and MGSE provided a professional development program to participants on conducting the research.
4.6.6 Use of technology
The CEP has organised an online forum for use by members of all three clusters to share documents, information and ideas. There is considerable geographic distance between the clusters and this online forum has the potential to facilitate communication with regard to joint ventures such as the research project and state-wide PD. Some partners were also involved in meetings via video conferencing.

In designing the ‘Teaching as clinical practice’ PD course for mentor teachers, MGSE used a blended learning model that included online-based seminars and discussion.

One partnership used technology to provide feedback to PSTs, and ongoing communication between the university and PSTs. Another partnership trialled professional development with PSTs on communication technology to enable them to provide learning for students in the cluster they were involved with, including delivery from a remote location.

4.6.7 Sustainability and costs
There is potential for greater certainty for the schools and university around the number of placement PSTs within a cluster on a yearly basis, as the partnership evolves. A downside to this is that schools usually take PSTs from several universities and the administrative role of managing multiple programs of the possible complexity of an SCTE may prove problematic for some schools.

The schools and universities feel that the SCTE approach has the potential to provide some significant advantages, notably in greater and better supported opportunities for teams of PSTs to experience teaching in a rural setting, and for current teachers to improve their professional networking and PD opportunities.

The role of the CEP in initiating and brokering the partnership is also appreciated. While school clusters are quite well networked, there is recognition that many schools are very small, with only one or two teachers, and the administration involved in coordinating, (e.g. placing PSTs across the cluster of schools) would place an additional burden on schools staff that would potentially be unsustainable. While coordinators within each cluster were nominated, funding to increase time in the role may assist in the development and sustainability of individual partnerships, and greater buy-in from key stakeholder groups, particularly teachers.
4.7 Western Metropolitan Region/ Victoria University (Point Cook Cluster)

4.7.1 Overview

The suburb of Point Cook is a large, relatively new development approximately seven kilometres west of Melbourne. High rates of population growth have meant significant increases in enrolment in newly built primary and secondary local schools, all of which are attractively designed and well equipped. Together they form the ‘Point Cook Education Precinct’, a cluster of schools that has aimed since its inception to establish strong relationships and partnerships among the schools and other education and business stakeholders in the area.

The SCTE project started in the Point Cook Education Precinct in 2011 with a view to building on the existing partnership between Point Cook Secondary College and Victoria University, and extending the PST arrangements to other schools. The lead school in the project, Point Cook Senior Secondary College, has implemented a successful site-based teacher education model in a partnership model with Victoria University ever since it opened in 2008.

The Point Cook SCTE cluster comprises five campuses in four schools. Point Cook Senior Secondary College is a Year 10-12 school with approximately 700 students and 48 EFT teaching staff. Point Cook P-9 College has approximately 800 students and 48 EFT teaching staff. The two P-9 Carranballac College (Boardwalk and Jamieson Way) campuses have a total of approximately 1445 students and 80 EFT teaching staff. Seabrook Primary School has approximately 840 students and 51 EFT teaching staff.

Victoria University has been supporting pre-service teacher education through partnership models for more than 15 years; the SCTE has enhanced and strengthened this arrangement. PSTs spend two days per week in schools as well as two block periods of four and six weeks. Lectures and tutorials are held in the schools, as well as at the university, with lecturers spending the two days at the schools - one mostly at Point Cook SSC and one at Caranballac. As well as conducting lectures and tutorials, observing PSTs in the classrooms and assisting mentors and teachers, the lecturers manage the ‘Learning Circles’ in which, at present, PSTs are working on the Applied Curriculum Project. PSTs spend mornings in the classrooms and work in their ‘Learning Circles’, in a special room assigned to them, for the rest of the day. Lectures and tutorials are also held in this room.

There are now about 20 PSTs at Point Cook Senior Secondary College. They are permitted to change schools after a minimum of one semester; consequently they have the opportunity to work at primary, middle and senior levels of the curriculum, and in different school settings.

In 2013, the SCTE coordinator reported that the only disappointment in relation to SCTE was the ending of the funding. Her position was funded by SCTE money and she was unsure of whether it could continue after the remained funds were exhausted. She saw her role of project management across Precinct schools as ‘the central link’. She believed that over the two years of SCTE the schools and the university had become ‘like a real community. We are very close’. She had no doubt that SCTE had made a major contribution to this relationship.

4.7.2 Partnerships and collaborations

The SCTE is managed by a formal Management Committee chaired by the Point Cook school principal. Each school has representation on the committee, along with Victoria University
and the Regional Office. The committee met once a month in 2011 and is scheduled to meet once a term in 2012 and 2013.

This has helped to develop the strong sense of partnership among the stakeholders. For example, at a Management Committee in 2012, school principals pointed out to the university staff that some extra places for PSTs had become available in precinct schools (placement of PSTs is always a difficult issue for universities). Other matters discussed openly included funding for available resources, the progress of the 2012 cohort of PSTs (it was agreed that they seemed to be ‘more settled and focused’ than last year’s cohort), and the need to follow up earlier cohorts – e.g. what employment, if any, they had obtained.

In 2013 the coordinator reported that the school had been able to ‘feed in’ to university programs:

[School representatives] went as a group to VU and talked about our Middle Years programs at Carranballac College. As a result of those talks the university has decided to introduce a Middle Years subject in its Graduate Diploma course. [The university lecturers] have worked very closely with us. The Praxis Enquiry model is brilliant. It has resulted in constant conversations between the lecturers, PSTs, mentors and other teachers. We all agree that there’s no point in them just coming here for a lecture. The material must be integrated into the program. The PSTs need to be in classrooms and then come back to the lecturer to continually reflect.

VU is also offering a new Graduate Diploma in primary teaching. This is partly in response to the needs of primary teachers at Seabrook, who wanted the university to be more involved at their site.

4.7.3 Practicum models and mentoring

The Point Cook model, in common with other Victoria University programs, places PSTs in schools for two days each week over the academic year. The PSTs spend most of each Tuesday working on an Applied Curriculum Project connected with their studies. VU School of Education staff oversee these studies. The PSTs, who work in teams, are also supported by school mentors who are drawn from the teaching staff of the school. Little difficulty is experienced in finding volunteer mentors. In some cases the mentoring role is required as part of the extra duties expected of Expert and Leading Teachers. PSTs also spend two teaching blocks of four and six weeks in the school. This allows them to teach and take responsibility for the development of full units of study over an extended period of time.

PSTs are expected to participate fully in the life of the school, and to develop an understanding of school culture, e.g. they help in sporting and other extra-curricular programs and attend staff briefings. They often attend school when they have time available, outside the required hours of attendance.

Each PST works with a classroom teacher as a mentor and is assisted by Victoria University lecturers and University Colleagues (UCs). The UCs are teachers or former teachers who work with the PSTs in schools and liaise with their mentors and through mentoring and assisting them with their Applied Curriculum Projects. In 2013, however, the University Colleague position is under threat because of cuts to VU funding.

In 2013 a Masters degree in mentoring is being delivered at Point Cook SSC. The SCTE project funding covered half the cost for mentor teachers to do the course. This is significant because most of the teachers are young people who were still paying off HECS debts.
Vignette 1. From Carranballac P-9 College, SCTE partner school in the Point Cook cluster

On the afternoon of the ACER evaluator’s visit to the Point Cook SCTE cluster she observed about 16 PSTs at work in the pleasant and spacious room which had been assigned to them by the school. They were sitting around tables in ‘Learning Circles’ of about 4-6. Also in the room were a Lecturer in Education from Victoria University and a University Colleague. The PSTs, who were spending one of their two days per week in the school, were, at first, informally discussing their morning’s experiences of observing and teaching in the school’s classrooms. Some had just that morning taught their first ever lesson, and were anxious to tell their colleagues about it.

The Lecturer made some general comments about the Applied Curriculum Projects (APCs) on which they had just started work in their groups. He called on the University Colleague to take them through, in some detail, what was expected in these APCs. She encouraged the PSTs to take a ‘Big Idea’ connected to a school initiative in an area like sport, music, drama, multiculturalism, and various curriculum areas, and develop their project around it. Some general discussion on what would be expected in the projects followed, after which the PSTs worked in their learning circles to develop ideas for their APCs, which, they knew, would form a major part of their assessment.

The two staff then circulated among the groups, answering questions, discussing concepts and giving advice. They were soon joined by the SCTE Coordinator, who, as teacher and Professional Growth Mentor at Carranballac, was obviously playing a very hands-on role in guiding the PSTs through their planning processes.

As group discussions proceeded, it soon became apparent that the PSTs were enthusiastically planning to contribute their existing knowledge and expertise to school initiatives (In one group, who were planning to make a major contribution to a school special celebration day, were members whose first degrees were in drama and music).

This provided an excellent example of the SCTE facilitating co-operation among the PSTs, the school and the university in working towards a practical and highly creative end-result. The school setting was significant, as was the obvious and comfortable rapport between the school, the PSTs and the university teachers.

4.7.4 Research

A research report: Vision Unlimited: Inspiring participant knowledge in schools, researching Site-Based Pre-Service Teacher Education was prepared and published by Victoria University, (2010-2111). This research was not specifically linked to SCTE, but the conceptual base is similar and most of the findings are highly relevant to the SCTE project.

Point Cook Senior Secondary College was one of the four schools ‘profiled’ in the research. The Management Committee is in agreement on the need for further research into SCTE outcomes, specifically the career destinations and ‘quality’ of VU SCTE graduate teachers. In 2013

4.7.5 Use of technology

Both PSTs and their mentors appear to be sufficiently skilled in the use of technology in their classrooms. Neither PSTs nor university staff have access to the Ultranet in schools, due to security concerns. In response to this, steps are underway to set up an ‘Edublog’ to allow greater communication between all SCTE stakeholders in the precinct. It is thought that there will be sufficient expertise among teachers in precinct schools to do this.
4.7.6 Infrastructure

PSTs have full access to all school facilities, including staff and recreation rooms and technology (except, as noted above, for Ultranet access). At each school the PSTs are allocated a room with facilities so that they can work comfortably in groups around tables, with spaces for individual discussions with lecturers, University Colleagues and mentors. At Point Cook SSC, the letters ‘SCTE’ are etched into the glass door of the SCTE space which is centrally located, thereby making the SCTE presence highly visible.

4.7.7 Sustainability and costs

SCTE funding is currently being used for: meeting the cost of mentor training and other relevant professional development; supporting the position of the SCTE coordinator to oversee the project and bring the various stakeholders together; meeting expenses connected with the operation of the Management Committee; and providing resources, e.g. the planned ‘Edublog’ for the electronic sharing of news, ideas and teaching and learning resources. At the Management Committee, there is a strong view that the success and sustainability of the SCTE teacher education model was highly dependent on SCTE funding.

Information gathered so far strongly suggests that the model is sustainable in the long term. Continuing improvement and development will be contingent on sufficient funding being made available. It is planned to direct more attention to professional development, especially for mentors, with the aim of advancing SCTE objectives.

4.7.8 Feedback

The SCTE model of teacher education is perceived to be highly successful and is well supported in all partner schools. In general, the SCTE model is seen by participants to have enhanced the operation and effectiveness of PST education in many ways:

- PSTs develop strong relationships with students and other staff.
- Teaching staff at the school have extended opportunities to observe the PSTs and to provide feedback on their performance. This has led to the ‘organic’ development of a professional learning culture where mentors examine their own practice and create opportunities to discuss their work with PSTs and with colleagues.
- PSTs are becoming role models for the school students. In this ethnically diverse, generally low SES area many school students have never had the opportunity to meet with young people who are attending university and planning professional careers. In getting to know the PSTs they can learn the steps to gain university entrance, the kinds of jobs available to university graduates and the kinds of experiences that universities are able to provide. Deeper relationships between school students and PSTs are more likely to develop in an extended placement situation than in the traditional one or two block placement-only models.
- The model allows for increased intervention to support PSTs who are experiencing difficulties, and the difficulties are much more readily identified than in the traditional models of practicum experience. In the (comparatively rare) cases where a PST is seen by him or herself, or by mentors, to be unsuited to teaching, early identification of problems allows the PST to make realistic decisions about the future.
- The model is an excellent segue into the VIT program for provisionally registered teachers, which requires them to develop a portfolio. This applies particularly to
the mentoring arrangements. The portfolio is better able to realize its potential as a vehicle for professional learning

- The SCTE model has allowed the positive aspects of the VU partnership model to be extended to the primary schools in the Point Cook precinct.
- The SCTE has strengthened school-university partnerships
- The SCTE model has promoted increased flexibility, e.g. for PSTs to work in different school settings. Art, Phys Ed and ESL PSTs are particularly appreciative of this.
- Transition arrangements between the schools have improved as a result of the better communication that has arisen this year as a result of improved co-operation under the SCTE model
- The funding has allowed more professional development to be offered at the schools. This is seen as an area to be more formally developed in 2012 and beyond.
- The funding has allowed volunteer teachers to undertake further study at VU, specifically linked to their work in the SCTE program.

4.8 Northern Metropolitan Region/ Victoria University (Hume Cluster)

4.8.1 Background

The Hume Cluster arose as a joint initiative from Victoria University and the Northern Metropolitan Region, with the university keen to extend a site-based preservice education model that had been developed over 15 years, to develop an SCTE in the Northern Region. With support from the Hume City Council, Cisco and the Victoria University Learning Hub, the SCTE proposal was successfully developed and implementation began in 2011.

4.8.2 Partnerships and collaboration

The Hume SCTE Cluster brings together Victoria University, the Hume Central Senior Secondary College (Blair St Campus), Broadmeadows Primary School, Broadmeadows Valley Primary School, Campbellfield Heights Primary School and Meadows Primary School. Victoria University had previous links with many of these schools through its early childhood learning program and through school placements. University staff played a very active role, meeting regularly and spending, whenever possible, a day per week in “their” school. In interviews, most staff expressed regret that the time in school could not have been longer.

In 2011, approximately 100 preservice teachers were placed in the five schools, spending 2 days each week in their schools. Although an approximately even distribution of PSTs across schools was intended, the complexities of travel made this impossible to achieve precisely. Because of travel difficulties experienced in 2011 (the university is in Footscray, the schools in the Broadmeadows area), it was decided for 2012 to rely totally on PSTs who volunteered, and the number available dropped from 80 to 68. This was disappointing, but eased the space pressures that had caused difficulties in 2011. Also, in 2011, the secondary participants were in the third year of their program; in 2012 they were fourth-year students (but not the same cohort).

Primary school placements were scheduled on Tuesday/Wednesday in two schools and Tuesday/Thursday in two schools, and secondary placements were scheduled for Tuesday/Wednesday. Classes at Victoria University were scheduled to fit around these arrangements, and half of the coursework undertaken by PSTs was in site-based classes.
4.8.3 Practicum models

The emphasis during school placement is on complete immersion, and PSTs are expected to participate fully in the life of the schools in which they are placed. They are fully briefed, and are expected to be thoroughly familiar with the expectations held of them, including professionalism, attitude and consistency. Teachers and PSTs meet each Tuesday to plan the lessons and events of the week. It is not uncommon for PSTs to attend school outside of their required days, where the schedule of university classes permits it.

PSTs are expected to participate fully in the school teaching program, including running practical activities, working with individual children and small groups, assisting with lunchtime, kitchen and garden activities, attending staff meetings, curriculum meetings and PLT meetings, as well as teaching specific lessons.

4.8.4 Mentoring

Mentoring is seen as a vital component of these arrangements, and teachers are encouraged to attend mentor training where appropriate. Arrangements differ across schools; at Broadmeadows Valley Primary School there are three Learning Neighbourhoods (P1-, 3-4, 5-6). Each PST is allocated to a Learning Neighbourhood, where a group of PSTs works with a group of teachers. In practice, teams of PSTs are mentored by teams of teachers, although three teachers are formally appointed as mentors in each Learning Neighbourhood.

Two units of study are conducted at the school (half of the required coursework) and PSTs work in small teams on site-based Applied Curriculum Projects, negotiated with the school. This has contributed to building closer relationships among school and university staff. In most cases, the only accommodation available for this has been the school staffroom, so it has involved some sacrifice on the part of school staff.

4.8.5 Research

The Hume precinct (like the Point Cook precinct) is becoming a centre for the offering of units in the Master of Education degree at Victoria University. Semester 2, 2012 will see the first unit offered (Curriculum) followed by Educational Leadership in Semester 1, 2013 and Education Research Design and Methods in Semester 2, 2013. With its location in the Hume Precinct, it is intended that the offering of the degree will foster a research culture and provide an opportunity for teachers involved in the SCTE project to support their participation with significant school-based research.

The July 2013 progress report reveals substantial research flowing from this project, including presentations at the Australian Teacher Education Conference (Adelaide, 2012); the Australian Association for Research in Education Conference (Sydney, 2012); the DEECD/Deakin Forum held in Melbourne in 2012, and the American Educational research Association Conference (San Francisco, 2013).

4.8.6 Use of technology

There has been considerable investment in IT to enable easier and quicker communication among PSTs and between PSTs and teaching staff. PSTs are in email contact with teaching staff and use it to provide lesson plans for preview, enquiries about the availability of materials and general discussion of issues. At Hume Senior Secondary College, PSTs are supplied with iPads, with connection via the wireless network to Facebook, Wikispace and the Ultranet. Without suitable wireless access in all schools, it has not been possible to extend these arrangements across the whole SCTE.
The use of ICT was restricted by the availability of equipment and Wifi in the schools. Greater use of IT for communication among PSTs and teaching staff, and directly in teaching, can be expected as the availability of equipment and Wifi improves.

A brief video promoting the Hume Central School Centre for Teaching Excellence was produced in collaboration with the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, and can be viewed by going to the DEECD website\textsuperscript{10} at: http://fuse.education.vic.gov.au/?77PHS9.

4.8.7 Feedback

Systematic data collection from the school principals, university lecturers, mentor teachers and preservice teachers has provided detailed formative data on aspects of the effectiveness of the SCTE program in 2011. Generally there appears to be enthusiastic support from the school and university staff involved. The SCTE model of teacher education is perceived to be successful and is well supported in all partner schools. The feedback was very constructive, with strengths and areas needing improvement clearly identified, school by school. This feedback has been useful in identifying, school by school, areas open to improvement in 2012.

