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Abstract

Teaching in Australia is acknowledged as a profession. The public, however, generally perceives teaching as a poorly paid occupation whose practitioners exert little control over their own standards of practice. Consequently, the professional status of teachers is low, and very few of the most capable school leavers and high ability university graduates are attracted to teaching as a career. Furthermore, teachers' perceptions that the public does not appreciate their work have led to low morale, high rates of resignations, and early retirements among experienced practitioners. These factors will contribute to serious shortages of teachers in the new millennium.

In the past Australian employers in both government and non-government school sectors have attempted to circumvent teacher shortages by reducing qualifications required for teaching. This anti-professional practice has contributed to a belief that teaching is something that anyone can do. Preventing employers from reducing the professional qualifications required of teachers is possible only when standards are protected by statutory teacher registration boards that are representative of the profession. At the end of the 1990s only two states, Queensland and South Australia, had registration boards to establish and protect standards for teachers in all schools.

It is argued in this thesis that the status of the teaching profession in Australia must be enhanced if teaching is to attract capable new recruits and retain knowledgeable, experienced practitioners. This could be achieved by giving teachers greater responsibility for their profession's standards through a system of statutory regulatory boards, comprised largely of practising teachers. The boards would be responsible for establishing and enforcing standards for registration of teachers, accreditation of
teacher education, and provision of advanced certification. Furthermore, such
regulation of the profession should be on a national basis to ensure that all children in
all schools in Australia have access to competent, professionally qualified teachers,
and to overcome problems of interstate mobility of teachers.

An examination was made of how teaching has been regulated in Australia and a
number of overseas systems. Attributes that were considered necessary or desirable for
inclusion in a system for regulating teaching in Australia were identified. Then, a
model for regulating the teaching profession in Australia was developed.

Senior representatives of significant interest groups in New South Wales—where a
recent attempt to legislate for teacher registration failed in parliament—were
interviewed in order to evaluate the model. Most of the respondents supported the
model, with few amendments. However, all respondents from the independent school
sector were strongly opposed to the introduction of teacher registration that would limit
them to employing as teachers only people who held accredited teacher education
qualifications. The respondents expressed doubt that national regulation of the
profession would be introduced into Australia because state governments would be
reluctant to forego their constitutional powers for education to the Commonwealth and,
further, because they perceived the present conservative Commonwealth Government
to be ideologically opposed to giving teachers profession-controlled registration.

The thesis concludes by calling on all stakeholders to acknowledge teaching as a full
profession. This could be achieved by accepting that teachers should regulate their
professional standards in the same way that other professions do, and the model
developed in Chapter 7 is offered as a way to achieve that end.
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Chapter 1

TEACHERS AND THEIR PROFESSION

This thesis examines three themes that are fundamental to the regulation of teaching as a profession:

♦ **Teacher registration**, that is, the licensing systems which are designed to ensure that only professionally qualified, competent people of sound character may teach in schools.

♦ **Accreditation of teacher education**, that is, the systems which exist or should exist for ensuring that teacher education programs are of high quality and that the institutions which provide those programs are capable of producing graduates who are suitable for registration, and thus employment, as professional teachers.

♦ **Advanced certification for teachers**, that is, the mechanisms which exist or should exist for recognising and acknowledging experienced teachers who have developed exceptional knowledge and skills.

The implementation of these three aspects of the professional life of teachers in Australia is examined and their present status evaluated. What happens with respect to these matters in a number of education systems from other countries is also examined. Practices that are effective in both local and overseas systems are identified and then integrated into a model for registration, accreditation and advanced certification for
Australia. Interviews that involve a number of key stakeholders in these policy areas are used to evaluate the model.

This chapter starts by looking at the governance of education and the regulation of teachers in Australia. This examination is important in that it shows how it is possible in a country with a relatively small population, albeit dispersed over a large land mass, for so many differences to have evolved in laws that govern education, schools and teachers in the six states and two mainland territories. It also shows that there is a forum, the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), through which the Commonwealth, states and territories can collaborate to remove some of the anomalies that exist with respect to education in those jurisdictions. Next in this chapter there is a brief account of how teaching has become deregulated in most Australian states, with the result that only two states now require all teachers in all schools to be registered. However, as the end of the 1990s approaches, there has been a renewed interest in registration, accreditation and advanced certification, and reasons for that are given. The chapter concludes with a statement of the aims of the thesis and an outline of its structure.

The Governance of Education and Regulation of the Profession of Teaching in Australia

Under the Australian Constitution, the Commonwealth is not the primary policy-maker in the area of schools, except in the cases of a few small external territories such as Christmas Island, the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and Norfolk Island (Commonwealth of
Australia, 1988; Dawkins, 1988b; Ministerial Council on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 1996). However, the Commonwealth has a role in identifying national priorities for education and schooling, promoting consistency and coherence in the provision of education across Australia, and in identifying strategies for achieving these aims (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 1995, 1996).

Except for tertiary education, which is a Commonwealth responsibility, education in Australia generally is the responsibility of each of the state and territory governments (Cunningham, 1988; Dawkins, 1988b; Harman, 1974; West, 1998; Whitty, Power & Halpin, 1998). State and territory governments have the major financial responsibility for government schools and contribute substantially to the funds of non-government schools (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 1995; Whitty et al., 1998).

Each state and territory has its own education ministry, which has control over the operation of schools in both the government and non-government sectors through legislation. In New South Wales, for example, the powers of the ministry with respect to schools is established in legislation that includes the Education and Public Instruction Act (1987), the subsequent Education Reform Act (1990), the Education Reform (School Discipline) Act (1996), and the Education Reform Further Amendment Act (1997). These, among other things, set the minimum standards that must be met for schools to be registered (New South Wales Government, 1987, 1990). Without
registration it is illegal for a school to operate in New South Wales, and heavy penalties can be imposed (New South Wales Government, 1987, 1990). It should be noted, however, that registration of a school is not a guarantee that the school’s teachers are well qualified and fit for professional practice. The Manual for the Registration of Individual Non-government Schools in New South Wales (Office of the Board of Studies, New South Wales, 1998) provides guidelines, but does not mandate, that all teachers in a non-government school must be qualified. The guidelines allow schools to be registered, even if they employ people who have no teacher education qualifications, provided that those unqualified people are “regularly supervised by teaching staff with the necessary experience or qualifications” (p. 4). The only way of guaranteeing that people employed as teachers are qualified for practice is by the state governments enacting legislation to make it mandatory for all teachers in all schools to be qualified. Such legislation exists only in Queensland and South Australia (Dunkin, 1995; Ingvarson, 1995; Kelly, 1996). In those states, the legislation requires all teachers to be registered before they can practise and specifies the minimum qualifications required for registration (Board of Teacher Registration [Queensland], 1990, 1995, 1996; Government of Tasmania, 1997; New South Wales Government, 1998). The New South Wales government has attempted to introduce registration for all teachers in all schools through its Teaching Standards Bill 1998. The progress of that Bill is discussed in later chapters.

There are pragmatic advantages for governments and other employers of teachers to resist any form of regulation of the teaching profession if that means prescribing
inviolable minimum qualifications for teachers. At times of serious shortages of qualified teacher education graduates—a situation that prevailed in the 1960s and 1970s and that is predicted as the new millennium approaches (Preston, 1997, 1998)—government education authorities would prefer flexibility to employ less qualified people to fill the gaps in the teaching profession (Dunkin, 1995; Ingvarson, 1995; Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998). Lee (1989), too, has suggested that employers of teachers in non-government schools have similar motivations for opposing any form of regulation that establishes mandatory qualifications standards for all teachers in all school systems.

There are approximately 300 education authorities in Australia that, between them, employ more than 200,000 teachers. There are considerable differences in employment policies and practices among these employers (Deer, Meyenn, Taylor & Williams, 1995). These policies and practices may even vary over time according to “funding or supply-and-demand pressures” (Kelly, 1996, p. 6). In most states, in the absence of mandatory registration of teachers, teaching qualifications are established by each school system, or by individual principals in the case of some non-government schools, and these may be waived in times of teacher shortages (Deer et al., 1995). Despite this, Preston (1996) accepted that responsible school authorities would employ only competent and qualified teachers, but she acknowledged that from time-to-time school authorities do not adequately guard standards of entry to practice. Especially at times of teacher shortages, “short-term administrative convenience [has taken] precedence over longer-term quality of teaching” (Preston, 1996, p. 256). Effectively,
this means that in some parts of Australia, a person can be employed as a teacher without any formal preparation for the profession. That this is a reality has been pointed out by significant stakeholders, including Kelly (1996), Maling (1995) and the Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee (1998). Wriedt (1997) gives an example from Tasmania—where the prevailing [Tasmanian] Education Act (1994) does not require teachers to be registered—of a non-government school that was found to have employed 43 unqualified people as teachers. This is a practice that contributes to the common view of teaching as a “job” rather than a “profession” (Maling, 1995).

Each of the six states and the territories jealously guards its control over education, with the result that there is considerable diversity across borders in such matters as curriculum, assessment and reporting, and in procedures for awarding school credentials (Baumgart & Low, 1990). As well, differences in the ways the states regulate school education have resulted in diversity with respect to standards of academic and professional preparation required of teachers. Initial teacher education qualifications are rigorously specified in some states and systems, while in others it is possible for a person with no teacher education qualifications at all to become a teacher (Maling, 1995; New South Wales Teachers Federation, 1997), even in government schools (Wriedt, 1997).

There is a national forum, the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), that has a charter to bring about collaboration between
the Commonwealth, states and territories in the development and implementation of policies relating to schooling in Australia and which could play a major role in eliminating the anomalies in standards required of teachers in different states.

MCEETYA is comprised of the state, Commonwealth and New Zealand ministers who are responsible for education, training and youth affairs. Papua New Guinea and Norfolk Island each have observer status at MCEETYA meetings. MCEETYA was formed in 1994, when the Australian Education Council (AEC) amalgamated with two other ministerial councils, the Council of Ministers of Vocational Education, Employment and Training (MOVEET) and the Youth Ministers Council (YMC) (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 1996).