Further collection of feedback data from PSTs, teaching staff and university staff has been a feature of the 2012 program. In the absence of continued external funding, the continuing involvement of six schools in 2013 speaks volumes for the commitment generated among school and university staff over 2012-13.

4.8.8 General

All participants seem convinced that the SCTE program is sustainable in the long-term, although there are a number of issues to resolve. Key among these is maintaining the number of university staff who are able to commit the time that the program requires. Meeting with staff in 2013 it was apparent that their time was stretched about as far as it could be, and there may not be large enough numbers of staff with the capacity and the level of commitment necessary to expand the program much beyond its present size. Expenditure at this site was quite evenly spread over the various categories, with most funds going to staffing, professional development, research and CRT release (see Table 4.6). This probably means that the Hume SCTE site may be better able to cope if less funds should be available in the future. Sites that are highly dependent on the employment of a coordinator, paid for out of SCTE funds, would have a greater adjustment to make.

Because of difficulties associated with travel, PSTs participation in the SCTE project has been on a voluntary basis (with some degree of encouragement at enrolment time, it appears). Briefings are now held in October of each year to encourage participation of current students and to clarify the responsibilities they will meet and the demands and rewards they will experience.

While the program relies on recruiting PSTs, the desired spread of 20 PSTs at each of 5 schools is likely to remain difficult to achieve. This has placed some strains on schools in the

\textsuperscript{10} Video materials from other sites can be viewed by going to https://fuse.education.vic.gov.au/Search/Results?AssociatedPackageId=&QueryText=scte&SearchScope=All.
provision of mentors, resources and space for the PSTs and for the university classes held in the schools. Even if the number of PSTs per school could be held to 20, many schools would be inhibited from signing up because of space limitations. This may become less of a problem if more schools were able to participate, in a wider range of locations – but this would create additional demands on the university staff, who appear to be already quite stretched under the present arrangement.

In spite of these challenges, the program is thriving, with one additional school joining in 2013 and a memorandum of understanding drawn up with participating schools to ensure the continuation of the program into 2014-2015.

4.9 Expenditure

Expenditure data, as provided by the SCTE sites in July 2013, are summarised in Table 4.6, and then graphically in Figure 4.1. These figures are not necessarily final, and in some cases appear to include actual expenditure as well as projected expenditure. The totals therefore should be seen as indicative rather than final. But they are the best estimates of actual expenditure available at the time of writing.

At all sites, the major item of expenditure is staffing, and from the site Progress reports, we know that the key item of expenditure is salary for a coordinator. This is an item that we know from site reports, is regarded as the most important, as well as the largest, item of expenditure.

It is apparent that three sites, Bendigo, Northern Bay and Gippsland, have focussed their expenditure almost exclusively on staffing compared to the remaining sites. This is apparent whether you look at raw dollar figures (Table 4.6; Figure 4.1) or at percent of total budget (Table 4.7; Figure 4.2). This reflects the fact that Bendigo and Northern Bay have appointed full-time coordinators, while other sites have had coordinators who are half-time, or who have fractional appointments (typically half-time) with a school, or their university. The Gippsland cluster has spent a similar amount in dollar terms to others with half-time appointments, but this shows up as higher in percentage terms because the total budget is significantly smaller.

Table 4.6. SCTE Clusters: Dollar Expenditure by Category, 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Northern Bay</th>
<th>Point Cook</th>
<th>Koonung</th>
<th>Bendigo</th>
<th>Gippsland</th>
<th>Hume</th>
<th>CEP</th>
<th>All Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>133,307</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>203,856</td>
<td>100,736</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>89,760</td>
<td>757,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Devpt</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>66,550</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>17,668</td>
<td>191,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>24,524</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>194,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT Release</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>12,502</td>
<td>123,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venues/catering</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>21,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,019</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>26,905</td>
<td>175,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>36,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,758</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>85,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>185,307</strong></td>
<td><strong>250,001</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>149,536</strong></td>
<td><strong>250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>200,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,586,766</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $250,000 from SCTE allocation, supplemented with $51,400 from other sources
Figure 4.1. Dollar Expenditure by Category, for each SCTE Cluster (2011-2012)

Table 4.7. SCTE Cluster: Percent Expenditure by Category, 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northern Bay</th>
<th>Point Cook</th>
<th>Koonung</th>
<th>Bendigo</th>
<th>Gippsland</th>
<th>Hume</th>
<th>CEP</th>
<th>All Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Devpt</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT Release</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venues/catering</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What stands out more than differences in the patterns of expenditure is the fact that the cost per participating PST, to this date, has varied dramatically, from $4545 for Bendigo to just $462 for Gippsland (see Table 4.8).

### Table 4.8. Cost per Preservice Teacher, by Site (2011-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>No. of PSTs</th>
<th>Cost per PST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$4,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>$200,522</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$2,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gippsland</td>
<td>$149,536</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>$462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koonung</td>
<td>$301,400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Bay</td>
<td>$185,307</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$3,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Cook</td>
<td>$250,001</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Centres</td>
<td>$1,586,766</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>$1,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures, as provided in July, 2013, reflect expenditure over 2011-2012, and may still be subject to update. All include setting-up costs, and do not reflect the ongoing costs of the programs. They nevertheless raise questions about the relative sustainability of the various SCTE models that will have to be addressed.

It is apparent, for example, that the approach pioneered on the Monash Gippsland site, is viable in the long-term, with little or no expenditure beyond the normal cost of running a teacher preparation program. This is because the “SCTE” experience is embedded within the curriculum – while it takes a great deal of time and work to give the curriculum the necessary makeover, once this is done the program can be more or less self-sustaining. Measured in terms of dollars per PST, it stands out for its affordability – in part because, at least in the
setting up period, many of the PSTs participating in SCTE may only be participating for a small portion of their time. But, like all the SCTE programs, it requires a high level of commitment on the part of university staff and partner schools.

Programs such as that at Bendigo, costing up to 10 times as much per participating PST, can only be viable in the long-term with substantial external funding – which appears unlikely. Most of the programs developed have been quite labour-intensive, and their success across a range of sites (about which more will be said later) has been sufficient to generate wide support for their continuation. How to maintain these programs under normal funding arrangements (whatever they may be) will obviously require a great deal of soul-searching
5 Survey Results

In late 2012, all Mentors and Principals in schools participating in the SCTE program were invited to participate in an online survey. In June, 2013, all teachers who registered with the Victorian Institute of Teaching in 2012-2013 were contacted by email and invited to participate in an online survey.

5.1 The Principal survey

For principals, there was a target population of 54 principals, of which responses were obtained from 38 – a response rate of 70 per cent.

The questions addressed a wide range of issues, focussing on the principals' experience with the SCTE program in 2012, and its impact on themselves, their staff and their schools.

A series of questions asked principals to assess the extent to which their school had been able to provide a collegial environment in which preservice teachers, mentors and other school staff could work together in a collegial and supportive environment. The framework within which they were asked to judge was a comparison with the environment they were able to provide before their participation in the SCTE program.

Table 5.1 provides a summary of their responses.

Table 5.1. How well has the school been able to provide a collegial environment for SCTE participants? Principals' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the preservice teachers in your school this year have</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. felt that they had become part of a school community?</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. enjoyed collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. enjoyed collegial support from their mentors?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. enjoyed collegial support from teaching staff other than their mentors?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. experienced the daily life of a teacher?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessments made by the principals were uniformly positive. For every question asked, 80-90 per cent of principals indicated that the SCTE program had provided a more collegial and supportive environment for PSTs, and almost none (3% equals one person) found it less so than before SCTE.

A set of five questions addressed the extent to which principals believed that PSTs had been able to work together with school staff, share a common purpose and gain experience of the life of a teacher.

Table 5.2 provides a summary of their responses. Again there was a uniformly positive response, with just three negative responses (indicating that this was less so in SCTE than in
previous programs) out of nearly 200. For these items, a negative response ("Much less" or "A little less") indicates that principals thought they were less able to provide this experience within SCTE than previously. An overwhelming 87 per cent of responses indicated that principals believed they had been better able to provide this kind of supportive environment within the SCTE programs than previously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the following statements to be true of the school experience that you have been able to provide to this year's SCTE preservice teachers?</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. The school staff and the university staff worked closely together for a common purpose.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The preservice teachers gained experience in a variety of ways of using Information/Communication Technology (ICT).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The preservice teachers were actively involved in research related to the school and/or their teaching.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Over their time in the school, preservice teachers came to relate to my staff as colleagues, rather than as visitors to the school.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Over their time in the school, students came to relate to these preservice teachers in much the same way as they relate to their regular teachers.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A series of questions asked principals to assess the strength of the school-university partnership that had been formed under the SCTE program. Again, the framework they used was a comparison with the partnership arrangements that had existed prior to their participation in the SCTE program.

The principals' responses are summarized in Table 5.3. While all their assessments were positive, the belief that the school had been able to influence the university's teacher education program was considerably stronger than the belief that the university had been able to influence school practice. A clear majority saw the university as having a stronger presence on the school campus than previously - although, as revealed in the mentors' comments (see later), there were sites in which the appearance of university staff on campus appears to have been quite infrequent.
Table 5.3. Strength of the school-university partnership: Principals' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the following statements to be true of your school’s experience of the SCTE pathway?</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. The university has been able to influence our school teaching practice.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The school has been able to influence the university teacher education program.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The university is seen to have a presence on this school campus</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For programs like the SCTE to thrive and survive, schools need to be convinced that their participation will be to their benefit rather than an additional burden for them to carry. This appears to be the case (see Table 5.4).

Overwhelmingly (97%), principals believed that their school had actually benefited from the presence of additional PSTs who had a high level of involvement in the life of the school. Almost as strongly (86%) they felt that the school had benefited from the closer relationship that SCTE had enabled them to develop with the university teacher education staff.

Unsurprisingly, principals look to school placement as an opportunity to identify prospective recruits to their staff, and with greater time spent in their schools, they should be better able to achieve this. One principal in three appears to have already used this to their advantage (those who responded "Definitely Yes" to Question 16 below), while most of those remaining appear to be hopeful that this may happen.

Table 5.4. Benefits to the school from its participation in SCTE: Principals' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to the following statements:</th>
<th>Definitely &quot;No&quot;</th>
<th>Possibly &quot;No&quot;</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Possibly &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>Definitely &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. My school has benefited from the presence of preservice teachers who were more involved in the life of the school.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My school has benefited from having a closer relationship with the university teacher education staff.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The SCTE has proved useful in recruiting teaching staff for my school</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the models developed under the SCTE framework to survive and thrive, they must be sustainable. Schools need a certain level of resources (in particular, space to accommodate a substantially larger group of PSTs than they have been accustomed to). Teaching staff need
to be able to make good use of the ‘manpower’ that these programs make available to them, so that it becomes an advantage rather than a burden.

In general, it appears that this is being achieved (see Table 5.5). Principals generally see that the demands that participation in SCTE makes on their staff are manageable and the majority believe they have the necessary physical resources in the school (although a significant number of them appear to have doubts on this).

The "Big Picture" is that every responding principal was supportive of his/her school's continuing participation in the SCTE program (83% definitely, 17% possibly). But principals were approximately evenly split on the need for additional funding - 42% "Yes," 42% "No" and the remainder not sure.

If SCTE-type programs are to be made more widely available, this is an issue that will need to be addressed. The results of this survey indicate that school principals are strongly supportive of the SCTE, but see lack of funds as a possible barrier to their participation (and by implication to the participation of other schools) in the future.

### Table 5.5. Sustainability of the SCTE program in their schools: Principals' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to the following statements:</th>
<th>Definitely &quot;No&quot;</th>
<th>Possibly &quot;No&quot;</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Possibly &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>Definitely &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. The demands that participation in SCTE makes on my staff are manageable.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My school has the physical resources that it needs to support its continued participation in SCTE programs.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My school can continue its participation in SCTE without additional funding.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I would like my school's participation in the SCTE program to continue.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A series of questions invited principals to comment on various aspects of the implementation of SCTE and their schools' participation in it.

In general, it appears that they have been reasonably happy with the process of implementation and the vast majority (89%) were satisfied that they were sufficiently consulted by the university and kept informed about what would be required of them (see Table 5.6).
Table 5.6. Satisfaction with the level of consultation about SCTE: Principals’ views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to the following statements about the SCTE model of teacher preparation to which your school has been contributing:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Were you happy that your school was sufficiently consulted by the university about its participation in the SCTE program this year?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Were you happy that your school was kept informed by the university about its participation in the SCTE program this year?</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering the impact of SCTE on their school, principals were approximately evenly divided on two issues (see Table 5.7):

- whether it had led to an increase in the cost of running their school, and
- whether it had led to increases in their workload, as Principal.

A majority believed that it had led to an increase in the workload carried by their staff.

Table 5.7. Perceived impact on school: Principals’ views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to the following statements about the SCTE model of teacher preparation to which your school has been contributing:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Has the introduction of the SCTE led to an increase in the cost of running your school this year?</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Has the introduction of the SCTE led to increases in your workload, as Principal?</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Has the introduction of the SCTE led to increases in the workload of your teaching staff?</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Have you encouraged any of the preservice teachers in your school this year to apply for continuing employment in your school?</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unedited comments from principals on these issues are reproduced in Appendix 4. They confirm the positive attitudes revealed in the survey, and illustrate a wide range of reasons for those positive attitudes. As with all such data, they can be illuminating, but need to be viewed with caution as they tend to reflect the views of the most articulate and those with the most firmly-held views.
5.2 Mentor survey

For mentors, there was a target population of 234, of which responses were obtained from 111 - a response rate of 47 per cent.

With a different structure altogether (see Chapter 4), the Gippsland site did not involve mentors in roles that corresponded to those of mentors in other sites, and the questions on the Mentor Survey would have been inappropriate. Therefore the Mentor Survey was provided to all mentor teachers on the remaining six sites. Responses were received from sites as shown below:

- Bendigo: 11
- Koonung: 22
- CEP: 12
- Northern Bay: 10
- Point Cook: 14
- Hume Central: 22

5.2.1 Analysis by Item

A series of questions addressed sought mentors' assessments of the extent of knowledge possessed by the PSTs about their subject matter and how to teach it. Like the principals, they were asked to estimate how this compared with the knowledge of PSTs they had supervised prior to their participation in SCTE. Their responses are summarized in Table 5.8.

The most common responses were "About the same." In combination with "Unable to say," this indicated that, in general, Mentors saw little difference in the level of knowledge possessed by PSTs in the SCTE program and PSTs in previous years. Those who did see a difference leaned a little way in the direction of "More knowledge," but any difference is minimal.
Table 5.8. Knowledge possessed by preservice teachers in SCTE, compared to previous years - Mentors' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared with the past few years, how do you rate the knowledge possessed by the preservice teachers in the School Centres for Teaching Excellence program this year about each of the following?</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The importance of building on students’ existing knowledge and experience</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teaching strategies that cater for the needs of students across the full range of abilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Broad, university-level content in the subjects they teach</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that they teach</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strategies that they can use for teaching literacy</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Strategies that they can use for teaching numeracy</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Using assessment data to give appropriate feedback to students</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast with the data reported in Table 5.8, Table 5.9 shows a clear trend. A substantial majority of mentors saw the PSTs in the SCTE program as having greater opportunity to practise their teaching skills. This was evident in every aspect of teaching about which they were asked, and relatively uniformly across all five. Those mentors seeing the PSTs as less provided for in this regard were a small minority - around 10 per cent across the five aspects of teaching included in the survey.

Table 5.9. Opportunity provided for preservice teachers in SCTE to practise skills, compared to previous years - Mentors' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to previous years, how well do you believe you have been able to provide this year’s SCTE preservice teachers with the opportunity to practise the following skills?</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning and delivering a sequence of lessons and classroom activities.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Developing a repertoire of effective teaching strategies that they can call upon as needed</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Organising classroom activities, providing students with clear directions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Understanding and managing challenging student behaviour</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two items addressed the extent to which PSTs had developed the knowledge and skills to fill the role of teacher in a more general sense - knowing how to behave ethically and responsibility and how to work collaboratively with colleagues. These are aspects of teaching that go beyond classroom performance, and which the extended time in schools afforded by SCTE programs might be expected to engender. This appears to have been the case, particularly so with collaboration with colleagues. For both aspects of teacher preparedness, only 3 per cent thought it occurred less under SCTE and a clear majority thought it occurred more.

These results are presented in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10 Knowledge and skills required to face the responsibilities of a teacher, compared to previous years - Mentors' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to previous years, how well do you believe you have been able to provide this year’s SCTE preservice teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills that they will need to face each of the following responsibilities as teachers?</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Working collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and using their constructive feedback to improve your teaching</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Behaving ethically and responsibly as a teacher.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven items addressed the extent to which PSTs had been able to experience the daily life of a teacher, with its rewards and challenges, and become part of a team, rather than outsiders performing a role. Providing this type of experience to PSTs is a key aim of SCTE programs, and (as indicated by the data reported in Table 5.11), mentors’ views suggest that this has been very successfully achieved.

Table 5.11. Support and interaction experienced in school by preservice teachers in SCTE, compared to previous years - Mentors’ views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the preservice teachers in your school this year have</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. felt that they had become part of a school community?</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. developed ongoing relationships with their mentor teachers?</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. enjoyed collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. experienced the daily life of a teacher?</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. had an impact on students’ learning?</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. known and understood their students?</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. learned to engage with students and manage behaviour in real situations?</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another key aim of SCTE programs is that there should be a high level of cooperation and common purpose between staff of the university and teaching staff in the schools where PSTs are located. In general, mentors saw this as being achieved to a substantially greater extent in SCTE programs than previously (see Table 5.12).

Table 5.12. Knowledge possessed by preservice teachers in SCTE, compared to previous years - Mentors' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the following statements to be true of the school experience that you have been able to provide to this year’s SCTE preservice teachers?</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. The school staff and the university staff worked closely together for a common purpose.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The coursework was closely related to the practical experience we provided during the course.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. During their practical experience, they had valuable support from their supervising teachers, or mentors.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. During their practical experience, they had valuable support from university staff.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. They gained experience in a variety of ways of using Information/Communication Technology (ICT) in their teaching.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. They were actively involved in research related to the school and/or their teaching.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, there was a strong consensus among mentors that the programs they had experienced were more effective in preparing participants to become successful teachers (See Table 5.13). Only 16 per cent felt that this had not been so, compared to 59 per cent who agreed that it had been the case. This was in spite of the fact (Table 5.14) that a majority of mentors reported that they had not been provided with specific training for their roles as mentors.