Prior to the establishment of MCEETYA, the states and territories reported separately to the Commonwealth Government through a plethora of resource agreements, and whatever collective decisions were made came through meetings of the AEC (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 1996). For example, in 1986, while acknowledging the primacy of the states and territories with respect to policy-making in the area of school education, the Commonwealth Government initiated changes through the AEC that promised to bring significant national uniformity to the curriculum of schools (Dawkins, 1988b). A national curriculum and a form of common assessment was seen by Dawkins, the Commonwealth Minister for Employment, Education and Training, as necessary to enable schools to contribute to the positive development of Australian society and the economy (Baumgart & Low, 1990; Dawkins, 1988b). The AEC determined to support
national curriculum standardisation on the grounds that it should overcome the dilemma of highly mobile students who, in moving from one state to another, often had to repeat an academic year when the syllabi and curricula between the states differed. A national curriculum has not eventuated, but it was from this stance that the AEC developed its “Common and Agreed National Goals for Schooling in Australia” (Pascoe, 1995). Over recent years there have been a number of other significant initiatives by the AEC, and later MCEETYA, directed at reducing interstate differences in educational practice (Eltis, 1997c; Maling, 1995). These include:

♦ A national framework for curriculum statements.
♦ National profiles.
♦ The formation of the (now defunct) Australian Teaching Council (ATC).
♦ The National Professional Development Program.
♦ Major reforms in the areas of literacy and Aboriginal education.
♦ National programs in school leadership for the nation’s principals.
♦ The Teaching Accord.
♦ The National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQTL).

(Adapted from Maling, 1995.)

In recent years, however, the states have demonstrated an appalling incapacity for developing joint statements and policies (Bowman, 1998). This situation has occurred
despite the considerable potential for co-operation through MCEETYA. The problems of co-ordination of the profession of teaching nationally have hardly been addressed, and the significant differences in the ways teachers and teacher education are regulated in the eight separate school governances persist. Only two states, South Australia and Queensland, have statutory registration of all teachers (Dunkin, 1995; Ingvarson, 1995; Kelly, 1996). There is no systematic form of accreditation to ensure that programs of teacher education are of comparably high standard across the nation (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998; Meyenn, Deer, Taylor & Williams, 1995). Furthermore, while some states have their own schemes for classifying teachers as “Advanced Skills Teachers”—which in the view of Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1995) fail to meet desirable criteria for systems of advanced certification—there is no form of advanced certification for teachers that is recognised across the borders of the states of Australia or across school systems (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998; Bluer, 1990; Williamson, 1994).

It has been shown above that, largely as a result of the Australian Constitution giving the individual states and territories power over school education, the profession of teaching has become a partially regulated profession. This means that in some states the profession is subject to occupational regulation, such as registration or certification, while in other states it is unregulated. Throughout the 1990s there has been a discernible trend towards deregulation of the profession of teaching. This trend is examined more fully in the next section, as a starting point in this investigation of what
has happened, what is happening, and what should happen, with respect to professional regulation of teaching in Australia.

The Decline in Regulation of the Teaching Profession during the 1990s
At various times most states have had statutory requirements for the registration of teachers. In 1989 all states except two, New South Wales and Western Australia, had formal, legislated registration procedures for teachers in all schools in all sectors (Lee, 1989). The trend over the last decade, however, has been for the states to abandon the requirement for teachers to be registered. This trend has mainly been in response to the National Competition Policy Agreements that were enacted in the early 1990s and the Mutual Recognition arrangements that were put in place after the Heads of Government Agreements of 1992. The National Competition Policy Agreements prohibit occupational licensing schemes, such as teacher registration, that may impose barriers to persons entering practice, unless it can be demonstrated that the benefits to the community outweigh costs and that the community’s best interests are served by restricting competition. The Mutual Recognition Agreements entitle any practitioner registered in one jurisdiction to be registered in any other jurisdiction in which the occupation is also registered. (Government of New South Wales, 1997). The Heads of Government were concerned that if teaching remained a partially regulated occupation, the mobility of practitioners between the state jurisdictions could be impeded. They recommended that teaching should become a fully deregulated occupation, and that the
registration boards should be abolished (Government of New South Wales, 1997).

The states which had registration responded in a variety of ways:

- Tasmania removed its teacher registration requirements altogether. The [Tasmanian] Education Act, 1994 replaced the existing Teachers Registration Board with a new Schools Registration Board. No longer was the registration of teachers required, but “in the registration of schools, teacher qualifications are to be taken into account” (Farrall, 1995, p. 49).

- The Victorian government dispensed with the requirement that teachers in government schools must be registered when it abolished the Teachers Registration Board in 1993. However, the government still required teachers in Catholic and other non-government schools to be registered through the existing Registered Schools Board (Ingvarson, 1995).

- Queensland and South Australia were the only two states to retain registration requirements for all teachers, but their respective registration boards modified their regulations so that movement of teachers between jurisdictions would not be impeded (Dunkin, 1995; Government of New South Wales, 1997; Ingvarson, 1995).

At a subsequent meeting of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), in August 1994, the state premiers were to consider a recommendation for the abolition of the two remaining teacher registration boards, those of Queensland and South Australia (“ATC supports teachers’ right to registration,” 1994; Melbourne Age,
26/7/94). The attempts to remove the need for registration of teachers in most Australian states were perceived by teacher educators and professional education bodies as threats to the profession (Dunkin, 1995; Ingvarson, 1995; Walker, 1992). The Australian Teaching Council (ATC), which had been formed in 1992 while the Australian Labor Party held government and which had as a major aim the establishment of national registration of teachers, called on the two state governments to resist the COAG recommendation. In an article in “The Australian” newspaper on July 26, 1994, that was reprinted as a foreword to the ATEA “Newsletter” of May, 1995, Dunkin (1995), then the President of the Australian Teacher Education Association (ATEA), warned the ATEA membership of the possible consequences of this “move to deregulate the teaching profession and to abolish the only two teacher registration bodies in Australia, those in Queensland and South Australia” (p. 6).

Dunkin (1995) considered that this constituted an acute challenge to education in that such deregulation of the profession would allow governments, which are the largest employers of teachers in Australia, scope to employ untrained teachers:

To face a shortage of teachers without an authority independent of employers to guarantee standards of teaching is to place our children in double jeopardy. What would stop the employment of people of inferior qualifications to fill the gaps in the teaching profession? (Dunkin, 1995, p. 6.)

No decision was made at the August meeting of COAG, and the recommendation subsequently lapsed, allowing the two boards to remain operational (“ATC supports teachers’ right to registration,” 1994).
In response to shortages of teacher education graduates in the 1960s and 1970s, the Victorian government had shown that it was prepared to employ many inexperienced and unqualified people as teachers rather than take positive steps to make teaching an attractive career option for capable graduates (Ingvarson, 1995). This anti-professional solution to the problem of shortages of qualified teachers led to chaos in schools and low morale among teachers, and consequently to a cycle of high resignation rates (Preston, 1996). As a result, the Victorian Teachers Registration Board was established in 1973 to prevent the employment of unqualified people as teachers, and to protect standards for the profession (Ingvarson, 1995). Ingvarson (1995) expressed his grave concern that the dismantling of the Victorian Teachers Registration Board in 1993 would again allow the government to employ poorly prepared people as teachers in times of shortages of teacher education graduates. As teacher shortages are looming again for the late 1990s, Ingvarson (1995) considered it to be a matter of concern that Victoria does not have an independent standards setting body for licensing teachers and ensuring the quality of entrants to the profession.

Not only has legislation effectively dismantled requirements for teachers in government schools in Victoria to be licensed, but additional legislation now means that decisions as to who teaches in those schools is made locally, by the principals of the schools. Ingvarson (1995) questioned whether or not principals have the expertise to make such decisions or, indeed, whether they want the responsibility for doing so. He warned that, in the absence of any regulation which set minimum qualifications for teachers in government schools in Victoria and with the possibility that the
introduction of school-based global budgeting could force the schools into cost-cutting measures, principals might hire less qualified and less experienced teachers. Indeed, Crowley’s 1998 *A Class Act: Inquiry into the Status of the Teaching Profession* (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998) confirmed that the devolution of staffing decisions to school level has exacerbated difficulties in filling positions in hard to staff schools in Victoria.

Dunkin (1995) contrasted the possible outcomes of “employment of people of inferior qualifications to fill the gaps in the teaching profession [at times of shortage of trainees graduating from universities]” (p. 6) with what he believed might ensue if doctors in Australia no longer had to be registered:

> Imagine the state of medical services if doctors no longer had to be registered. Medicine could then be practised by charlatans and many patients would die prematurely as a result. Why would we want to risk placing our children’s education under the same threat? (Dunkin, 1995, p. 6.)

Further, Ingvarson (1995) described a person advertising to be a doctor in Melbourne when not registered with the Victorian Medical Practitioners’ Board as being “quickly brought to court and punished” (p. 7). He suggested that if the person had misrepresented himself or herself as being qualified to teach, little would have happened in Victoria. However, it is significant to note that in South Australia where teachers must be registered, under the *South Australian Education Act, 1972*, Part IV, Division III, 64(4), a person who fraudulently claims to be a registered teacher is liable to be fined $500.
From the non-government schools sector, strong opposition to the establishment of registration boards for teachers comes nationally from AHISA, the Association of Heads of Independent Schools of Australia (Dixon, 1996; Lee, 1997a), and in New South Wales from the AIS, the Association of Independent Schools (Chapman, 1997). These organisations represent many of the largest non-government school employers. As well, the group representing parents in non-government schools in New South Wales, the New South Wales Parent Council, is opposed to such a board (Dixon, 1996; McInnes, 1997). With respect to non-government schools, there is little the profession can do to guard standards of preparation and qualifications of teachers in states where resistance by employers of teachers has prevented the introduction of teacher-controlled registration boards. In a discussion of issues arising from a draft paper by Brennan (1989) that supported the concept of national registration for all teachers, Lee (1989), then vice-president of the New South Wales Independent Teachers’ Union, was critical of the stance of employers in the non-government schools sector who resisted attempts at defining minimal training requirements for teachers during salaries and industrial awards negotiations. As he commented, “New South Wales non-government employers, in award negotiations . . . are strongly committed to retaining unqualified and under-qualified employment options” (Lee, 1989, p. 1).

There has been no requirement under the New South Wales Education and Public Instruction Act (1988) or its subsequent revisions, the Education Reform Act (1990), the Education Reform (School Discipline) Act (1996) or the Education Reform Further Amendment Act (1997), or the Teachers (Independent Schools) (State) Award (New
South Wales Independent Education Union, 1995, 1997), for a person employed as a teacher in a non-government school in New South Wales to have professional teacher education qualifications (Lee, 1997a). Clause 2(a) of the 1997 Teachers' [Independent Schools] [State] Award defines a teacher simply as follows: “Teacher means a person employed as such to assist the Principal in the work of the school” (New South Wales Independent Education Union, 1997, p. 5.)