Table 5.13. Overall effectiveness of the SCTE program compared to previous years - Mentors' views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall effectiveness of the SCTE program</th>
<th>Much less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>Much more</th>
<th>Unable to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Compared to previous years, how effective do you believe the SCTE program has been this year in preparing its participants to become successful teachers?</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14. Provision of Specific Training for Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific training for mentors</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Were you provided with specific training to meet the expectations of you as a mentor in the SCTE</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.2 Analysis by Attitude Scale

Four attitude scales were constructed by aggregating the responses across items as follows:

**Knowledge of Pedagogy and Subject Content (9 items)**
This provided a measure of how the mentors rated the knowledge possessed by the preservice teachers in their School Centres for Teaching Excellence program, compared to their experience in previous years.

**Opportunity to Practise Teaching Skills (5 items)**
This provided a measure of how well the mentors believed they had been able to provide SCTE preservice teachers with the opportunity to practise a range of teaching skills, compared to their experience in previous years.

**Real-Life Experience in a School (7 items)**
This provided a measure of how well the mentors believed that the preservice teachers in their school this year had been able to experience the day-to-day life of a teacher, compared to their experience in previous years.

**Common Purpose between School and University (6 items)**
This provided a measure of how well the mentors believed that school and university staff had been able to work together with a common purpose in supporting the preservice teachers in their schools, compared to their experience in previous years.

Appendix 3 lists the items that contribute to each scale. Scales were created by coding the responses as follows:

- Much less: 1
- A little less: 2
- About the same; Unable to say: 3
- A little more: 4
- Much more: 5

and computing a mean score across items for each scale. All four scales proved to be highly reliable, with Cronbach alpha coefficients ranging from 0.83 to 0.95.

The results of these analyses, including a breakdown by site, are presented in Table 5.15. In interpreting these figures, it is important to bear in mind that any mean score greater than the midpoint of the scale (3) indicates that the respondents are, on average, rating the SCTE experience as superior.

For all scales, the overall mean scores are close to 4, indicating a clear view on the part of mentors that the experience provided within SCTE was superior to that provided previously in all the respects covered by the survey. This view was quite consistent across sites and, as would be anticipated from previous discussion, was most strongly held in the two areas *Opportunity to Practise Teaching Skills* and *Real-Life Experience in a School*. 
Table 5.15 Descriptive statistics on scaled scores from mentor views about SCTE, by Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>Reliability¹</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
<th>Knowledge of Pedagogy and Subject Content</th>
<th>Opportunity to Practise Teaching Skills</th>
<th>Real-Life Experience in a School</th>
<th>Common Purpose between School and University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koonung</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Bay</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Cook</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume Central</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The reliabilities reported are internal consistency estimates for each scale (Cronbach's Alpha).

The differences between sites are small and not statistically significant (the size of the mentor sample was insufficient to make the fine distinctions that would be required to identify these differences). This is clearly seen in Figure 5.1, in which the mean scores by site are shown, accompanied by 95% confidence intervals. The overlap of the confidence intervals sounds a clear warning that the amount of data is not yet sufficient to yield conclusions about inter-site differences.
Figure 5.1. Scaled scores from mentor views about SCTE, by Site, showing 95% confidence intervals on scale means
The mentor data can also be summarized item-by-item. Figure 5.2 ranks the items from highest to lowest, in order of the percent of respondents who responded "A little more" or "Much more," indicating superiority of the SCTE programs.

**Figure 5.2. Mean scaled scores from mentor views about SCTE, by Site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of SCTE program rated &quot;More&quot; or &quot;Much more&quot; favourably, compared to mentors’ previous experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Enjoyed collegial support from fellow preservice teachers (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. During their practical experience, they had valuable support from their supervising teachers, or mentors (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Working collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and using their constructive feedback to improve your teaching (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Knowledge about difficulties understanding content (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Strategies that they can use for teaching numeracy (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach (39%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strongest support was expressed through the following items:

19. Enjoyed collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers (76%)
12. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning (75%)
26. During their practical experience, they had valuable support from their supervising teachers, or mentors (72%)
15. Working collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and using their constructive feedback to improve your teaching (70%)

The weakest support was expressed through the following items:

5. Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that they teach (45%)
6. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively (44%)
8. Strategies that they can use for teaching numeracy (44%)
1. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach (39%)

In interpreting these data, it is important to bear in mind that even on the four items for which the mentors expressed the weakest support (5, 6, 8 and 1) the percent of mentors who responded "A little less" or "much less" was significantly smaller in all cases:
5. Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that they teach (23%)
6. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively (14%)
8. Strategies that they can use for teaching numeracy (23%)
1. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach (18%)

The strongest support from mentors was for items clearly related to the school experience, and the weakest support was for items related largely to content knowledge. This is consistent with conclusions advanced previously. In the eyes of mentors, the SCTE programs have empowered them to provide a significantly superior experience for PSTs in all areas, but particularly so in the areas towards which have been the key the focus of the SCTE project - teamwork, support, collaboration and constructive feedback during their school experience.
5.3 Findings from the Graduate Survey

As noted previously, this survey was conducted online. With the generous support of the Victorian Institute of Teaching, all new teacher registrants in 2012 and 2013 were invited to participate. The invitation made clear that responses were being sought from 2011 and 2012 graduates of teacher preparation programs, so that registrants who did not fit this description were not expected to respond. They were invited to respond "Not a new graduate," which enabled us to avoid sending them reminders when no response had been received.

This strategy elicited 125 such responses, most of which came from experienced teachers who had registered in order to return to teaching after a lengthy absence. Others came from interstate or overseas. How many simply determined that they were not relevant to the survey and therefore ignored it is impossible to determine.

In addition, there were 267 "bounce backs," most of which came from university email addresses, indicating that graduates were no longer at university, but had yet to obtain a teaching position (or, if they had obtained a teaching position, had not updated the records with the Victorian Institute of Teaching). If they had not obtained a teaching position, they were not part of the target population. But how many such graduates had registered, not obtained a teaching position, and ignored the survey because they recognised it as not relevant to them, is impossible to determine.

For this reason, it is not clear which non-respondents should and should not be regarded as part of the target population and lacking this information, the exact response rate cannot be determined.

For the purposes of this research, the data of most interest were the responses to the survey from 2011 and 2012 graduates of SCTE programs, and graduates of other programs within the same universities. These data are summarised in Figures 4.3 through 4.8.

Table 5.15. Responses to Graduate Survey (participating universities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>SCTE Participants</th>
<th>Not SCTE Participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ballarat</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>923</strong></td>
<td><strong>1026</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of responses received are sufficient to draw comparisons between SCTE programs and non-SCTE programs, but not sufficient to make reliable comparisons between SCTE sites.
5.3.1 Analysis by item

Figures 5.3 through 5.11 present a profile of the responses given by SCTE participants and non-participants to each item. For ease of interpretation, these figures present the percent of responses given that fell in the top two (most positive) of the five response categories – that is, “Very well” or “Well” but not “Reasonably well,” “Only slightly” or “Not at all.” The percentages reported, therefore, represent a favourable endorsement of program quality.

Across almost all items there was a common pattern – SCTE participants gave a greater proportion of positive assessments than non-SCTE participants.

5.3.1.1 Necessary knowledge and understanding

These data are summarized in Figure 5.3.

The first set of items (1 through 15) asked graduates how well their teacher preparation had provided them with necessary knowledge and understanding in a wide range of areas. More positive responses were received from SCTE participants on all items, except one, for which the difference was in the opposite direction, although small (16.5% compared to 17.7%):

8. Legal requirements for support with disabilities.

On the remaining 14 items, which covered both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, the proportion of positive responses (i.e., “Well” or “Very well”) was higher by significant margins ranging from a minimum of 1.8% for Item 6 (The particular needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders) to a maximum of 14.5% for Item 12 (Understanding and respect for ATSI histories, cultures and languages).

Figure 5.3. Graduates’ perceptions of the necessary knowledge and understanding gained from their teacher preparation programs

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding about each of the following?
Items 6 and 8 both relate to knowledge about the particular needs of minority groups (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, and students with disabilities). Not only were these the only two items in which there was no difference of any consequence between graduates of SCTE and non-SCTE programs; they were the by far the items that drew the most negative appraisals from graduates. It may be concluded that knowledge and understanding about the needs of (at least) these two minority groups is an AITSL priority that is, at present, less successfully addressed than most others.

The areas of greatest success in both SCTE and non-SCTE programs appear to be those related to knowledge and understanding of students

1. How students learn and develop,
2. Individual differences among students that can affect their learning, and
4. How to build on student knowledge and experience,

for which very positive responses ("Well" or "Very well") were given by more than 60% of SCTE graduates and more than 50% of non-SCTE graduates. This indicates a strength in both sets of programs, but particularly in the SCTE programs.

5.3.1.2 Opportunity to practise classroom skills

These data are summarized in Figure 5.4.

A feature of all SCTE programs was that PSTs spent considerably longer time in schools, and it would be disappointing if this did not provide considerably greater opportunity for them to practice relevant skills in a realistic environment. The data provide convincing evidence that this was achieved. On the relevant items (16 through 23), there was a consistent pattern, with more positive appraisals ("Well" or “very well”) being given the SCTE graduates, by margins of 10-15 per cent on all items.

The most positive responses were given to the items:

17. Planning and delivering a lesson, and
18. Planning and delivering a sequence of lesson.

The greatest margin in favour of the SCTE program was for the item

23. Understanding and managing challenging student behaviour.

Although it was understandably the area rated less successful by both groups of graduates, it is worth noting that just more than half the SCTE graduates assessed that their programs had provided opportunities to practise this skill “Well” or “Very well,” compared to just one third of graduates from non-SCTE programs.
Figure 5.4. Graduates’ perceptions of the classroom skills practice provided by their teacher preparation programs

How well do you believe your teacher preparation has provided you with the opportunity to practise the following skills?

5.3.1.3 Opportunity to practise skills beyond the classroom

These data are summarized in Figure 5.5.

The opportunity to practise skills in assessment was assessed by items 26 through 31, and in all of these the more positive assessments were given by the SCTE graduates. The differences were generally smaller than in the areas considered previously, and were least positive (among both groups of graduates) for Item 30 (Reporting to students, parents and carers).

Figure 5.5. Graduates’ perceptions of the assessment and professional skills practice provided by their teacher preparation programs

How well do you believe your teacher preparation has provided you with the opportunity to practise the following skills?
5.3.1.4  **Knowledge and skills necessary to face the professional responsibilities of a teacher**

These data are summarized in Figure 5.6.

**Figure 5.6.** Graduates’ perceptions of how well they were provided with the knowledge and skills necessary to face the responsibilities of being a teacher?

*How well do you believe your teacher preparation has provided you with necessary knowledge and skills that you will need for each of the following responsibilities that you will face as a teacher?*

The knowledge and skills acquired in this area were assessed by items 32 to 40. In only one item:

40.  *Working effectively with non-teaching professionals*

was there no difference between the appraisals given by SCTE and non-SCTE graduates. This was also the item in which the most negative appraisals were given (less than 25% positive).

For two items,

37.  *Understanding legislative and organisational policies,* and

38.  *Working effectively with parents and carers,*

the difference was small, but for all others the difference was substantial, and even exceeded 20 per cent for one item: *Locating relevant and appropriate sources of professional learning.*

This provides strong evidence that SCTE programs have been particularly effective in this area.

**5.3.1.5  Feeling part of a well-supported school community**

These data are summarized in Figure 5.7.

Items 41 to 45 addressed this aspect of teacher preparation, and in all aspects the SCTE graduates rated their program more favourably than graduates of other programs. The difference was greatest for item 44, which asked them to appraise the extent to which they had enjoyed collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers. This is an encouraging result, given the aims and the nature of SCTE programs.
Figure 5.7. Graduates' perceptions of the extent to which they felt part of a well-supported school community

During the time you have spent in your preservice program, to what extent do you believe that you have:

5.3.1.6 Other aims of SCTE

These data are also summarized in Figure 5.7.

Items 46 to 50 addressed aspects of teacher preparation that are seen as vital to SCTE:

46. Had an impact on students' learning?
47. Known and understood your students?
48. Learned to engage with students and manage behaviour in real situations?
49. Been encouraged to try new approaches to teaching?
50. Been doing academic work that developed strong links between theoretical and practical aspects of teaching.

For each of these items, the SCTE graduates gave the most favourable ratings, most notably in the final item: Doing academic work that developed strong links between theoretical and practical aspects of teaching.

5.3.1.7 Support provided during practicum experience

These data are summarized in Figure 5.8.

Items 51 to 55 addressed the level of support received during practicum experience.

51. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from my supervising teachers, or mentors.
52. During my practical experience, I had quality feedback from my supervising teachers, or mentors.
53. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from university staff.
54. During my practical experience, I had quality feedback from university staff.
55. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from my fellow students.

Again, the SCTE graduates saw themselves as better supported on all aspects addressed in the survey, but the difference was quite dramatic on items 53 and 54, indicating that the
university staff in SCTE programs were much more involved in providing support during practicum, and that this was seen as valuable by the (then) PSTs.

Figure 5.8. Graduates' perceptions of the experiences provided in the teacher education component of their course

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the teacher education part of your course.

5.3.1.8 Academic rigour

These data are summarized in Figure 5.9. Figure 5.9 demonstrates that, for both SCTE and non-SCTE programs, a clear majority of respondents (around 80% for both SCTE and non-SCTE) believed that the academic rigour demanded of them by their program was of an appropriate level. Approximately equal percentages (10%, approximately) saw the demands as being too high and too low. There was no apparent difference between the SCTE and non-SCTE programs in this regard.

Figure 5.9. Graduates' perceptions of the academic rigour required in the Teaching studies and the Subject studies components of their course

In my Teaching Studies, the academic rigour required was:

5.3.1.9 Workload

These data are summarized in Figure 5.10.
Figure 5.10. Graduates’ perceptions of the workload demanded of them in the Teaching studies and the Subject studies components of their course

In my Teaching Studies, the amount of work required of me was:

In my Subject Studies, the amount of work required of me was:

Very few graduates saw the workload demanded of them as too high, and only a small minority thought it was too low. Interestingly, given the amount of time that SCTE students spent in schools, fewer SCTE graduates than non-SCTE graduates saw the workload in their teaching studies as too high. It may well be that SCTE graduates believed their time was well-spent (particularly when the university teaching was conducted in school settings) and therefore did not judge it to be excessive.

5.3.1.10 Overall ratings of program components

These data are summarized in Figure 5.11.

Graduates of both SCTE and non-SCTE programs saw the practical component as being more valuable than the university component of their programs (this is a common finding in evaluations of teacher education programs).

SCTE graduates gave higher ratings to both the practical component and to the university-based component of their programs than did their non-SCTE counterparts. In the light of this, it comes as no surprise the SCTE programs were given higher overall ratings than non-SCTE programs, nor that the overall ratings fell, in each case, between the ratings given to the practicum- and university-based components.

Figure 5.11. Graduates’ overall ratings of their teacher preparation programs, including the practicum and the university-based components

How do you rate
your teacher preparation program, overall?
the practicum component of your teacher preparation program?
the university component of your teacher preparation program?
5.3.2 Analysis by measurement scales

5.3.2.1 AITSL Standards

Items 1 to 40 on the Graduate Survey were constructed with the specific purpose of assessing the extent to which graduates rated themselves as having met the graduate level of the Standards developed by the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL, 2011). Appendix 3 lists the items that contribute to each scale. Appendix 4 provides a summary of the Standards (graduate level), along with a matching of the survey items to the Standards.

Each scale was constructed by aggregating the items into a Likert scale. Because all items were scored on the range 1 (most negative) to 5 (most positive), the scores have been made more easily interpretable by reporting the mean, rather than the sum of all the items on each scale.

A scale score of 1.00 would be obtained if a respondent gave the most negative possible response to every item on the scale; a scale score of 5.00 would be obtained if a respondent gave the most positive possible response to every item on the scale. These, of course, are unlikely to occur. But scale scores less than 3.00 reflect responses that are generally negative, and scale scores greater than 3.00 indicate responses that are generally positive.

Table 5.16 provides details of the scales, the items that contribute to them, and their reliabilities (Cronbach’s alpha).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale: AITSL Standard</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>List of Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Know students and how they learn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Know the content and how to teach it</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9-14</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16-22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26-31</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Engage in professional learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32-35</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Engage professionally with colleagues, parents and others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17, and Figure 5.11, which follows, display the mean scores on these seven scales for 2011 and 2012 SCTE graduates, and for graduates of non-SCTE programs from the same set of universities. Table 5.17 (and, later, Table 5.19) also reports whether these differences are statistically significant.\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\)Statistical note: The significance of the differences were tested using a two-way analysis of variance, with University and Program (SCTE vs. non-SCTE) as independent variables. This analysis has two advantages:
- the inclusion of University as a fixed factor effectively controls for between-university differences when testing the effect of Program, and
- it enables the testing for an interaction between Program and University.

For all seven Standards, and for the measures Fit with SCTE model and Support and Feedback, the interaction effect was not statistically significant, establishing that the effects of being in an SCTE program compared to a non-SCTE program can be treated as uniform across universities. In Tables 4.17 and 4.19, the significance level reported for the SCTE versus non-SCTE difference is that for the main effect in the two-way analyses of variance.
Table 5.17. Mean scores of SCTE and non-SCTE graduates on the seven AITSL Standards scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale: AITSL Standard</th>
<th>Not SCTE</th>
<th>SCTE 2011</th>
<th>SCTE 2012</th>
<th>Sig. of Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Know students and how they learn</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Know the content and how to teach it</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Engage in professional learning</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Engage professionally with colleagues, parents and others</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The test of statistical significance reports on the difference between the mean response from graduates of SCTE programs and graduates of non-SCTE programs.
ns – SCTE vs not-SCTE difference is not statistically significant (p>0.05)
* - SCTE vs not-SCTE difference is statistically significant (p<0.05)

Results for 2011 and 2012 SCTE graduates are presented separately because in many sites the SCTE programs were implemented over the course of 2011, and it was only in 2012 that full
implementation was achieved. Thus it was anticipated that the full benefits of SCTE would not be realised until the 2012 graduates completed their programs. The charts and tables to follow are designed to display this pattern of results, should it occur.