While there is no requirement under legislation or in the Award for a minimum level of training for a teacher in a non-government school, there is provision for classifications such as “Not Otherwise Classified” (Clause 3[e], p. 11) and “One Year Trained Teacher” (Clause 2[j], p. 5). Further, there is provision for the principal of the school and a potential “teacher” to come to an agreement as to the level of classification upon employment via their mutual judgement of an “equivalent qualification or equivalent course” (Clause 2[g], p. 5). In other words, a principal in such a school could employ an unqualified person as a teacher, give that person full responsibility for teaching students within that school irrespective of whether the person has a sound content or pedagogical knowledge in the area he or she is to teach, and even determine the level of payment for that person’s services.

It is not just in the non-government sector in New South Wales that state legislation or industrial awards do not ensure that only qualified people can be employed as teachers. It has been pointed out above (Ingvarson, 1995) that it is possible for principals in state schools in Victoria to employ unqualified persons as teachers. In 1994 the Tasmanian
government in part justified omitting mandatory registration of teachers from the
[Tasmanian] Education Act (1994) by claiming that the state’s teaching service award
prevented the employment of unqualified persons as teachers in the public sector
(Wriedt, 1997). However, as Wriedt (1997) and Crowley (Senate Employment,
Education and Training References Committee, 1998) have demonstrated, this belief
that an award protects standards is unwarranted.

A Renewal of Interest in Regulating Teaching in Australia
Historically, in the field of teaching, registration, accreditation and advanced
certification have been weak (Maling, 1995). However, from the late 1980s strong
support for national registration of teachers has been shown by all state and national
teachers’ industrial unions that have jurisdiction over both government and non-
government sectors (Australian Education Union, 1991; “How Teacher Registration
Works in Queensland,” 1997; Lee, 1997a; Marshall, 1998; New South Wales
Independent Education Union, 1998b; New South Wales Teachers’ Federation, 1997).
The New South Wales Teachers’ Federation (1997) sees registration as “the hallmark
of a respected profession” (p. 11) that challenges the notion that “teaching is unskilled
work which anyone can do” (p. 11). As the end of the 1990s approaches, there has
been renewed interest in these issues by some state governments and the
Commonwealth Government. However, little progress has been made in these areas of
regulation of the teaching profession in Australia. Some of the reasons for this
renewed interest, which are discussed in this section, include:
♦ the outcomes of the Wood Royal Commission and child protection;

♦ concern about a decline in the status of teaching as a career and its effect on the morale of teachers;

♦ concern about an impending serious shortage of teachers; and,

♦ a need to recognise teaching as a profession and reinforce the public image of teachers as professionals.

The Wood Royal Commission and Child Protection

One driving force for renewed interest in registration of teachers has been the concern for child protection that emerged following the Wood Royal Commission in New South Wales, which investigated not only the police force but also paedophilia (Williams, O’Donnell & Sinclair, 1997). The findings of the Wood Royal Commission which concluded in 1997 with its report, *The Paedophile Inquiry*, undoubtedly prompted the New South Wales Government to accelerate its investigations into establishing a registration authority for teachers in that state (Elits, 1997d). The Wood Royal Commission was critical of how the New South Wales government dealt with allegations of child abuse by teachers and others. Its report has resulted in not only New South Wales but also the other states and territories moving to put into place mechanisms to reduce, if not eliminate, the chances of paedophiles working as teachers or in other capacities in schools. In New South Wales, offences against children are now addressed through the *Commission for Children and Young People Act 1998 (No.2)*, the *Ombudsman Amendment (Child Protection and*
Community Services) Act 1998 (No.3), the Child Protection (Prohibited Employment) Act 1998 (No.3)¹ and updated provisions of the Children (Care and Protection) Act 1987 (New South Wales Independent Education Union, 1998a). These Acts require data relating to teachers’ criminal histories and professional discipline histories to be lodged with the Commission for Children and Young People. As well, the Child Protection (Prohibited Employment) Act 1998 (No.3) establishes a register of those who are unfit to teach in schools and other educational settings because of a record of serious sex offences. Employers must have preferred applicants for jobs in schools and early childhood settings screened by the Commission for Children and Young People, a registration body or the employer itself, and whoever does the screening must have access to the records lodged with the Commission for Children and Young People. While in agreement with pre-employment screening for teachers, unions fear that the procedures have enormous potential for breaches of teachers’ civil liberties and prefer that this matter should be directly within the jurisdiction of a probity unit attached to a teacher registration body that has authority in relation to all schools (Lee, 1998; New South Wales Independent Education Union, 1998c; New South Wales Teachers Federation, 1997). The establishment of a register of who is fit to teach is consistent with the intents of such legislation and if this is done through national registration it may be an effective way for states to deal co-operatively with this serious problem.

¹ Note that these were given assent as Acts on 12 December 1998. The Ombudsman Amendment (Child Protection and Community Services) Act 1998 (No.3) was proclaimed on 7 May 1999, while the Commission for Children and Young People Act 1998 (No.2), the Child Protection (Prohibited Employment) Act 1998 (No.3) and updated provisions of the Children (Care and Protection) Act 1987 will come into force later in 1999.
A question that should be asked with respect to pre-employment screening of people who might wish to become teachers is: when should screening be conducted?

Following the introduction of the legislation, the New South Wales Department of Education and Training (1999) commenced negotiations with universities with respect to having teacher education students screened before commencing their practicum experiences in government schools. It would certainly seem appropriate to conduct such screening before student teachers are allowed to take control of classes. An argument could be mounted for such screening to be conducted even before students commence their teacher education programs. It would avoid at the outset the futility of unsuitable people commencing programs that they would, effectively, be disqualified from completing. If a teacher registration authority were to be given the responsibility for pre-employment screening of potential teachers, then the institution of a form of pre-professional registration for teacher education students could be an appropriate way to handle this matter.

The need to protect school students from sexual molestation or assault is certainly one of the prime reasons for having teacher registration (Government of New South Wales, 1997; Jansen, 1997). However, this significant issue of protecting students from sex offenders must not be seen as the only defensible reason for registering teachers (Eltis, 1997d; Lee, 1997b).
A Decline in the Status of Teaching as a Career and its Effect on the Morale of Teachers

In 1998, the Commonwealth Government’s Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee (1998), chaired by Senator Crowley, found that there was a widespread crisis of morale among teachers, and that the status of teaching was “disturbingly low” (p. 1) and declining. Eltis (1997b) saw the status of teachers as being so eroded that “teachers feel themselves devalued as professionals” (p. 15). In a study of more than 2000 teachers and school executives in Australia, New Zealand and England, Dinham and Scott (1998) found that teachers in Australia showed the least satisfaction with their status. As well, a major international study of some 17 developed countries revealed that in Australia only 25% of teachers believed that society appreciated their work (Ingvarson, 1997).

Factors that have contributed to the decline in public esteem for teachers and that have affected the morale of teachers include perceptions that teachers are not well paid and have few avenues for career advancement, the scant regard in Australia for careers that involve large numbers of women,² the low status of children in Australia, adverse media coverage of school and teacher issues, the low value placed on education in Australia, attacks on teachers and their industrial associations by governments, poor physical working conditions, increased workloads and crowded curricula, increased fear by teachers of litigation, lack of overt support from governments and education

---

² In 1996 some 64.4% of teachers in Australian schools were women (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998).
departments, and lack of control by teachers over their profession and their work (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998).

The poor image of teaching in the eyes of the public and the consequent decline in attractiveness of teaching as a career for high ability students are major problems for the profession (Laird, 1997; Meade, 1990; Walker, 1996). The perception of teaching as a low status occupation contributes to its inability to attract capable recruits (Eltis, 1997a; Laird, 1997; Speedy, 1989). Furthermore, Taylor (1991) considered that low morale among teachers was sufficiently apparent to secondary school students as to dissuade many of them from selecting teacher education as a first-preference tertiary option. This finding was confirmed by the research of Abbott-Chapman, Hull, McCann and Wyld (1991) who found not only that the apparent poor morale exemplified by teachers deterred senior high school students from preparing for the profession, but also that in a significant number of cases students were actively advised by their teachers not to become teachers.

There were grounds for some optimism that teacher education was attracting more able students when figures for the 1999 intake of students showed that the demand for placement in teacher education programs in some states had grown (Errey, 1999). However, this optimism might be premature, since entry requirements for teacher education programs were still low when compared to levels for other courses. University Admission Indices (UAIs) at the 1998 New South Wales Higher School Certificate showed that, with few exceptions, requirements for entry to teacher
education degrees in universities in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory were among the lowest for any programs (Universities Admission Centre, 1999). For students leaving school at the end of 1998 to enter universities in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory in 1999, the Universities Admission Indices for entry to teacher education programs ranged from a low of 58.50 for the combined Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Education program at the University of New England to a high of 91.00 for the combined Bachelor of Computer Science/Bachelor of Education program at the University of Wollongong. The modal UAI for the 47 teacher education programs for which figures were available was 69.30 and the median UAI was 70.15. In general, data from the Universities Admission Centre (1999) show that UAI's required for entry to teacher education programs were low when compared to UAI's required for entry to other degree programs in the same universities. In Victoria, the minimum secondary school achievement levels required for entry to primary teacher education degrees at the University of Melbourne in 1997 and 1998 were amongst the lowest for any faculty (Hill, 1998).

The poor status of teaching as a career and the low rate of attraction of teacher education programs, especially for more able young people, have contributed to the concern by the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE) that the future supply of teacher education graduates will not meet demands (Ingvarson, 1997; Preston, 1997). The probable paucity of high calibre recruits to the profession is likely

---

1 These were calculated from the data available from the NSW and Australian Capital Territory Universities Admission Centre (Universities Admission Centre, 1999). They are UAI's for the first round offers of places in courses. UAI's for second round offers, for unfilled places, would be expected to be lower. A UAI of 63 corresponds to the median UAI for the 1998 NSW Higher School Certificate.
to affect the quality of learning in Australian schools in the future (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998), and therefore a major set of reforms needs to be set in place to raise the status of teaching so that competent students will in the future be attracted into teacher education programs. The potential of a shortfall in supply of teachers is discussed next.

An Impending Serious Shortage of Teachers

The combination of fewer capable people entering the profession and increased numbers of experienced teachers leaving the profession has led Preston (1997, 1998) to predict teacher shortages that will become serious in the new millennium. Preston (1998) has estimated that in the year 2000 there will be only 5327 teacher education graduates to fill 6519 vacancies in primary schools (a shortage of 1192 teachers)\(^4\) while for secondary schools only 5131 graduates will be available to fill 8212 predicted vacancies (a shortage of 3081 teachers).\(^5\) That is, the supply of teachers for primary schools will meet only 82% of demand and for secondary schools the supply will meet only 62% of demand. By the year 2004 there could be a deficit of 4631 primary and secondary school teachers (Preston, 1998).\(^6\) The Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee (1998) has accepted Preston’s predictions that there will be significant shortages of teachers, but with reservations as

---

\(^4\) Source: Table 17, p. 36 of Preston (1998).