The actual number of 2011 graduates is quite small, and is insufficient to provide the power needed for hypothesis testing. Therefore, the only hypotheses formally tested (and reported in the last columns of Tables 5.17 are between SCTE graduates (with 2011 and 2012 combined) and graduates from non-SCTE programs in the same universities over the same two years.

The conventional 5% level of significance is applied. When, as in five of the seven AITSL Standards, the difference between SCTE and non-SCTE graduates is determined to be statistically significant, it means that, given the size of the samples being compared, the probability of a difference of the size observed (or greater) occurring by chance is less than 5 in 100.

Thus, from Table 5.17, it can be seen that SCTE graduates rated their teacher preparation more effective in relation to five of the seven AITSL Standards. For the remaining two Standards (1 and 4), the difference was in the same direction, although it fell short of statistical significance.

The pattern of difference is portrayed graphically for all seven standards in Figure 5.12. This makes clear that the same pattern of difference occurs across all seven standards, and that for the two standards for which the difference falls short of statistical significance, the pattern is similar to that in the remaining five. The difference is one of degree, rather than exception.

The information conveyed in Table 5.17 and Figure 5.12 may be summarised as follows:

In relation to the AITSL Standards, graduates of SCTE programs rated their programs as more effective than did graduates of parallel teacher preparation programs: those in the same universities over the same two years.

This difference was observed across all seven standards, and was statistically significant at the 5% level for five of the seven standards. For the remaining two, the difference was in the same direction and of similar magnitude, but fell short of statistical significance.

When 2011 and 2012 graduates of SCTE programs were portrayed and compared to graduates of non-SCTE programs, a consistent pattern was observed (see Figure 5.12):

- Graduates of 2012 SCTE programs rated their programs as more effective in preparing them to meet the Standards than did graduates of 2011 SCTE programs.
- Graduates of both SCTE programs rated their programs as more effective in preparing them to meet the Standards than did graduates of other programs in the same universities.

This pattern is as expected, given the general observation that implementation was underway in 2011, but fully achieved only in 2012.

In conclusion, the graduate survey provides undeniable evidence that programs conducted as part of the SCTE project were more effective in addressing the AITSL Standards than programs in the same universities that were not part of the SCTE project.

The graduate survey also provides undeniable evidence that the SCTE programs became, in general, more effective in addressing the AITSL Standards in 2012 than they had been in 2011.
Another set of items formed scales to assess the extent to which the programs were implementing the key features of the SCTE model. These were titled *Fit with SCTE Model* and *Support and feedback provided during the course*. The items contributing to these scales are summarised in Table 5.18 and listed immediately after the table.

**Table 5.18. Implementing of the SCTE model: Scale Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>N of items</th>
<th>List of Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fit with SCTE Model</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41-50, 58-60</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and feedback provided during course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3 lists the items that contribute to each scale.

For each scale, the responses were aggregated and then averaged, so that, as with the AITSL Standards scales, the possible range of scores is from 1 (total disagreement) to 5 (total agreement), with a score of 3 corresponding to an average response of 3 (not sure).

Summary statistics for these two scales are provided in Table 5.19 and portrayed graphically in Figure 5.13.

**Table 5.19. Mean scores of SCTE and non-SCTE graduates on the scales relating to specific SCTE objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Not SCTE</th>
<th>SCTE 2011</th>
<th>SCTE 2012</th>
<th>Sig. Of Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with SCTE Model</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and feedback provided during course</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The test of statistical significance reports on the difference between the mean response from graduates of SCTE programs and graduates of non-SCTE programs.*

* - SCTE vs not-SCTE difference is statistically significant (p<0.05)

**Figure 5.13. Mean scores of SCTE and non-SCTE graduates on the scales relating to specific SCTE objectives**

![Graph showing mean scores of SCTE and non-SCTE graduates on the scales relating to specific SCTE objectives.](image)
It is apparent from Table 5.19 and Figure 5.13 that graduates of all programs tended to agree with these statements, with mean scores approaching 4.00 (Agree). Nevertheless, the difference between the mean scores of SCTE graduates and that of graduates of other programs in the same universities was statistically significant, although small, with the mean scores of SCTE graduates a little higher on both scales.

Figure 5.13 demonstrates that there is no evidence that SCTE programs in 2012 provided a closer fit to the SCTE model, nor that they provided greater levels of support and feedback, than in 2011.

5.3.2.3 Details of responses by item

Further details are provided in Appendix 2, which shows the frequencies of responses of SCTE graduates to each individual item on the survey. For the most part, this table elaborates on, but does not add to, the summary presented above. One additional detail that does emerge, however, is evident from the three items listed in Table 5.20.

**Table 5.20. Responses of SCTE graduates to selected survey items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only slightly</th>
<th>Reasonably well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The importance of understanding and respecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories, cultures and languages</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only slightly</th>
<th>Reasonably well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Understanding and managing challenging student behaviour</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of these items, the two most common responses are not adjoining, indicating that there may be some divergence in the assessments made by SCTE graduates from different sites with respect to these issues. For the vast majority of items on the survey, however, the summary details provided previously can be generalised with some confidence across SCTE sites.

5.3.3 A note on the findings from the Graduate Survey

The Graduate Survey gathers information about the effectiveness of the SCTE programs from the persons most qualified to judge – graduates of those program who are anywhere from 8 months to 20 months into their teaching careers. They have gained enough teaching experience to make an informed judgment about the effectiveness of their preparation, and are sufficiently distant from it to make a judgment that is unclouded by irrelevant matters such as the excitement (or the boredom) generated by the program, the difficulties they may have encountered during the program, or their emotional state at the time.
The comparison group enlisted for this evaluation provide the most valid comparison available. They attended the same universities, so that differences in selection standards for different universities are controlled for and therefore irrelevant. They completed their studies at the same time, and have had comparable teaching experience as the SCTE graduates. There is no reason to suppose that they differ in any other way from the SCTE graduates, except for the teacher preparation program that they experienced.

Given all of this, then, it seems undeniable that there were clear benefits to graduates from their participation in the SCTE programs. These benefits are seen most clearly in relation to the extent to which, with the benefit of experience, they believe their programs provided them with the knowledge, understanding and experiences that they needed in order to attain the relevant AITSL Standards. And they are clearly greater for those graduates who had two years’ experience with an SCTE program than for those who had just one.

Finally, we note that the Graduate Survey provides compelling data from participants who have no stake in SCTE. The fact that its findings are consistent with the accounts of those who do (Principals, Coordinators, Mentors, University staff) not only adds detail to those accounts, but also confirms their accuracy.
6 Overview of Findings

6.1 From the Case Studies

6.1.1 Partnerships and collaboration

A formal partnership raises the expectation of a closer working relationship (in this case, between a university and a set of schools), than is generally the case. Setting up such partnerships allows each party to benefit from the others. To what extent has this been happening with the SCTEs?

The evidence that we have seen indicates that SCTE programs have:

- enhanced and strengthened existing partnerships between groups of schools and university providers of teacher education (e.g. the Koonung, Point Cook, Bendigo and Northern Bay clusters). enabled new partnerships to be formed (e.g. the Hume cluster, where an existing model of teacher education was expanded and adapted to take in new sites in a different geographical area);
- enabled the creation of formal partnerships between teacher education providers and schools in situations where previously there has been close but informal relationships (e.g. Monash, Gippsland);
- enhanced and strengthened existing site-based or ‘clinical’ models of teacher education (e.g. Victoria University and the University of Melbourne);
- hastened the development of site-based or ‘clinical’ models of teacher education (e.g. La Trobe Bendigo, Deakin, Geelong);
- brought about significant change in teacher education curriculum (e.g. Monash, Gippsland)
- enhanced and strengthened existing school curriculum, e.g. the ‘synchronisation’ of the Deakin pre-service teacher education program with the school improvement agenda of Northern Bay College. This has resulted in a new science based program, developed by the resident PSTs, becoming embedded in the College in the Middle Years and expanding to the all Junior campuses. Similar contributions were also being made at Point Cook, as PSTs completed their Applied Curriculum Projects in which they had worked collaboratively with school staff throughout the year on such initiatives as a Science Fair, Drama production, and a sustainable kitchen garden project.
- Facilitated more flexible co-operation between universities and schools, e.g. at Point Cook, when cuts to university funding placed in jeopardy the valuable role played by University Colleagues, the Management Committee discussed how this might be overcome through the school making a small, short term contribution, to see the program through to satisfactory completion in 2012. Other options will be discussed for the future.

In 2012, SCTE cluster members have:

- Liaised with member schools and shared facilities and expertise
- Initiated visits between schools to experience different environments and facilities
- Made some facilities (e.g. science facilities at Box Hill High School) available to work with primary and secondary groups of PSTs
- Established stronger connections between primary and secondary schools
- Initiated learning walks at cluster schools and reciprocal professional development
• Hosted national and international academics (e.g. the Koonung Cluster hosted NSW DET and Thai visitors)
• Worked in partnership with local Aboriginal co-operative, Wannik, NBC and Deakin to implement a literacy and numeracy focused learning centre for Koorie students. The program is developed and driven by PSTs aligned with the college school improvement agenda (Northern Bay).
• The Gippsland SCTE cluster presented at the Australian Teacher Education Conference (ATEA) focusing on new initiatives developed through the SCTE. This cluster is also producing, for general dissemination, and a view to extending partnerships, a video showing SCTE initiatives.
• Websites highlighting the development of school university partnerships and the resulting changes to teacher education have been produced for all centres and can be viewed by going to the DEECD website: https://fuse.education.vic.gov.au/pages/View.aspx?id=5699f1f1-e34f-427b-b270-4a575846f16e&Source=%252fpages%252fResults.aspx%253fs%253dSCTE

We note that some existing partnerships have been established following major school reorganisation (e.g. Point Cook, Hume, Bendigo, and Northern Bay). Where teaching normally occurs with teams of teachers and students, an approach to teacher education that brings teams of PSTs together with teams of teachers may be particularly suited to the teaching environments created in these new schools. Architecturally new ‘open-space’, ‘learning pod’ areas create a teaching environment that is quite different to that in traditional schools, with their relatively inflexible self-contained classrooms, and that may be particularly suited to the approaches to teacher education that the SCTE project is perceived as encouraging. This project has demonstrated that the establishment of harmonious and effective partnerships is not dependent on any particular school organisation or architecture.

Across all sites, there are key elements that make the partnerships work. A coordinator position seems to be pivotal, and needs to be high-profile, well paid and given a generous time allowance so that it can be attractive to highly competent people with standing in the university and/or schools. Arrangements in which the coordinator has a base in the university and in a school seem to be advantageous.

All clusters have management or steering committees with senior levels of membership (e.g. school principals, program directors at the universities, SCTE coordinators). These committees are vital in generating common purpose and resolving the issues that will inevitably arise. Collaboration allows for input from all stakeholders, group discussion and for timely, reinforcing feedback.

Relationships and communication between school and university educators are greatly strengthened by the increased contact that occurs in site-based models and by the presence of university staff in schools. This has resulted in significant changes to practicum arrangements and university course content. In some cases, the movement of PSTs between schools has included primary PSTs spending time in secondary schools and vice-versa. Where this has occurred, it has been highly valued by the PSTs and by the university staff.

Professional collaboration among teachers in schools improved as a result of new ‘mentoring cultures’ that have developed out of SCTE mentoring initiatives.

In general, PSTs are seen more as resources who can add value to a school, rather than a burden for the school to carry. At Monash Gippsland, for example, the PSTs are able to contribute to the teaching program of schools in ways that would be impossible for teachers alone to achieve.
6.1.2 Course quality and design

There is a greatly increased emphasis on practice and the knowledge derived from practice. University and school staff develop increased respect for the contributions that each can make. The close school-university relationship enables courses to be tailored to local circumstances such as rural needs, ethnic diversity and socioeconomic disadvantage.

Changes in course content take time, due to external and internal course approval and accreditation processes. Changes in delivery method come more easily, and in the majority of sites changes in the university teaching have largely been a matter of emphasis, new directions and new, often on-site delivery. The major exception to this seems to be Monash Gippsland, where curriculum change has been a key focus, with existing subjects being completely redesigned to build in significant school involvement.

Under the SCTE model, courses necessarily must keep up to date with current developments in schools. The most important example is probably the team teaching in open space school environments. In respect of this, however, it would have been interesting to find evidence of university programs with a focus on research into open-classroom forms of education (an area in which La Trobe University, Bendigo, has a particular research focus).

Team teaching and integrated curriculum in schools are reflected in course arrangements, with PSTs also working in teams and on team projects. This was having positive effects on school curriculum (see Partnerships and Collaboration, above).

In some SCTEs teams of teachers were established to work on course development and delivery with teams of PSTs. Some PST assessment focused on this involvement, e.g. practicum presentations and presentations of curriculum projects.

In some SCTEs (e.g. Northern Bay) university assessment of PSTs is seen to be in need of adaptation and re-development to suit the model. This work is underway.

Exemplary seminars were delivered through the MGSE M. Teach program on the VIT standards, presenting at interviews, and preparation of CVs.

The SCTE model influenced practicum and course design principles across other teacher preparation courses (e.g. La Trobe, Bendigo)

The SCTE Northern Bay cluster is working in partnership with the Knowledge Media Division Unit of Deakin University to film John Hattie Feedback Projects in action. The cluster is Aligning PSTs with this work across the college. This will form part of Master Class videos.

6.1.3 Practicum models

SCTE has enabled the development of on-site, practise-oriented models of teacher education, with greater emphasis on PST participation in the life of the school. A typical pattern for the practicum is an extended period (often a semester), in which PSTs spend at least two days per week in a school followed, later, by a more traditional block placement of three or four weeks. Outside of the SCTE, a pattern of purely block placements is much more common. Note that schools linked to Victoria University and to the M Teach at the University of Melbourne had already been committed to this model.

Even in more traditional ‘block’ placements, we have seen greater emphasis on PST participation in the life of the school. Generally there is a greater collegiality with PSTs; often they are invited to faculty and learning team meetings and are given the opportunity to consider policy and school focus areas (e.g., Northern Bay and to an extent the University of Ballarat cluster in the CEP).
Within SCTE programs, teams of PSTs usually enter the school as a group, even where they are not going into a team teaching environment. This provides greater opportunity for mutual support and their arrival as a team encourages greater involvement of the whole school, including reconsideration of policies regarding PSTs.

The SCTE model places greater emphasis on the quality of the practicum – both delivery (what PSTs experience, variety etc) and assessment. The SCTE model is highlighting the restrictive nature of current policy around the traditional teacher-supervisor role (see below).

6.1.4 Mentoring

The team emphasis within SCTE calls into question the traditional teacher-supervisor role, where one supervising teacher is paid for the supervision of one PST. In the team approaches characteristic of the SCTE, questions of who assesses the PSTs in their practicum, who writes their reports and who receives payment can become problematic. This is particularly the case in schools such as Northern Bay, Point Cook and the Bendigo cluster, where school students are accommodated in groups of up to 100 in open spaces with teams of teachers and where, in consequence, they are mentored within the team.

In Bendigo, SCTE funded a position of ‘Expert Mentor’ in each of the four schools. A key role of the SCTE coordinator was to liaise regularly with these people, who, like the coordinator, also gave lectures at the schools and the university. The Expert Mentors were expected to develop the mentoring capacities of teachers in their schools.

The selection of mentors was seen to be an issue in some schools. No one thought that ‘Expert Teachers’ (by classification) should be required to be mentors.

SCTE was funding Koonung teachers to complete the first unit (mentoring) of a Masters degree in clinical teaching. (23 in 2011, continuing into 2012). These people are expected to share their learning with colleagues to develop a ‘mentoring culture’ in the SCTE cluster. Similar opportunities were available at Victoria University, Monash Gippsland and the CEP cluster. These were also supported by SCTE funds. Melbourne and La Trobe Universities are piloting a new course ‘Teaching as Clinical Practice’ with a focus on feedback as a form of mentoring, with a view to providing these courses at reduced cost to SCTE cluster schools.

At Northern Bay, a handbook for SCTE site-based teacher educators (mentors) has been prepared.

The work of mentors, teachers, university staff and PSTs is being shared, recognised and celebrated, e.g. at the Point Cook Precinct a major celebration of the achievements of 2012, including presentation of all Applied Curriculum Projects was held on 18 October, to which major stakeholders, including representatives of the DEECD and ACER were invited.

6.1.5 Use of technology

We have not seen evidence of any significant increased use of technology to enhance SCTE outcomes. We have heard much of the difficulties encountered (lack of Wi-Fi access in schools, inability to access the Ultranet, difficulty in setting up web connections). This is clearly an area that needs to be given further attention over the coming year. At Point Cook, however, a collaborative website using ‘Edugate’ is currently in preparation. It will include a blog, photo library, educational resources and activities. It is expected to be operational by Term 4 2012 leading into 2013.

Members of the SCTE Northern Bay cluster have made extensive use of Deakin ICT facilities throughout 2012. Additional funding has been sought through Deakin to support a new ICT
Several initiatives are underway in the CEP cluster. These include:

- A Rural Centre of Excellence web based forum to share information and resources
- Trialling an online mentoring approach within one partnership – St Arnaud partnership
- The delivery of elements of the professional development programs to be provided through an online environment
- The provision of some professional learning and support within specific partnerships to support the implementation of the Cluster Action Plan

### 6.1.6 Infrastructure

The arrival of teams of PSTs in a school for an extended period of time makes serious demands on the school’s capacity to provide suitable accommodation. In some schools this is not seen as a problem, while in others it can be acute. Where there is an accommodation problem, short-term fixes, such as having teachers vacate a staff room, cannot last. They eliminate the possibility of expanding the program and are likely to exacerbate relationships between PSTs and regular teaching staff.

We can offer no solution to what is, in some cases, an acute problem. But we note that shortage of accommodation can pose a serious threat to the success and survival of programs such as those encouraged by the SCTE.

There is some evidence that newer school buildings have greater capacity to provide accommodation and facilities for PST education than many would suppose. Two examples that stand out are the establishment of the Koonung Learning Centre and the dedicated rooms that have been made available specifically for SCTE at Point Cook. As such schools are situated in areas of population growth; however, there is no guarantee that these spaces and facilities will be available as student enrolments increase.