\(^6\) These figures represent a considerable change from Preston’s earlier predictions of a total shortfall of some 4681 teachers by the year 2000, rising to over 7000 in the year 2003 (Preston, 1997).
to the quantum of the shortages. Bowman (1998) has described the impending shortages of teachers as a state of crisis.

A number of factors have led Preston (1997, 1998) to predict the shortfalls. These include an insufficient supply of teacher education graduates that has been exacerbated by reductions in university places for teacher education students, a relatively high level of retirements and other separations\(^*\) since the median age of the current teaching workforce is quite high (in the order of 46 years), and projected increases in enrolments of primary and secondary school pupils in most states and territories. As well, the number of recent graduates who traditionally wait for appointments to schools in areas that they favour, and thus constitute a reserve pool of teacher education graduates who might fill upcoming vacancies, is expected to diminish, to the point of vanishing, as these people accept positions in other occupations. A particular consequence of this last factor is that, since most in the reserve pool are recent graduates, the proportion of young people entering the profession will be further reduced.

One way to address this impending shortage of teachers is to improve the status of teachers. This could be done through reinforcing the public image of teachers as professionals by granting them control over their profession through an autonomous registration authority.

\(^*\) "Separation" is the term used by Preston (1997, 1998) for the unavailability of qualified teachers through resignation, retirement, death, dismissal, and absence on extended leave.
The Need to Recognise Teaching as a Profession and Reinforce the Public Image of Teachers as Professionals

Eltis (1997b) asked what should be done to convince the public that teaching is “respectable” (p. 21). Certainly, as Eltis (1997a, 1997b) suggested, increases in remuneration and improvements in working conditions would go far towards improving the public perception of teaching as a worthy profession and an attractive career option for capable potential recruits. However, the nature of teaching in Australia as a mass profession of more than 200,000 teachers, the majority of whom are employed by large bureaucracies, militates against free market competitiveness in salaries and conditions and greatly limits the probability of real improvements in wages and conditions. This being so, it is argued in this thesis that the most feasible way to give teachers a better professional image in the eyes of the public would be by introducing a system of teacher registration that acknowledges teaching as a full profession.

The questions of whether teaching is a “profession” and whether teachers are “professionals” or not have been of continual concern to teachers, teacher educators, and administrators (Abbott-Chapman, Hull, McCann & Wyld, 1991; Anderson, 1962; Beare, 1992; Bowman, 1998; Dinham, 1995b; Eltis, 1997b; Grundy, 1989; Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998). Denemark (1985) considered unequivocally that teaching was a profession. He saw it as important for the public and for teachers to consider teaching to be a profession, because the view that people have of an occupation will influence how the occupation
is conducted. Denemark (1985) considered that professional status is important, not because of what enhanced status means to teachers as individuals, but for what it means for the quality and character of teaching and learning in schools.

Characteristics that are generally associated with a profession include: professional autonomy; a clearly defined, highly developed, specialised, and theoretical knowledge base; control of training, certification, and licensing of new entrants; self-governing and self-policing authority, especially with regard to professional ethics; and a commitment to public service. As well, high remuneration, high social status, and the existence of a “collegium” are often seen as necessary for members of an occupation to be considered professionals (Abdul-Haqq, 1992). From a functionalist stance, one of the criteria normally assumed to be met by a profession is that there is a form of registration such that regulation of the profession is by the profession itself (Ashenden, 1990; Beare, 1992; Brennan, 1989). The absence of autonomy and self-governance and a collegium are cited by Abdul-Haqq (1992) as of particular concern if teaching is to be considered a profession.

At the 1990 USA/Australia Foundation Conference on The Professionalism of Teaching in the Next Decade, Fenton Sharpe, then the Director-General of the New South Wales Department of Education, argued that since teachers in Australia did not exert control over the standards of entry to and practice of teaching they could not regard teaching as a profession (Ashenden, 1990). Beare (1992) questioned teaching’s claim to be a profession on this same point, and emphasised the necessity for a
profession itself to control the standards required of potential initiates, when he commented:

Clearly, if the people inside the profession, and they alone, share esoteric rare skills and knowledge, and if it requires prior study and training to join that group, there is no other body in existence able to verify whether a neophyte qualifies for admission to the company, or is capable of professional practice. (Beare, 1992, p. 68.)

Also at this time, Walker (1992) was concerned at the continual, unresolved debate about what constituted teachers’ professionalism. He saw a need to recognise what made teaching a “profession,” relate this to professional development, seek co-ordination of the profession, and to “attend to standards . . . which can then be related to registration” (Walker, 1992, p. 57).