### 6.1.7 Sustainability

Across all sites, there is general agreement that successful implementation and continuation of SCTE programs requires changes in resource allocation. The following are seen as essential:

- An SCTE coordinator. This role is seen as pivotal, and probably needs to be full-time, depending on the size and structure of the centre. Aside from the significant administrative load, it takes a substantial commitment for a single person to be ‘the face of SCTE’ and both visible and available in the university and in the schools.
- A Management Committee or coordinating group (the title may vary, but the role remains vital). There is a clear need for a mechanism to bring stakeholders – school staff, university staff, regional staff and maybe PSTs) together on a regular basis. This will be the group that makes decisions about changes in program direction, curriculum, practicum, staffing and accommodation needs. All of these are matters that, if not decided jointly, have the potential to lead to discord.
- Mentoring. There will be a continuing need for mentors and supporting the development of the mentoring culture that is characteristic the SCTE initiative in schools. This will require continuing provision of professional development, and this always comes at a cost, either to the Centre, or directly to the university. The gains
made through, for example, mentor teachers’ participation in the (SCTE funded) first unit of the MGSE Master’s degree in Clinical Teaching and the Certificate of Clinical Teaching have been considerable for PSTs, the teachers themselves and all school staff. The impetus of this initiative needs to be sustained if the associated gains are to be maintained and to grow.

- In many cases, the SCTE is a relatively small component of a university’s overall teacher preparation program. Where it is seen as successful (and this, in our judgment, it generally is), there will naturally be a desire to expand the program and make it available to more PSTs. This could include the possible extension of the SCTE model to other clusters of schools. Again, should this happen, there will be costs associated with it.

In conversations with SCTE staff, the most common response to questions about sustainability is “We need to keep the SCTE Coordinator.” We accept this claim, but where the funding should come from may prove to be a contentious issue. A case could be made for contributions from at least three sources: the Region, the schools and the university. It is an issue that must be resolved if the SCTE is to have the lasting impact that it deserves.

6.1.8 Research

Relatively little evidence of research was found. The CEP is developing a ‘tracking’ approach to determine the employment outcomes of PSTs involved in the rural partnerships. Currently data is being collected over five years. This cluster is also undertaking some action research in each partnership that focuses on youth learning aspirations, but the connection to SCTE appears to be tangential. Northern Bay is using SCTE funding to support joint research into raising student aspirations. Again the relationship with SCTE appears to be tangential. Another Northern Bay research project is investigating the use of residency models in PST education. At Point Cook a Research Officer has been appointed and a research project is underway. The research topic is mentoring and the impact of PSTs on the school community. This issue needs further clarification in discussions with the DEECD and SCTE cluster members.

6.2 From the Surveys

6.2.1 Information from the Principal survey

The assessments made by the Principals were uniformly positive.

On the collegiality of the environment experienced by PSTs:

Principals believed very firmly that they had been able to provide a more collegial and supportive environment for PSTs under the SCTE program than before. Across all questions relating to the collegiality of the environment they had been able to provide, 80-90 per cent of principals indicated that the SCTE program had provided a more collegial and supportive environmental for PSTs, and almost none found it less so than before SCTE.

On the extent to which PSTs had been able to work together with school staff, share a common purpose and gain experience of the life of a teacher:

An overwhelming 87 per cent of responses indicated that Principals believed they had been better able to provide this kind of supportive environment within SCTE than previously.
On how fully preservice teachers had been able to participate in school life:

Principals reported that school staff and the university staff had been working more closely together for a common purpose in SCTE than previously (84%); that preservice teachers in SCTE related to school staff more as colleagues, rather than as visitors to the school (86%), and that their school students were more inclined to relate to preservice teachers in SCTE in a similar way as they relate to their regular teachers (75%).

On the strength of the school-university partnership:

Principals believed that, with an SCTE program in operation, the university was seen to have a greater presence on the school campus (73%); and that school had been more able to influence the university teacher education program (72%). On the other hand, only 42 per cent reported that the university had been more able to influence school teaching practices under SCTE.

On the benefits gained by their school from participation in SCTE:

Principals were firm in their belief that their schools had benefited from the presence of additional PSTs with a higher level of involvement in the life of the school (97% agreeing with this statement). There was also strong agreement (86%) that within SCTE the school had gained more benefit from a closer relationship with the university teacher education staff. These findings are important for the future of programs of this nature, which can only work with the support of principals and the willingness of schools are willing to enter into close (and enduring) partnerships with schools.

On the sustainability of the SCTE program in their schools:

Undoubtedly programs of this nature make demands on schools that are different, and often greater, than what might now be seen as traditional programs. If they are to grow and flourish, it is important that participating schools have the staff and the resources to make it work. In general, principals expressed confidence that the demands that participation in SCTE made on their staff were manageable (84%), and that their schools had the physical resources needed to support continued participation in SCTE programs (72%). The only negative response came in relation to funding, with only 42 per cent of principals reporting that their schools could continue their participation in SCTE without additional funding.

In spite of the funding issue, principals were unanimous in reporting that they wanted their school’s participation in the SCTE program to continue.

In Summary:

Principals overwhelmingly believe that their schools have benefited from participation in the SCTE program in their schools. They unanimously want their schools’ participation to continue; but a majority believes that continued funding is necessary for the programs to be sustainable.

A note of caution

Most (but not all) of the principals surveyed were the very same persons who had previously made the decisions that their schools would participate in the SCTE program. Two consequences flow from this. First, they are likely to have greater commitment to the
values that underlie the SCTE program than other principals might have. Second, having made the decision that their school should participate, they may find it difficult to acknowledge, even to themselves, that it may not have been a good decision. For these two reasons at least, it would be natural for this group of principals, more than any others, to be supportive to the program, and therefore to err, if they do err, on the side of generosity in their responses.

For this reason, it is important to establish that the positive appraisals by principals are confirmed from other stakeholders in the project.

6.2.2 Information from the Mentor survey
There are no such issues with the responses to the mentor survey. The mentors themselves are unlikely to have played a large part in the decision that the school would participate. And, if there is an added burden to carry, these are the staff who are required to carry it. The mentors, then, occupy a position in which they have an intimate knowledge of the program and no commitment to the program that would inhibit them from being critical.

Their support for SCTE was strong, but not quite as strong as that of the principals.

On the knowledge possessed by preservice teachers in SCTE, compared to previous years:
Mentors saw little difference in the level of knowledge possessed by PSTs in the SCTE program and PSTs in previous years. Those who did see a difference leaned a little way in the direction of "More knowledge," but any difference was minimal.

On the opportunity provided for preservice teachers in SCTE to practise skills, compared to previous years:
A substantial majority of mentors saw the PSTs in the SCTE program as having been provided with greater opportunity to practise their teaching skills. This was evident in every aspect of teaching about which they were asked, and relatively uniformly across all of them.

On how well they had been able to provide preservice teachers with the knowledge and skills required to face the responsibilities of a teacher:
A clear majority (65%) reported that preservice teachers had been better able to work collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and to use constructive feedback to improve their teaching. A narrow majority (52%) reported that preservice teachers had been better prepared to behave ethically and responsibly as teachers. (To put this in perspective, it should be noted that only 3% responded that they were less prepared).

On the extent to which PSTs had been able to experience the daily life of a teacher, with its rewards and challenges, and become part of a team, rather than outsiders performing a role:
Clear majorities of mentors reported that, in their 2012 SCTE program, preservice teachers had, to a greater extent than in previous years
- felt that they had become part of a school community;
- developed ongoing relationships with their mentor teachers;
- enjoyed collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers;
- experienced the daily life of a teacher;
- had an impact on students’ learning;
• known and understood their students, and
• learned to engage with students and manage behaviour in real situations.

On the level of cooperation and common purpose between staff of the university and teaching staff in the schools:

In general, mentors saw this as being achieved to a substantially greater extent in SCTE programs than previously (42% reported “more”; 15% “less”).

On the overall effectiveness of the SCTE program compared to previous years:

In spite of the fact that a majority of mentors reported that they had not been provided with specific training for their roles as mentors, a clear majority (63%) rated SCTE as more effective, compared to only 16 per cent who rated it as less effective.

In Summary:

Mentors were generally positive in their assessment of the benefits of participation in SCTE programs, although not quite as overwhelmingly positive as Principals. For the reasons noted earlier, this is not a surprising result.

A clear majority of mentors rated their SCTE programs as more effective in general, and, in particular, more effective
• in providing opportunities for preservice teachers in SCTE to practise their skills;
• in enabling them to experience the daily life of a teacher;
• in providing them with the knowledge and skills required to face their responsibilities as teachers; and
• in achieving a spirit of cooperation and common purpose among school and university staff.

6.2.3 Findings from the follow-up survey of graduates

The evidence provided by the survey of graduates is the most compelling, for three reasons:

• The respondents have strong credibility as persons able to make informed judgments about their preparation for teaching. Graduates reported to us at a time when they had gained at least half a year of teaching experience (one and a half years, in the case of 2011 graduates). They had time to escape the emotional response (whether positive or negative) to their university life, to reflect dispassionately on their preparation, and to test what they had learned against the realities of school life. Their judgments about the effectiveness of their preparation for teaching were informed judgments.

• The survey design is very strong, allowing us to make comparisons between SCTE graduates and graduates from other programs with great confidence. The SCTE graduates attended the same universities, graduated at the same time, and had similar length of teaching experience, as the non-SCTE graduates. The two groups of graduates were as similar as could possibly be obtained, except for fact that one group had completed an SCTE program and the other group had completed a non-SCTE program. And the survey was not identified as being about SCTE; every effort was made to present it simply as a survey designed to enable them to make judgments about their preparation for teaching, whatever program they had undertaken. At the time when they completed, they would have been among fellow teachers from a variety of backgrounds, not among their fellow students.

• There was a remarkable strength and consistency in the comparisons yielded by their responses. On almost all measures, the pattern of response was clear: graduates of SCTE
programs rated their preparation as more effective than did graduates of non-SCTE programs

On responses to individual survey items

The items were organised into groups, covering:

- the necessary knowledge and understanding required of teachers
- the opportunity to practise classroom skills
- the opportunity to practise skills beyond the classroom
- the knowledge and skills necessary to face the professional responsibilities of a teacher
- feeling part of a well-supported school community.

In each of these areas, almost every item displayed a common pattern: SCTE participants gave a greater proportion of positive assessments than non-SCTE participants. And, generally, 2012 SCTE graduates gave a greater proportion of positive assessments than 2011 SCTE participants.

The consistency of this pattern across items is quite remarkable, and leaves no room for doubt that graduates of SCTE programs were, with the wisdom of hindsight, more satisfied with their preparation for teaching than non-SCTE graduates.

On graduates' preparation to meet AITSL Standards

The survey items were designed to be combined into scales that matched in content the seven Standards of the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL, 2011):

**Professional Knowledge**
1. Know students and how they learn
2. Know the content and how to teach it

**Professional Practice**
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning

**Professional Engagement**
6. Engage in professional learning
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community.

Using these scales it was possible to demonstrate clearly that, in relation to the AITSL Standards, graduates of SCTE programs saw themselves as better prepared than graduates of non-SCTE programs. When 2011 and 2012 graduates of SCTE programs were portrayed and compared to graduates of non-SCTE programs, a consistent pattern was observed:

- Graduates of 2012 SCTE programs rated their programs as more effective in preparing them to meet the Standards than did graduates of 2011 SCTE programs.
- Graduates of both SCTE programs rated their programs as more effective in preparing them to meet the Standards than did graduates of other programs in the same universities programs.

Given these results, it is undeniable that there were clear benefits to graduates from their participation in the SCTE programs. These benefits are seen most clearly in relation to the extent to which, with the benefit of experience, they believe their programs provided them
with the knowledge, understanding and experiences that they needed in order to attain the relevant AITSL Standards. They appear to have become greater for those graduates who had two years’ experience with an SCTE program than for those who had just one.

**On academic rigour and workload**

There were no observable differences between SCTE and non-SCTE programs in the academic rigour that graduates perceived to have been demanded of them.

Very few graduates saw the workload demanded of them as too high, and only a small minority thought it was too low. Slightly fewer SCTE graduates than non-SCTE graduates saw the workload in their teaching studies as too high. This was a surprising result, since all of our observations indicated that students in SCTE programs had significantly greater time commitments because of the extended time spent in schools. Perhaps they judged that the time was well-spent, and therefore did not judge it to be excessive.

Regardless, it is apparent that graduates did not see the better outcomes achieved in SCTE programs as resulting from greater workload demands, or from their undertaking more intellectually demanding work. The better outcomes appear to result, not from more work, not from more difficult work; but from more relevant work.
7 Conclusions

7.1 Effectiveness of SCTE

There is no single SCTE model, although the programs introduced on all the SCTE sites had much in common. Typically, this involved a partnership between one university and a number of schools, and an arrangement that allowed PSTs to spend extended time in school. In some cases, the university classes were brought to them (run in the school, sometimes by a team of university staff and school staff). In some cases, the university subjects taught remained much the same; in one case (the Monash Gippsland site), curriculum change was the driver that led the reform.

In spite of these differences among programs, there is abundant evidence that, across the board, the SCTE programs that were implemented in this project had positive effects. Data gathered through site visits, observations and interviews led to predominantly positive appraisals, as outlined in Chapter 6. The surveys of mentors and school principals conducted in late 2012 confirmed what we had learned through interviews and observations. And finally, the Graduate survey, conducted in June-July, 2013, presents undeniable evidence that the SCTE programs introduced in 2011-2012 led to greater success in achieving a substantial range of outcomes.

While different programs were generated on different sites, there was clear evidence of successful outcomes across the range of programs.

7.2 What is needed for successful reform?

Successful reform of teacher education is possible, but the evidence from the SCTE initiatives has shown that it makes demands on all participants - PSTs, school staff and university staff. We do not claim to have all the answers, but the list below outlines what we have seen to be key factors in success.

7.2.1 Genuine commitment and 'buy in'

There needs to be a core of staff in both university and schools who are committed to the principles and ideas involved in the SCTE model of educating PSTs and the belief that schools have an important role to play. This commitment should extend to teaching staff in schools and universities.

7.2.2 A shared vision between stakeholders, especially the school and the university

There must be common understandings about what is to be achieved and the best ways to achieve it. In the most successful examples this was done through a structure – e.g. management committee with high level representation from principals and senior university staff and others with the power to make things happen. This committee needs to meet regularly and follow accepted meeting procedures – agenda, minutes etc. There need to be clear goals and milestones for what is to be achieved.

For example in Northern Bay, PSTs were made aware of the areas in which the college was looking to improve and given the opportunity to develop programs as part of their practical experience. Some of the programs developed by PSTs are being continued and are now a regular part of curricular and extra-curricular activities.
However, success ultimately depends not only on sound management and administration but on the commitment and knowledge of the mentors and university staff who are working together with the PSTs.

7.2.3 Leadership

Strong school principals who were committed to the SCTE principles and were able to find effective ways of implementing them played an important role in successful examples. Engagement by university staff was also an important aspect of leadership and for the buy-in of school staff, such as demonstrating a specific interest in the school context and a willingness to hear feedback and be open to change within the university program. The leadership of the SCTE coordinator was also an important – in some cases pivotal – role (see below).

7.2.4 Enabling contexts

SCTE seemed to work best at sites where good relationships already existed between stakeholders. The SCTE funding and ideas for action helped those relationships to become stronger by providing opportunities and resources for joint planning and monitoring. SCTE seemed to be particularly successful in new school groupings like Northern Bay and Point Cook.

7.2.5 Climate of inquiry and adventure

Success occurs when everyone is keen to try new things to develop a great model of teacher education. This entails strong and visionary leadership from university staff, school principals and the SCTE coordinator all working together to achieve agreed goals – although the mode of working together was often quite different.

7.2.6 Senior position of SCTE coordinator needs to be established and supported.

This person provides the essential link between the school and university. He or she has responsibility for the overall management of the project and for liaison between all participants, including PSTs. He/she provides regular reports to the management committee.

If schools are to accept more responsibility for educating PSTs as a ‘joint venture’ with universities, the position of coordinator could open up career prospects for interested teachers. This could include mentors who specialise in becoming teacher educators.

7.2.7 Mentor training

Training for mentors (e.g. MGSE program which was funded by SCTE) was seen to have very positive results not just for the PSTs but also for other school staff who benefited from the knowledge of colleagues who had been trained.

7.2.8 Mentoring

There was no one way of considering the supervisor/mentor role. Successful changes included teachers seeing PSTs as resources and colleagues rather than a pre-teacher with a knowledge deficit. This encouraged greater collegiality and collaboration – a more two-way relationship. In schools where teachers worked in teams, mentoring PSTs was viewed as an extension of the collaboration between colleagues and an ongoing (therefore sustainable) part of the teacher role, rather than the occasional ‘burden’ on an individual teacher of additional supervision.
7.2.9 **Role clarity and sound relationships**

All participants (e.g. school mentors, university lecturers) need to be clear about their roles and the relationships between them and others – looking at the comments, it seems that in many cases stronger relationships needed to exist between mentors and university staff, with more opportunities to discuss the progress of the PSTs. The old one to one model with occasional visits from university staff seemed to be prevailing at some sites. This differed by model, however – some sites concentrated more as a partnership on the experience and involvement of the PSTs in the school setting and its relation to university and theory than on building closer relationships directly between lecturers and teachers – and long term, if SCTE projects are to expand, this may be a more successful model. In these cases, the role of the coordinator, spanning the school and university settings, was particularly important in maintaining the relationship ‘on the ground’.

7.2.10 **Clear expectations**

Comments suggest that mentors did not have clear expectations of university staff, how often they would see mentors and PSTs and what would happen when they did. They need to understand that they are working as a team to educate each PST.

7.2.11 **University staff on site**

There are clear advantages in this, as at Hume Central, and at Point Cook, with a dedicated SCTE room. In theory this should allow more mentor-university staff liaison and also courses delivered on site where possible. But communication needs to be such that mentors and other teachers at the school have regular contact with university staff. This can be achieved through team work and shared projects where PSTs and their mentors become members of a teaching team, as e.g. in a comment from Hume: ‘Having a team of mentors has essentially enabled the PSTs to develop their own capacity as educators, learning from us all and ultimately developing and moulding their own teaching style.

7.2.12 **Opportunity for PSTs to become involved in a range of activities beyond the usual school lessons**

PSTs were in some cases given maximum opportunity to be involved in all school activities – staff meetings, sport etc. and form relationships with other staff and students (become role models for students, especially in disadvantaged areas).

Activities and assessments where PSTs can work with mentors, school teaching staff and university staff in teams on team projects like the Victoria University’s Applied Curriculum Project.

The view that PSTs were additional resources and colleagues, and part of a team, enabled teachers to take greater interest in their university requirements. Teachers also, through either relationship with lecturers or with the coordinator, were able to provide feedback in areas such as the validity of forms used for their assessment of PSTs, and to have the university consider the feedback.

7.2.13 **Developing new materials**

Northern Bay teachers and Deakin lecturers and media have also run ‘Masterclasses’ on areas such as literacy. The Masterclasses have an audience of PSTs and take place within the school – and these are then recorded by the University for Use as course material. This involves the teachers in the development of university material and is another means of linking theory-practice.
7.2.14 Information dissemination and celebration of achievements

Many examples could be cited, including the state-wide seminars organised by Deakin and Monash Universities and a National Forum in May, 2012. On a smaller scale, many examples could be cited, e.g. at Point Cook the PSTs made presentations about their Applied Curriculum Projects to school and university staff and students.

Notably, Monash courses developed as part of the SCTE project were recognised as outstanding and received the highest possible commendation from their university.

7.3 What of the future?

The SCTE funding allowed people to exercise their talents in innovative and creative ways to implement programs that supported the SCTE ideas and principles. There are three issues that need to be addressed on all sites:

- Can the programs initiated under the SCTE banner be maintained within recurrent funds?
- Can these programs be expanded within the sites currently involved?
- What will it take to expand such programs to other sites not currently involved?
- What changes, if any will need to be made to the programs if they are to be made available on a wider scale?

Each of these issues will be addressed in turn.

7.3.1 Maintenance of the programs established through SCTE

Each of the current programs have had the benefit of an initial grant which has been used largely, but not exclusively, on costs associated with setting up. Typically, the biggest item was a salary for a coordinator, which, we were repeatedly assured, is absolutely vital for the success of the program. Observations made on site visits and information sought through interviews confirmed this. We saw some outstanding coordinators, and were left in no doubt as to the importance of the work that they did.

Coordinators with an attachment to both school and university appear to have found acceptance easier to gain, and this has no doubt helped them to be more effective. This suggests that there is merit in having coordinators with a joint appointment to a school and to the university. If this is to happen, there is a case to me made for the school and the university both contributing to the funding.

We understand how little extra staffing funds are available to schools. Without the funding provided to establish these programs, their continuation (which is seen by all as highly desirable) will require some (possibly creative) rearrangement of priorities within current funding levels.

A university, for example, which has become accustomed to having PSTs acquiring their practicum experience in very small groups (sometimes even one or two) over a very large number of schools, requires significant administrative support just to liaise with schools and to find places for all its PSTs (sometimes this can require one or more full-time appointments). Once the PSTs are placed in those schools, university staff spend substantial time and incur substantial travel expense travelling from school to school providing support to and assessing the PSTs. Their time is not used very efficiently - where the PSTs are widely dispersed, it can be difficult to visit more than two PSTs in a day, and impossible to visit more than three. Visits are often hurried, and significant amounts of salary are paid to people as they sit in cars travelling from one school to another.
Programs organised along the lines that we have seen in the SCTE usually have larger groups of PSTs in a smaller number of schools. Typically a team of mentors is associated with a team of PSTs, and the mentors are able to spend a greater amount of time attending to the needs of their PSTs without the added burden of travel from school to school. Put bluntly, these programs make more efficient use of mentors' time.

If the continuation of the Coordinator position requires a rearrangement of priorities, we think these factors provide some scope to do it. If the Coordinator program cannot be maintained, we think the continued success of the program could be put at risk.

### 7.3.2 Expanding the programs within the current sites

In many cases, the SCTE programs, as implemented, were available only to a minority of PSTs within any given university, although this did change from 2011 to 2012, during which the per cent of PSTs to whom the SCTE programs were available increased from 45 per cent to 75 per cent. The ease with which access to programs like these can be increased depends on the nature of the program.

At University of Melbourne, the M Teach program has already adopted many of the principles that underlie the SCTE project, and it may well be possible to develop other sites in the same way that Koonung has been developed, within the existing structure. The same may also be the case with the two Victoria University sites. In both cases, however, the SCTE programs have been quite labour-intensive, and the demands that the programs make on staff time present the greatest challenge.

The Monash program is structurally different to all of the others, and has already become universally available. Essentially, subjects currently available have been redeveloped, and new subjects developed, to be taught in local schools and to involve significant amounts of time working with children in those local schools. Monash have been very clever in designing these subjects in ways that make them attractive to schools (e.g. because they provide a level of one-to-one teaching that the schools would like to provide, but cannot). After two years, it would be impossible to complete a teaching degree at Monash Gippsland without experiencing what we now know as SCTE, but will, presumably lose that title and become simply the standard program.

During this evaluation, Monash Gippsland was only a small part of Monash University and the expansion of SCTE-type programs to other campuses was by no means assured. The merger of Monash Gippsland and the University of Ballarat to become Federation University Australia in 2014 creates some uncertainty about the future of SCTE at both Monash and Federation Universities. The subjects developed remain “on the books” at Monash University, and the opportunity exists to offer them (modified as necessary for the different context) across the wider Monash program. Federation University Australia will have staff at each of its two campuses who have experience in offering two quite different SCTE programs, and important decisions will need to be made for 2014. At the time of writing, the outcome is not clear.

At other sites (e.g., Northern Bay and Deakin) SCTE programs have been available only to a minority of students in teaching programs, and it will be no small challenge to make them more widely available.

In general, our observation is that the university and school staff involved with SCTE programs over 2011-2012 have been thoroughly convinced that they are offering more effective teacher preparation than ever before. The will to make these types of programs more
widely available is certainly there - the question is whether the time, staffing and physical resources necessary can be made available.

7.3.3 Expanding these types of programs to other sites

At this stage, it is not clear that the current initiatives would have been possible without the additional funding made available through the SCTE program. Large proportions of the funds received were dedicated to setting-up costs. To form similar partnerships between universities and schools at other sites would certainly involve initial costs that may well be beyond the capacity of universities and schools to meet. If further funding should be available, it may be strategic for priority to be given to new sites, and particularly those that are willing to work in partnership with, or simply join up with, current SCTE sites.

7.4 The process of change

In the long run, it may not be more expensive to run teacher education programs of this type across Victoria than to run them as they have been in the past. We have been accustomed to having PSTs widely dispersed for their school experience - "thinly spread" over large numbers of schools. The programs introduced under the SCTE banner have PSTs concentrated in a smaller number of schools for longer periods of time. This enables some economies of scale.

Programs of this type require that schools have more physical resources to accommodate the large numbers of PSTs that they will house for longer periods of time than is presently the case. They also make extra demands on their staff (particularly, but not exclusively) mentor staff. But they involve fewer schools.

We note that Victoria University, at its Hume Central site, has signed Memoranda of Understanding with six schools to participate in their program until 2015. Once schools have agreed to be "locked in" to a program in this way, it would seem reasonable that some support will be needed. Is it possible, then, to divert resources (including money, staff and/or building space) to schools entering into such partnerships with providers of teacher education?

If resources can be diverted in this way, it may be possible to run better programs, involving larger numbers of PSTs in smaller numbers of schools, at no (or very little) extra cost. This would require high-level planning and some tough decisions, but we think it warrants consideration.

7.5 A footnote

As this evaluation draws to a close, the University of Ballarat and the Gippsland Campus of Monash University have combined to be known as Federation University Australia, effective on January 1, 2014.

Both universities have been involved in SCTE programs over 2011-2013, operating under quite different models, as outlined in Chapter 4.

How the new Federation University Australia, combined university's programs will be structured in 2014 is not yet clear, but no doubt the experiences gained in 2011-2013 will be invaluable for building and extending on the school-university partnerships formed across the two locations. Monash University will continue to focus its teacher education curriculum structure on SCTE principles, and is well positioned to continue to build new school-university partnerships across the three Monash based campuses.
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## Appendix 1 Interview Schedules and Survey Questions

### Interview Schedule: School Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> What impact has your school’s participation in the SCTE program had on you? your staff? your students? the PSTs coming to your school?</td>
<td>What demands does the partnership make on you and your time? Is this sustainable? Can you draw on SCTE funds to cover the use of your time? Is any one person or partner driving the partnership? Could the partnership be made to work better and if so, how? What (costs/benefits) can you see for teachers who participate in the SCTE? What (costs/benefits) can you see for PSTs who participate in the SCTE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> What kind of relationship do you have with [name] university?</td>
<td>To what extent is the university involved in school practice? To what extent are your staff involved in university teaching? Do your staff have any influence on university curriculum? Have the university staff had any impact on the teaching in your school? What does the university provide to the school? What does the school provide to the university? Are both partners happy with the relationship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> How has the role of Mentor teacher been designed in the SCTE?</td>
<td>How are teachers and PSTs grouped? Do Mentors get any time-release? (Is so, is this funded through SCTE?) How are Mentors chosen? Are there any concerns amongst teachers (e.g. about workload?) How are PSTs assessed (by whom, using what methods?) and given feedback? How have teachers been supported in developing/improving their skills as mentors? (as assessors?) Has this support been effective? Do you take PSTs from other universities? How does this affect the program you offer as part of the SCTE? Does this model provide increased immersion (compared to previous/current models) in professional practice for participating PSTs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> In what way is ICT being used within the SCTE model?</td>
<td>What is being used and how is it being used? Is ICT used for:  - communication with PSTs? - assessment of PSTs? Are PSTs using ICT on practicum? Is there a focus on ICT use in the classroom Have PSTs had access to the Ultranet? How has this been achieved? Were there barriers and have these been overcome?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: What do you see to be the major costs and benefits of the SCTE partnership?
Prompts: What does the school get out of this? At what cost? What do the PSTs get out of it? At what cost? Do you think the SCTE model has had a positive or a negative impact on PST education? In what ways? How sustainable do you think the SCTE model is? Are there any financial requirements for sustainability? What issues may arise in the future?

Question: Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experience to date?
# Interview Schedule: School Mentors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong> What is your role in the school? (e.g. classroom teacher, expert teacher, leading teacher?) How long have you been teaching? Have you supervised a pre-service teacher before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> How does your school view pre-service teachers? What experience do PSTs get in the school and how has this changed from previously? How has your role changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompts:</strong> In what ways has your school’s practice changed in regard to PSTs? How are teachers and PSTs grouped? Do Mentors get any time-release? (Is so, is this funded through SCTE?) How are Mentors chosen? Are there any concerns amongst teachers (e.g. about workload?) How are PSTs assessed (by whom, using what methods?) and given feedback? How have teachers been supported in developing/improving their skills as mentors? (as assessors?) Has this support been effective? Do you take PSTs from other universities? How does this affect the program you offer as part of the SCTE? Does this model provide increased immersion (compared to previous/current models) in professional practice for participating PSTs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> What kind of relationship do you and other teachers have with the university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompts:</strong> To what extent is the university involved in school practice? To what extent are you involved in university activities? Do you have any influence on university activities and curriculum? Have the university staff had any impact on your teaching/the teaching in your school? What in your view does the university provide to the school? What does the school provide to the university? Are both partners happy with the relationship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> In what way is ICT being used within the SCTE model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prompts:</strong> What is being used and how is it being used? Is ICT used for: communication with PSTs? assessment of PSTs? Are PSTs using ICT on practicum? Is there a focus on ICT use in the classroom Have PSTs had access to the Ultranet? How has this been achieved? Were there barriers and have these been overcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experience to date?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicum Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership &amp; collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interview Schedule: University Staff**

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed about your experience so far of the School Centres for Teaching Excellence project. This interview is subject to ACER/DEECD ethics guidelines – the information that you provide will be kept confidential, and all reporting will be anonymous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> What impact has your school’s participation in the SCTE program had on you? On other university staff? On PSTs? <strong>Prompts:</strong> What demands does the partnership make on you and your time? Is this sustainable? Can you draw on SCTE funds to cover the use of your time? Is any one person or partner driving the partnership? Could the partnership be made to work better and if so, how? What (costs/benefits) can you see for the university to participate in the SCTE? What (costs/benefits) can you see for teachers who participate in the SCTE? What (costs/benefits) can you see for PSTs who participate in the SCTE?</td>
<td>Partnership &amp; collaboration Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> What impact has your school’s participation in the SCTE program had on the design and delivery of your course/s? <strong>Prompts:</strong> Have you delivered the same courses but rescheduled them to fit the different timetables needed for participation in SCTE? Have you rewritten existing courses for the SCTE program? Have you delivered existing courses in a different way, e.g. at school? Have you developed new courses for SCTE? Do you think your courses are taught more effectively under SCTE?</td>
<td>Course Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> What kind of relationship do you have with the schools? <strong>Prompts:</strong> To what extent is the university involved in school practice? How much time do you spend in the schools where PSTs are placed? To what extent are elements of your course based in the school setting? Have university staff had any impact on teaching in the SCTE schools? What does the university provide to the school? What does the school provide to the university? Are both partners happy with the relationship?</td>
<td>Partnership &amp; collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> How has the role of Mentor teacher been designed in the SCTE? <strong>Prompts:</strong> How are teachers and PSTs grouped? Do Mentors get any time-release? (Is so, is this funded through SCTE?) How are Mentors chosen? Are you aware of any concerns amongst teachers (e.g. about workload?) How are PSTs assessed (by whom, using what methods?) and given feedback? How are teachers being supported in developing/improving their skills as mentors? (as assessors?) Have you any evidence of the effectiveness of this support? Does this model provide increased immersion (compared to previous/current models) in professional practice for participating PSTs?</td>
<td>Practicum Models Mentoring Assessment quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Question: In what way is ICT being used within the SCTE model? | Prompts: What is being used and how is it being used? Is ICT used for:  
• communication with PSTs?  
• assessment of PSTs?  
Are PSTs using ICT on practicum?  
Is there a focus on ICT use in the classroom?  
Have PSTs had access to the Ultranet? How has this been achieved?  
Were there barriers and have these been overcome? | Use of ICT |
|---|---|---|
| Question: What do you see to be the major costs and benefits of the SCTE partnership? | Prompts: What does the university get out of this? At what cost?  
What do the PSTs get out of it? At what cost?  
What do the schools get out of it? At what cost?  
Do you think the SCTE model has had a positive or a negative impact on PST education? In what ways?  
How sustainable do you think the SCTE model is? Are there any financial requirements for sustainability?  
What issues may arise in the future? | Infrastructure  
Sustainability & costs |
| Question: Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experience to date? | | All |
### Interview Schedule: Coordinators

#### Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **What is your role as viewed by the PSTs, the mentors, the wider school, the university?** | **How have you and your role developed since you started?**  
What demands does the partnership make on you and your time? Is this sustainable?  
Are you drawing on SCTE funds to cover the use of your time?  
Is any one person or partner driving the partnership?  
Could the partnership be made to work better and if so, how?  
What (costs/benefits) can you see for teachers who participate in the SCTE?  
What (costs/benefits) can you see for PSTs who participate in the SCTE? |
| **What kind of relationship do the schools have with the university?**   | **To what extent is the university involved in school practice?**  
To what extent are school staff involved in university teaching?  
Do school staff have any influence on university curriculum?  
Have the university staff had any impact on the teaching in the schools?  
What does the university provide to the schools?  
What do the schools provide to the university?  
Are both partners happy with the relationship? |
| **How does the role of Mentor teacher work in the SCTE?**               | **How are teachers and PSTs grouped?**  
Do Mentors get any time-release? (Is so, is this funded through SCTE?)  
How are Mentors chosen? Are there any concerns amongst teachers (e.g. about workload?)  
How have teachers been supported in developing/improving their skills as mentors? (as assessors?) Has this support been effective?  
Do your schools take PSTs from other universities? How does this affect your SCTE program?  
Does this model provide increased immersion (compared to previous/current models) in professional practice for participating PSTs? |
| **In what way is ICT being used within the SCTE model?**                | **What is being used and how is it being used? Is ICT used for:**  
  - communication with PSTs?  
  - assessment of PSTs?  
Are PSTs using ICT on practicum?  
Is there a focus on ICT use in the classroom  
Have PSTs had access to the Ultranet? How has this been achieved? Were there barriers and have these been overcome? |
Question: What do you see to be the major costs and benefits of the SCTE partnership?
Prompts: What do the schools get out of this? At what cost?
What do the PSTs get out of it? At what cost?
What does the university get out of it? At what cost?
Do you think the SCTE model has had a positive or a negative impact on PST preparation? In what ways?
How sustainable do you think the SCTE model is? Are there any financial requirements for sustainability?
What issues may arise in the future?

Question: Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experience to date?
Survey Questions: School Principals

Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the preservice teachers in your school this year have...

1. felt that they had become part of a school community?  
2. enjoyed collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers?  
3. enjoyed collegial support from their mentors?  
4. enjoyed collegial support from teaching staff other than their mentors?  
5. experienced the daily life of a teacher?

Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the following statements to be true of the school experience that you have been able to provide to this year’s SCTE preservice teachers?

6. The school staff and the university staff worked closely together for a common purpose.  
7. The preservice teachers gained experience in a variety of ways of using Information /Communication Technology (ICT).  
8. The preservice teachers were actively involved in research related to the school and/or their teaching.  
9. Over their time in the school, preservice teachers came to relate to my staff as colleagues, rather than as visitors to the school.  
10. Over their time in the school, students came to relate to these preservice teachers in much the same way as they relate to their regular teachers...

Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the following statements to be true of your school’s experience of the SCTE pathway?

11. The university has been able to influence our school teaching practice.  
12. The school has been able to influence the university teacher education program.  
13. The university is seen to have a presence on this school campus

The next set of questions seek your opinions about the future of the SCTE model of teacher preparation that your school has been contributing to. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to the following statements:

14. My school has benefited from the presence of preservice teachers who were more involved in the life of the school.  
15. My school has benefited from having a closer relationship with the university teacher education staff.  
16. The SCTE has proved useful in recruiting teaching staff for my school
17. The demands that participation in SCTE makes on my staff are manageable.

18. My school has the physical resources that it needs to support its continued participation in SCTE programs.

19. My school can continue its participation in SCTE without additional funding.

20. I would like my school’s participation in the SCTE program to continue.

Finally, we would appreciate your views about some aspects of your experience with the SCTE this year.

21. Were you happy that your school was sufficiently consulted by the university about its participation in the SCTE program this year? Please Comment:

22. Were you happy that your school was kept informed by the university about its participation in the SCTE program this year? Please Comment:

23. How difficult was it to identify suitable, willing teachers, to act as mentors for preservice teachers this year? Has it become easier, or more difficult, with the introduction of the SCTE?

24. Has the introduction of the SCTE led to an increase in the cost of running your school this year? If so, is the increase sustainable?

25. Has the introduction of the SCTE led to increases in your workload, as Principal? If so, is the increase sustainable?

26. Has the introduction of the SCTE led to increases in the workload of your teaching staff? If so, is the increase sustainable?

27. Have you encouraged any of the preservice teachers in your school this year to apply for continuing employment in your school? If so, with what degree of success? Comment:
### Survey Questions: School Mentors

**Compared with the past few years, how do you rate the knowledge possessed by the preservice teachers in the School Centres for Teaching Excellence program this year about each of the following?**

1. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach
2. The importance of building on students’ existing knowledge and experience
3. Teaching strategies that cater for the needs of students across the full range of abilities
4. Broad, university-level content in the subjects they teach
5. Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that they teach
6. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively
7. Strategies that they can use for teaching literacy
8. Strategies that they can use for teaching numeracy
9. Using assessment data to give appropriate feedback to students

**Compared to previous years, how well do you believe you have been able to provide this year’s SCTE preservice teachers with the opportunity to practise the following skills?**

10. Planning and delivering a sequence of lessons and classroom activities.
11. Developing a repertoire of effective teaching strategies that they can call upon as needed
12. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning
13. Organising classroom activities, providing students with clear directions
14. Understanding and managing challenging student behaviour

**Compared to previous years, how well do you believe you have been able to provide this year’s SCTE preservice teachers with the necessary knowledge and skills that they will need to face each of the following responsibilities as teachers?**

15. Working collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and using their constructive feedback to improve your teaching
16. Behaving ethically and responsibly as a teacher.
Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the preservice teachers in your school this year have

17. felt that they had become part of a school community?
18. developed ongoing relationships with their mentor teachers?
19. enjoyed collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers?
20. experienced the daily life of a teacher?
21. had an impact on students’ learning?
22. known and understood their students?
23. learned to engage with students and manage behaviour in real situations?

Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the following statements to be true of the school experience that you have been able to provide to this year’s SCTE preservice teachers?

24. The school staff and the university staff worked closely together for a common purpose.
25. The coursework was closely related to the practical experience we provided during the course.
26. During their practical experience, they had valuable support from their supervising teachers, or mentors.
27. During their practical experience, they had valuable support from university staff.
28. They gained experience in a variety of ways of using Information /Communication Technology (ICT) in their teaching.
29. They were actively involved in research related to the school and/or their teaching.

Compared to previous years, how effective do you believe the SCTE program has been this year in preparing its participants to become successful teachers?

30. Compared to previous years, how effective do you believe the SCTE program has been this year in preparing its participants to become successful teachers?

31. Were you provided with specific training to meet the expectations of you as a mentor in the SCTE program?
31A [if yes ] How was the training provided?
31B [if yes] How effective was it?

32. How were you and other mentors chosen in your school?
33. How is mentoring organised in your school? (e.g. one-to-one, teams of 3 mentors with 3 preservice teachers, etc.)?

34. How is the assessment of preservice teachers handled in your school?
   - Is it done individually by mentors, or by teams of mentors arriving at a consensus?
   - Is it carried out in consultation with university staff, or handled within the school and then reported to the university staff?

35. During the time that preservice teachers are in your school as part of the SCTE program, how closely do you work with university staff?

36. How frequently do university staff visit your school?

37. Did you form closer personal/professional relationships with the preservice teachers that you mentored than in previous years?

38. Have you encouraged any of the preservice teachers that you mentored to apply for continuing employment in your school?

38A [if yes] With what degree of success have you encouraged preservice teachers to apply for employment in your school?

39. As part of your preservice training program, have you developed continuing partnerships
   - with primary teachers in another school?
   - with secondary teachers in another school?
   If “Yes,” how do they work?

40. How have you found the demands on mentors in the SCTE program, compared to your previous experience in supervision?

41. Is the role of mentor as you have experienced it this year sustainable?

42. How keen are you to continue in this role in 2013?
Survey Questions: Graduates

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding about each of the following?

1. How students learn and develop
2. Individual differences among students that can affect their learning
3. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach
4. How to build on students’ existing knowledge and experience
5. How to vary teaching strategies to meet the needs of students from different backgrounds
6. The particular needs of students from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds
7. Teaching strategies that cater for the needs of students across the full range of abilities
8. What schools are legally required to do to support the learning needs of students with disabilities
9. Broad, university-level content in the subjects that you are likely to teach
10. Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that you are likely to teach
11. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively
12. The importance of understanding and respecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories, cultures and languages
13. Strategies that you can use for teaching literacy
14. Strategies that you can use for teaching numeracy
15. How you can further develop your skills in literacy and numeracy?

How well do you believe your teacher preparation has provided you with the opportunity to practise the following skills?

16. Choosing learning goals that provide appropriate levels of challenge for all of your students
17. Planning and delivering a lesson in a subject that you will be expected to teach.
18. Planning and delivering a sequence of lessons and classroom activities that build on students’ prior learning

19. Developing a repertoire of effective teaching strategies that you can call upon as needed

20. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning

21. Encouraging the active involvement of all students in classroom activities

22. Organising classroom activities, providing students with clear directions

23. Understanding and managing challenging student behaviour

How well do you believe your teacher preparation has provided you with the necessary knowledge and skills that you will need for each of the following responsibilities that you will face as a teacher?

24. Working within the school and system requirements that are in place to ensure student safety and well-being

25. Ensuring that student use of ICT is safe, responsible and ethical

26. Making appropriate use of formative, summative and diagnostic assessments

27. Using assessment data to give appropriate feedback to your students

28. Moderating student assessments to support consistent and comparable judgments of student learning

29. Interpreting student assessment data and using it to improve student learning

30. Reporting to students, parents and carers in a variety of ways

31. Keeping reliable records of student achievement

How well do you believe your teacher preparation has provided you with the necessary knowledge and skills that you will need for each of the following responsibilities that you will face as a teacher?

32. Using the national Professional Standards for Teachers

33. Identifying your own professional learning needs

34. Locating relevant and appropriate sources of professional learning

35. Working collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and using their constructive feedback to improve your teaching

36. Behaving ethically and responsibly as a teacher.
37. Understanding the legislative and organisational policies and processes that apply to you as a teacher?

38. Working effectively, sensitively and confidentially with parents and carers

39. Engaging in wider professional networks to support your work as a teacher

40. Working effectively with non-teaching professionals and staff (e.g. Integration aides and speech pathologists)

**During the time you have spent in your preservice program, to what extent do you believe that you have:**

41. felt that you had become part of a school community?

42. been part of a team (with university staff and your supervisors or mentors) working together for a common purpose?

43. developed an ongoing professional relationship with one or more experienced mentor teachers?

44. enjoyed collegial support from your fellow preservice teachers?

45. experienced the daily life of a teacher?

46. had an impact on students’ learning?

47. known and understood your students?

48. learned to engage with students and manage behaviour in real situations?

49. been encouraged to try new approaches to teaching?

50. been doing academic work that developed strong links between theoretical and practical aspects of teaching.
And now, some general observations about your teacher preparation course. To this point of the course, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the teacher education part of your course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from my supervising teachers, or mentors.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. During my practical experience, I had quality feedback from my supervising teachers, or mentors.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from university staff.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. During my practical experience, I had quality feedback from university staff.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from my fellow students.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. I have confidence that the assessment of my practical experience was thorough and fair.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. I have confidence that the assessment of my coursework subjects was thorough and fair.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. I was actively involved in research related to the school and/or my teaching.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. I was provided with ample opportunities to apply what I learned at university in the classroom.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I had frequent opportunities to see teachers modelling good practice.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Over the course of the year, the number of times I would have been visited in school by university staff would have been approximately</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We would appreciate your comments on the quality of the teaching in the two components of your teacher preparation course, which, for convenience we will refer to as:

**Subject Studies:** that part of your program in which you studied subject content (i.e. your undergraduate degree in a postgraduate program, or the academic subjects in a concurrent program), and

**Teaching Studies:** that part of your program in which you studied education and teaching (i.e. the Education degree or diploma in a postgraduate program or the Education subjects in a concurrent program).

62. In my Subject Studies, the teaching has been of high quality.
63. In my Teaching Studies, the teaching has been of high quality.

Finally, we would appreciate your comments on the workload in the two components of your teacher preparation program:

64. In my Subject Studies, the amount of work required of me was:
65. In my Subject Studies, the academic rigour expected of me was:
66. In my Teaching Studies, the amount of work required of me was:
67. In my Teaching Studies, the academic rigour expected of me was:
# Appendix 2 Graduate Survey: Details of responses by item

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding about each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only slightly</th>
<th>Reasonably well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How students learn and develop</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual differences among students that can affect their</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the subjects that you teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How to build on students’ existing knowledge and experience</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How to vary teaching strategies to meet the needs of students</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from different backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The particular needs of students from Aboriginal and Torres</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strait Islander backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teaching strategies that cater for the needs of students across</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the full range of abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What schools are legally required to do to support the learning</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs of students with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Broad, university-level content in the subjects that you are</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that you are</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likely to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The importance of understanding and respecting</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories, cultures and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Strategies that you can use for teaching literacy</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Strategies that you can use for teaching numeracy</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How you can further develop your skills in literacy and</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numeracy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well do you believe your teacher preparation has provided you with the opportunity to practise the following skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only slightly</th>
<th>Reasonably well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Choosing learning goals that provide appropriate levels of</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenge for all of your students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Planning and delivering a lesson in a subject that you will be</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected to teach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Planning and delivering a sequence of lessons and classroom</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities that build on students’ prior learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Developing a repertoire of effective teaching strategies that</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you can call upon as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 21. Encouraging the active involvement of all students in classroom activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only slightly</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably well</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 22. Organising classroom activities, providing students with clear directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only slightly</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably well</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 23. Understanding and managing challenging student behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only slightly</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably well</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How well do you believe your teacher preparation has provided you with the necessary knowledge and skills that you will need for each of the following responsibilities that you will face as a teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only slightly</th>
<th>Reasonably well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working within the school and system requirements that are in place to ensure student safety and well-being</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that student use of ICT is safe, responsible and ethical</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making appropriate use of formative, summative and diagnostic assessments</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using assessment data to give appropriate feedback to your students</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating student assessments to support consistent and comparable judgments of student learning</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting student assessment data and using it to improve student learning</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to students, parents and carers in a variety of ways</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping reliable records of student achievement</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the national Professional Standards for Teachers</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying your own professional learning needs</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating relevant and appropriate sources of professional learning</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and using their constructive feedback to improve your teaching</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaving ethically and responsibly as a teacher.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the legislative and organisational policies and processes that apply to you as a teacher?</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively, sensitively and confidentially with parents and carers</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in wider professional networks to support your work as a teacher</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with non-teaching professionals and staff (e.g. Integration aides and speech pathologists)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### During the time you have spent in your preservice program, to what extent do you believe that you have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Only slightly</th>
<th>Reasonably well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>felt that you had become part of a school community?</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been part of a team (with university staff and your supervisors or mentors) working together for a common purpose?</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And now, some general observations about your teacher preparation course. To this point of the course, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the teacher education part of your course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. The school staff and the university staff worked closely together for a common purpose.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from my supervising teachers, or mentors.</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. During my practical experience, I had quality feedback from my supervising teachers, or mentors.</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from university staff.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. During my practical experience, I had quality feedback from university staff.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from my fellow students.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. I have confidence that the assessment of my practical experience was thorough and fair.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. I have confidence that the assessment of my coursework subjects was thorough and fair.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. I was actively involved in research related to the school and/or my teaching.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I was provided with ample opportunities to apply what I learned at university in the classroom.</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. I had frequent opportunities to see teachers modelling good practice.</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subject Studies:** that part of your program in which you studied subject content (i.e. your undergraduate degree in a postgraduate program, or the academic subjects in a concurrent program), and

**Teaching Studies:** that part of your program in which you studied education and teaching (i.e. the Education degree or diploma in a postgraduate program or the Education subjects in a concurrent program).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Studies, the quality of the teaching was generally:</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62. In my Subject Studies, the quality of the teaching was generally:</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Studies, the quality of the teaching was generally:</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63. In my Teaching Studies, the quality of the teaching was generally:</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**On the workload in the two components of your teacher preparation program:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Studies, the amount of work required of me was:</th>
<th>Much too low</th>
<th>A little too low</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>A little too high</th>
<th>Much too high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64. In my Subject Studies, the amount of work required of me was:</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In my Subject Studies, the academic rigour expected of me was:</strong></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In my Teaching Studies, the amount of work required of me was:</strong></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In my Teaching Studies, the academic rigour expected of me was:</strong></td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How do you rate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>your Teacher Preparation program, overall?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>the practical component of the Teacher Preparation program?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>the university-based component of the Teacher Preparation program?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Details of Scales Constructed from the Mentor and Graduate Surveys

The Mentor Survey

Knowledge of Pedagogy and Subject Content

Compared with the past few years, how do you rate the knowledge possessed by the preservice teachers in the School Centres for Teaching Excellence program this year about each of the following?

1. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach
2. The importance of building on students’ existing knowledge and experience
3. Teaching strategies that cater for the needs of students across the full range of abilities
4. Broad, university-level content in the subjects they teach
5. Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that they teach
6. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively
7. Strategies that they can use for teaching literacy
8. Strategies that they can use for teaching numeracy
9. Using assessment data to give appropriate feedback to students

Opportunity to Practise Teaching Skills

Compared to previous years, how well do you believe you have been able to provide this year’s SCTE preservice teachers with the opportunity to practise the following skills?

1. Planning and delivering a sequence of lessons and classroom activities.
2. Developing a repertoire of effective teaching strategies that they can call upon as needed
3. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning
4. Organising classroom activities, providing students with clear directions
5. Understanding and managing challenging student behaviour

Real-Life Experience in a School

Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the preservice teachers in your school this year have

17. felt that they had become part of a school community?
18. developed ongoing relationships with their mentor teachers?
19. enjoyed collegial support from their fellow preservice teachers?
20. experienced the daily life of a teacher?
21. had an impact on students’ learning?
22. known and understood their students?
23. learned to engage with students and manage behaviour in real situations?
Common Purpose between School and University

Compared to previous years, to what extent do you believe the following statements to be true of the school experience that you have been able to provide to this year’s SCTE preservice teachers?

17. The school staff and the university staff worked closely together for a common purpose.
18. The coursework was closely related to the practical experience we provided during the course.
19. During their practical experience, they had valuable support from their supervising teachers, or mentors.
20. During their practical experience, they had valuable support from university staff.
21. They gained experience in a variety of ways of using Information /Communication Technology (ICT) in their teaching.
22. They were actively involved in research related to the school and/or their teaching.

The Graduate Survey

AITSL Standard 1: Know students and how they learn

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with

- the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding?
- practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?

1. How students learn and develop
2. Individual differences among students that can affect their learning
3. The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach
4. How to build on students’ existing knowledge and experience
5. How to vary teaching strategies to meet the needs of students from different backgrounds
6. The particular needs of students from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds
7. Teaching strategies that cater for the needs of students across the full range of abilities
8. What schools are legally required to do to support the learning needs of students with disabilities

AITSL Standard 2: Know the content and how to teach it

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with

- the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding?
- practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?

9. Broad, university-level content in the subjects that you are likely to teach
10. Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that you are likely to teach
11. How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively
12. The importance of understanding and respecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories, cultures and languages
13. Strategies that you can use for teaching literacy
14. Strategies that you can use for teaching numeracy
15. Planning and delivering a sequence of lessons and classroom activities that build on students’ prior learning
16. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning
AITSL Standard 3: Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with
- the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding?
- practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?

16. Choosing learning goals that provide appropriate levels of challenge for all of your students
17. Planning and delivering a lesson in a subject that you will be expected to teach.
18. Planning and delivering a sequence of lessons and classroom activities that build on students’ prior learning.
19. Developing a repertoire of effective teaching strategies that you can call upon as needed
20. Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning
21. Encouraging the active involvement of all students in classroom activities
22. Making appropriate use of formative, summative and diagnostic assessments

AITSL Standard 4: Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with
- the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding?
- practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?

22. Organising classroom activities, providing students with clear directions
23. Understanding and managing challenging student behaviour
24. Working within the school and system requirements that are in place to ensure student safety and well-being
25. Ensuring that student use of ICT is safe, responsible and ethical

AITSL Standard 5: Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with
- the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding?
- practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?

26. Making appropriate use of formative, summative and diagnostic assessments
27. Using assessment data to give appropriate feedback to your students
28. Moderating student assessments to support consistent and comparable judgments of student learning
29. Interpreting student assessment data and using it to improve student learning
30. Reporting to students, parents and carers in a variety of ways
31. Keeping reliable records of student achievement

AITSL Standard 6: Engage in professional learning

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with
- the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding?
- practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?

33. Identifying your own professional learning needs
34. Locating relevant and appropriate sources of professional learning
35. Working collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and using their constructive feedback to improve your teaching

AITSL Standard 7: Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community

How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with
• the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding?
• practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?

36. Behaving ethically and responsibly as a teacher.
37. Understanding the legislative and organisational policies and processes that apply to you as a teacher?
38. Working effectively, sensitively and confidentially with parents and carers
39. Engaging in wider professional networks to support your work as a teacher
40. Working effectively with non-teaching professionals and staff (e.g. Integration aides and speech pathologists)

Fit with SCTE Model

During the time you have spent in your preservice program, to what extent do you believe that you:
41. felt that you had become part of a school community?
42. have been part of a team (with university staff and your supervisors or mentors) working together for a common purpose?
43. developed an ongoing professional relationship with one or more experienced mentor teachers?
44. enjoyed collegial support from your fellow preservice teachers?
45. experienced the daily life of a teacher?
46. had an impact on students’ learning?
47. knew and understood my students?
48. learned to engage with students and manage behaviour in real situations?
49. have been encouraged to try new approaches to teaching?
50. have been doing academic work that developed strong links between theoretical and practical aspects of teaching.
51. were actively involved in research related to the school and/or my teaching.
52. were provided with ample opportunities to apply what I learned at university in the classroom.
53. had frequent opportunities to see teachers modelling good practice.

Support and Feedback

To this point of the course, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about the teacher education part of your course.
51. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from my supervising teachers, or mentors.
52. During my practical experience, I had quality feedback from my supervising teachers, or mentors.
53. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from university staff.
54. During my practical experience, I had quality feedback from university staff.
55. During my practical experience, I had valuable support from my fellow students.
## Appendix 4 Links between Survey Items and AITSL Standards

Items 1 to 40 on the Graduate Survey were specifically written to assess the extent to which graduates rated themselves as having met the AITSL Standards (Graduate Level), as shown in the scheme outlined below.

### 1. Know students and how they learn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AITSL Standard</th>
<th>Expectations (Graduate level)</th>
<th>How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Physical, social and intellectual development and characteristics of students</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of physical, social and intellectual development and characteristics of students and how these may affect learning.</td>
<td>Individual differences among students that can affect their learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Understand how students learn</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of research into how students learn and the implications for teaching.</td>
<td>How students learn and develop The typical difficulties students have in understanding content in the subjects that you teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3: Students with diverse linguistic, cultural, religious and socioeconomic backgrounds</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of teaching strategies that are responsive to the learning strengths and needs of students from diverse linguistic, cultural, religious and socioeconomic backgrounds.</td>
<td>How to build on students’ existing knowledge and experience How to vary teaching strategies to meet the needs of students from different backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4: Strategies for teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students</td>
<td>Demonstrate broad knowledge and understanding of the impact of culture, cultural identity and linguistic background on the education of students from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds.</td>
<td>The particular needs of students from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5: Differentiate teaching to meet the specific learning needs of students across the full range of abilities</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of strategies for differentiating teaching to meet the specific learning needs of students across the full range of abilities.</td>
<td>Teaching strategies that cater for the needs of students across the full range of abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6: Strategies to support full participation of students with disability</td>
<td>Demonstrate broad knowledge and understanding of legislative requirements and teaching strategies that support participation and learning of students with disability.</td>
<td>What schools are legally required to do to support the learning needs of students with disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Know the content and how to teach it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AITSL Standard</th>
<th>Expectations (Graduate level)</th>
<th>How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1: Content and teaching strategies of the teaching area</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the concepts, substance and structure of the content and teaching strategies of the teaching area.</td>
<td>Broad, university-level content in the subjects that you are likely to teach Details of the school curriculum in the subjects that you are likely to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2: Content selection and organisation</td>
<td>Organise content into an effective learning and teaching sequence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3: Curriculum, assessment and reporting</td>
<td>Use curriculum, assessment and reporting knowledge to design learning sequences and lesson plans.</td>
<td>How to use curriculum guidelines and documents effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4:</td>
<td>Understand and respect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to promote reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5:</td>
<td>Literacy and numeracy strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6:</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology (ICT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Demonstrate broad knowledge of, understanding of and respect for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories, cultures and languages. |
| | The importance of understanding and respecting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories, cultures and languages |
| | Know and understand literacy and numeracy teaching strategies and their application in teaching areas. |
| | Strategies that you can use for teaching literacy |
| | Strategies that you can use for teaching numeracy |
| | Implement teaching strategies for using ICT to expand curriculum learning opportunities for students. |
### 3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AITSL Standard</th>
<th>Expectations (Graduate level)</th>
<th>How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1:</strong> Establish challenging learning goals</td>
<td>Set learning goals that provide achievable challenges for students of varying abilities and characteristics.</td>
<td>Choosing learning goals that provide appropriate levels of challenge for all of your students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2:</strong> Plan, structure and sequence learning programs</td>
<td>Plan lesson sequences using knowledge of student learning, content and effective teaching strategies.</td>
<td>Planning and delivering a lesson in a subject that you will be expected to teach. Planning and delivering a sequence of lessons and classroom activities that build on students’ prior learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3</strong> Use teaching strategies</td>
<td>Include a range of teaching strategies.</td>
<td>Developing a repertoire of effective teaching strategies that you can call upon as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4:</strong> Select and use resources</td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of a range of resources, including ICT, that engage students in their learning.</td>
<td>Using resources, including ICT, to support and enhance student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.5:</strong> Use effective classroom communication</td>
<td>Demonstrate a range of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies to support student engagement.</td>
<td>Encouraging the active involvement of all students in classroom activities Organising classroom activities, providing students with clear directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.6:</strong> Evaluate and improve teaching programs</td>
<td>Demonstrate broad knowledge of strategies that can be used to evaluate teaching programs to improve student learning.</td>
<td>Appropriate use of formative, summative and diagnostic assessments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.7:

**Engage parents/carers in the educative process**

Describe a broad range of strategies for involving parents/carers in the educative process.

### 4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AITSL Standard</th>
<th>Expectations (Graduate level)</th>
<th>How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support student participation</strong></td>
<td>Identify strategies to support inclusive student participation and engagement in classroom activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manage classroom activities</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate the capacity to organise classroom activities and provide clear directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Manage challenging behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of practical approaches to manage challenging behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maintain student safety</strong></td>
<td>Describe strategies that support students’ well-being and safety working within school and/or system, curriculum and legislative requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use ICT safely, responsibly and ethically</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the relevant issues and the strategies available to support the safe, responsible and ethical use of ICT in learning and teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AITSL Standard</th>
<th>Expectations (Graduate level)</th>
<th>How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assess student learning</strong></td>
<td>Making appropriate use of formative, summative and diagnostic assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1:</td>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of assessment strategies, including informal and formal, diagnostic, formative and summative approaches to assess student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2:</td>
<td><strong>Provide feedback to students on their learning</strong></td>
<td>Using assessment data to give appropriate feedback to your students about their learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3:</td>
<td><strong>Make consistent and comparable judgements</strong></td>
<td>Moderating student assessments to support consistent and comparable judgments of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3:</td>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of assessment moderation and its application to support consistent and comparable judgements of student learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4:</td>
<td><strong>Interpret student data</strong></td>
<td>Interpreting student assessment data and using it to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4:</td>
<td>Demonstrate the capacity to interpret student assessment data to evaluate student learning and modify teaching practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5:</td>
<td><strong>Report on student achievement</strong></td>
<td>Reporting to students, parents and carers in a variety of ways and Keeping reliable records of student achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Engage in professional learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AITSL Standard</th>
<th>Expectations (Graduate level)</th>
<th>How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.1: Identify and plan professional learning needs | Demonstrate an understanding of the role of the National Professional Standards for Teachers in identifying professional learning needs.                                                                 | 32. Using the national Professional Standards for Teachers  
33. Identifying your own professional learning needs |
| 6.2: Engage in professional learning and improve practice | Understand the relevant and appropriate sources of professional learning for teachers. | Locating relevant and appropriate sources of professional learning |
| 6.3: Engage with colleagues and improve practice | Seek and apply constructive feedback from supervisors and teachers to improve teaching practices. | Working collaboratively with teaching colleagues, and using their constructive feedback to improve your teaching |
| 6.4: Apply professional learning and improve student learning | Demonstrate an understanding of the rationale for continued professional learning and the implications for improved student learning. | |
### 7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AITSL Standard</th>
<th>Expectations (Graduate level)</th>
<th>How well do you believe your teacher preparation program has provided you with the necessary levels of knowledge and understanding practice in the skills that you will need about each of the following?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1:</td>
<td>Meet professional ethics and responsibilities</td>
<td>Understand and apply the key principles described in codes of ethics and conduct for the teaching profession. Behaving ethically and responsibly as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2:</td>
<td>Comply with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements</td>
<td>Understand the relevant legislative, administrative and organisational policies and processes required for teachers according to school stage. Understanding the legislative and organisational policies and processes that apply to you as a teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3:</td>
<td>Engage with the parents/carers</td>
<td>Understand strategies for working effectively, sensitively and confidentially with parents/carers. Working effectively, sensitively and confidentially with parents and carers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4:</td>
<td>Engage with professional teaching networks and broader communities</td>
<td>Understand the role of external professionals and community representatives in broadening teachers’ professional knowledge and practice. Engaging in wider professional networks to support your work as a teacher. Working effectively with non-teaching professionals and staff (e.g. Integration aides and speech pathologists)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5 Comments from the Principals' Survey

Were you happy that your school was sufficiently consulted by the university about its participation in the SCTE program this year?

Comments:
- As a member of the steering committee I was well aware of the commitment.
- I think more work needs to be done in conjunction with our school in relation to the selection of the students involved in the program.
- Met with staff prior at a cluster meeting.
- Ongoing positive relationship with the University allowed positive discussions about the future of the program.
- Our cluster and the university met at the end of 2011 to plan for 2012.
- Our cluster was consulted through our cluster leader.
- our previous relationship with Melbourne University through the Master of teaching program allowed an almost seamless transition into the SCTE project.
- Relationship with University was productive.
- The 2011 Progress Report issues were followed up in late 2011 and early 2012. Many issues which occurred in 2011 were worked on with satisfactory conclusions.
- The meeting process of school expert mentor and university kept communications open.
- The SCTE developed from an already NAB grant partnership. There was some initial confusion regarding the SCTE and NAB partnership.
- There were aspects of the consultative process and timeline which wasn't most conducive with the school schedule, but we had to consider that.

Were you happy that your school was kept informed by the university about its participation in the SCTE program this year?

Comments:
- Communication was generally good.
- Having university staff on sight was a key element in strengthening the relationships and understandings between the school and the university.
- I believe the correspondence between the university and the cluster leader was minimal. Our cluster leader had to initiate conversations about placement of students and organised the placements himself.
- Information did not come from the university, but rather from Country Education Program.
- Limited, but adequate.
- Regular meetings and discussions took place with the lecturers involved.
Has the introduction of the SCTE led to an increase in the cost of running your school this year?
If so, is the increase sustainable?
Comments:
- Running the PLT's for the pre-service teachers. 'Creating' additional planning time for the mentor teacher.
- and it is sustainable but not to the same level. There is a need to continue to fund the SCTE facilitator who is currently located at Koonung.
- Because we have been supported with funding for the mentor leader teacher.
- Having an increase of such a large number of PSTs on staff has complex organisational and logistic issues. The funding is paramount in sustaining the use of a classroom at the school, increases in usage of ICT and photocopying, supervisory staff for Applied Curriculum projects and use of other facilities. Also the funding for a Project Manager to liaison between the schools, the university and PSTs is paramount to the successful implementation of the SCTE project. Schools can sustain a number of Pre-service teachers, but not to the extent of the SCTE program. Mentor training is needed and was highlighted in the progress reports as a main concern. This needs funding. Inclusion of PSTs in all aspects of the school e.g. PD days takes funding. Involving the staff and students in community projects takes funding. Providing the on-site (2 day a week) praxis model, takes funding. To continue the SCTE program without funding will place a strain on both school and university resources.
- However, it does depend on other National School Partnership Funding movements.
- I am the teaching fellow for this program and that requires me to visit and support the preservice teachers. I am a teaching principal and must be replaced by a CRT. It takes a time to find and arrange accommodation for the preservice teachers in our cluster and that time needs to be dedicated from teaching or planning/admin time, therefore I need to be replaced once again. Travel to and from the schools in the cluster, evening mentor meetings or participation in community activities is another cost which must be either met by my personal pocket or external funding. Shared professional development and meetings with the partnership participants require me to represent the cluster and are also costly in travel, accommodation and CRT coverage.
- It adds to simple costs like materials, copying etc. Also we set space aside for them, so cleaning, heating etc are costs that are involved.
- Needs some admin time to sustain
- photocopying costs, classroom resources, professional materials, refreshments,
- Small amount in providing physical resources for larger number of PS teachers in school at one time.
- There have been costs associated with the professional learning of the pre-service teachers.
- This relates to finding additional time for conferencing and professional development needs.
- We have had the commitment of the Assistant Principal and another staff member that is outside the classroom working with the project. This has taken time away from their regular work which has led to each days of work that needed to be paid for by the school.
- We have released team leaders to facilitate reflection/feedback sessions. It is sustainable.
- With the funding available it was no cost to the school but funding is essential to sustain the expert mentor

Has the introduction of the SCTE led to increases in your workload, as Principal?
Comments:
- Additional large scale network and partnership based activity always creates more work.
- Although this is my choice - I am committed to ensuring all preservice teachers meet with me and are inducted into the school.
As a principal, anything that affects the running of the school has an impact on my role. We work as a team to support each other and therefore mentoring is seen as a shared responsibility.

As mentor

As the Cluster Leader much of the work around placements, school tours and accommodation has ended up being my responsibility.

Attending presentations, providing briefings and liaising with precinct colleagues in the management of the STCE are all calls upon my time.

Because the SCTE facilitator has had time funded by the project and is an excellent operator. The facilitator for the Koonung SCTE cluster is on staff at Koonung and she has led the way

Because we have had the funding to employ a leading teacher to mentor the teachers and the students involved in this program.

But the outcomes are far worth it for the effort. Sustainable yes.

Expert mentor and AP undertakes this role.

For example, chasing up suitable accommodation, sorting out access to internet, I am a teaching Principal so the mentoring responsibilities are actually shared by myself and the mentor teacher.

I am the mentor so this places much more work on me. I am happy to continue though.

I feel it is important for the leader to have a significant role

Moderately due to the way in which a third player is involved, that being CEP. I'm not sure how sustainable it is, because the involvement of CEP is just another layer, that we don't really need.

more staff, more work

See above

Sustainable and important

The expert mentor completed all the work from PD for staff and PST's to tours etc. I only had to be involved for specific discussions

Yes, but to make the partnership work you need to invest time otherwise it would not work.
Has the introduction of the SCTE led to increases in the workload of your teaching staff?

Comments:

- All our teachers involved have spent a great deal of time supporting their students.
- As above, but sustainable and well worth it.
- but at their request due to enrolment in the Master degree unit, which they have loved doing. Many of the mentor teachers have undertaken a unit of a masters degree which has been subsidised by SCTE funds and this has created extra work for them however they have enjoyed this.
- coordinating of resources and releasing teachers for guest lecture spots
- Establishment can be the most time consuming times.
- I have noted increased time spent after school and in apt - where teachers and preservice teachers meet to plan and reflect.
- If anything a lot of the instruction load was run by the expert mentor leaving the staff to get to know the PST and concentrate on teaching practice
- It is about Professional responsibilities and we could go on and on about those and how teacher training could be better managed.
- Mentoring adds time demands to a teachers load inevitably.
- Mentoring requires a commitment from staff. As result it does increase their workload.
- Minimal and definitely not excessive.
- Needs some time release to sustain
- Ongoing feedback, planning discussions etc. It is sustainable.
- Our mentors do spend a long time supporting the planning of a program and coaching needs. It is a burden that is shared so that staff members do not do it every year. It is sustainable but only because of the willingness of our staff and the valuable contributions candidates make to our learning environment.
- Our staff provide a high quality program that does place a strain on the staff and resources, particularly in instances where the pre-service teacher is unprepared and at times is unsuitable for the role and challenges they may face in the profession of teaching. There are at times 'gaps' in what the university is teaching the students and what is expected of final year students at a school level. Teachers need to find extra time in their very busy days to discuss lesson plans, offer reflections and constructive comments and write written reports whilst supporting the needs of the pre-service teacher and also the needs of the students in their classes (which is their primary role). The staff at Carranballac willingly take on the mentor role and work diligently to maintain a high standard in both their roles as a classroom teacher and as a mentor.

prin is teacher

- Supervision always requires extra effort.
- Sustainable and important
- The increase is sustainable if the relationship works and the preservice teacher has initiative and has well developed skills in managing their own workload. The issues arise when the preservice teacher requires additional personal or professional support.
- The SCTE coordinator spends a great deal of time touching base with the mentor teachers and pre-service teachers. Additional time for mentors in reviewing planning, lessons, providing continuous feedback
- There are more requirements on those staff who are mentors to a pre- service teacher from SCTE.
- Time must be spent with the preservice teachers to support them, reflect on practise, mentor and plan. All of this is an added responsibility but one happily given to our profession.
- Unfortunately, unlike other years, the pre-service teachers selected in 2012 were not all suitably prepared for the experience, creating an increased workload for our staff.
- Yes, but the increase is sustainable.
• Yes, but to make the partnership work you need to invest time otherwise it would not work. Teachers have completed this after hours with little or no financial reward.

Have you encouraged any of the preservice teachers in your school this year to apply for continuing employment in your school? If so, with what degree of success?

Comments:
• But if we required teachers for next year there are definitely some that I would offer employment.
• I do not have the capacity to employ more staff. I am a school of 11 students.
• I wish I could!
• If we had a position available I would have encouraged those participating within the program to apply. Generally one graduate is employed each year.
• No positions are available.
• No vacancies available.
• Not this year, but only due to budgetary constraints. In the past we have employed multiples.
• Our preservice teachers were all in their first year of the course.
• Ours is a small school and there are no vacancies. We would happily offer employment based on the merit of the preservice teachers if vacancies existed.
• Pre-service teachers in our placement still have another half year to complete until they are fully qualified.
• They are all second years.
• They were all second year students but we're aiming to stay in contact with a select group.
• We have had a number of pre-service teachers who have completed an excellent year in the program. These teachers showed initiative and demonstrated the values of the college. They acted in a professional manner at all times and met many of the standards required of them as graduating teachers. These students were then encouraged to apply for positions if and when they became available.
• We have had discussions with several about job prospects but they will have to apply for whatever positions we put up in the same way as others.
• We have reducing numbers and are close to naming a teacher in excess.
• Yes we have encouraged preservice teachers to apply for positions at our college.