Preston (1996) also related standards to professionalism, and expressed her belief that higher levels of professionalism will, in general, lead to higher levels of student learning and more satisfying teaching. Rather than use a taxonomic listing of the characteristics that usually distinguish a profession from other levels of occupations, Preston (1996) defined the professionalism of teaching by focusing on teachers’ practice, which she saw as professional because of the use of high level judgments. She accepted that control of entry to an occupation such as teaching by the occupational group itself is often specified as a necessary condition in order that the occupation be considered a profession and its practitioners be considered professionals. However, she argued that purely profession-controlled entry to an occupation is rare, and is not an ideal situation since it is unlikely to be optimal for quality outcomes of
professional practice. Where admission to practice is determined through a registration authority, it is not the profession itself, but members of a statutory body, including other stakeholders, who set entry standards. Those standards are often established with reference to quality provision and the needs of clients and the wider community, not just the interests of the profession.

World-wide, teachers are often not treated as professionals (Pring, 1996). There is reluctance by governments to give full professional power and autonomy to teachers through the establishment of profession-controlled registration bodies (Pring, 1996). Teachers have professional control in only a few communities, such as Scotland where a General Teaching Council has been established, but in general they are prevented from taking control of their own membership and rules of professional conduct. Pring (1996) attributes this reluctance to giving teachers full professional responsibility and power to the fear that by doing so governments would lose the power to redirect educational funding to achieving their social and economic goals.

In itself, the absence of occupational self-regulation would seem to disqualify teaching from being regarded as a “profession.” However, the *Australian Standard Classification of Occupations Dictionary*, published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations, includes teaching as one of the nine major occupational sub-groups classified as “professional” (Brennan, 1990). It is Preston’s view (1996) that in Australia, teaching is generally regarded as a profession.
One distinguishing feature that has earned teaching the status of being a profession is the recognition that it is based on a body of knowledge and skill that is continually modified by research (France, 1990). There is a strong case that the agreed values and levels of required expertise that underlie teaching warrant recognition of teaching as a profession, and justify for teaching the kind of self-regulation through registration that characterises other professions such as medicine, law and nursing (Jansen, 1997; Pring, 1996). However, professional values, expertise and knowledge have not been articulated as clearly for teaching as for other professions. A significant role for a regulatory body for teaching would be to render explicit the essential values, knowledge and levels of expertise that are often implicit within the practice of teaching (Jansen, 1997; Pring, 1996).

According to Maling (1995), it is the profession itself that must assume responsibility for its standards if it wishes to become fully professional. In exchange for the right to self-determination as a profession, free from bureaucratic supervision and external regulation, teaching must develop standards of “good practice” (Maling, 1995, p. 4). The right to professional autonomy through setting standards for licensure, accreditation and advanced certification brings grave responsibilities, and granting teachers such control over standards for their profession could be regarded as what Maling (1995) refers to as a social contract whereby the profession agrees to “an exchange of autonomy for obligation” (p. 5).
Aim and Scope of the Study

The aim of this thesis is to answer the question of how the status of teaching as a profession can be affirmed, and indeed reinforced. The thesis has nine chapters. The present chapter has examined the context of the study and presented the study's aim. In subsequent chapters, this aim is accomplished by:

♦ critically examining the ways in which the profession of teaching is regulated in Australia;

♦ identifying the key characteristics of registration, accreditation and advanced certification in a number of other educational systems, namely the USA, Scotland, England and Wales, New Zealand, and Canada (Ontario and British Columbia);

♦ producing a model for regulating the profession of teaching in the Australian context that integrates international and local "best practice" policy; and,

♦ evaluating the model through discussions with key stakeholders.

Techniques of the constant comparison method are used to identify the critical issues for regulating the profession of teaching. Variations of this classic method are used extensively in qualitative research (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Miles & Huberman, 1991; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Chapter 2 establishes the methodology, which is qualitative. The study uses inductive methods to produce a model that is evaluated through interviews. In Chapter 3,
systems of teacher registration, accreditation of teacher education and advanced certification in Australia are examined with a view to analysing and putting into perspective what exists. In Chapters 4, 5 and 6, respectively, registration, accreditation and advanced certification as practised in a number of overseas systems—the multiple comparison groups—are examined to ascertain elements of professional regulation that might be appropriate in a model for Australian teachers. In Chapter 7, a unified model for the regulation of the teaching profession in Australia is presented. This model is then evaluated in Chapter 8 through interviews with representatives of key stakeholder organisations. The ninth, and final, chapter draws conclusions and makes recommendations with respect to the implementation of the three policy mechanisms.
Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with methodological issues that are most relevant to this policy-oriented study. It outlines why a qualitative approach which utilises techniques of document analysis, the constant comparative method and evaluation is believed to be most appropriate for this study of policy. It details how the constant comparative method has been applied in a rational analysis framework to develop the model. Finally, it shows how interviews were used to evaluate the model and to illustrate the views of key stakeholders.

Research into Educational Policy

“Policy” is defined by Millikan (1987) as “the weighted and adopted preference of a decision-making body, after consideration of various stimuli and constraints in relation to an issue, or for the determination of an action” (p. 26). In policy-making, it is of fundamental importance to ensure that policies address the social needs of the groups for which they are formulated and implemented (Millikan, 1987). Policy recommendations should ideally be based upon research evidence, but the research process should take into account social and educational values (Humes, 1979).

A policy is a deliberate reflection of the values and ideologies of policy-makers. Millikan (1987) acknowledges the role of human value systems in policy-making in the following definition: “Policy-making is the process of aggregating and clarifying
the values preferences of a decision-making group and its constituency, in light of a range of stimuli and constraints, in relation to an issue or a proposed action” (p. 26). Policy decisions may result from the considered preferences of a leader or of a policy-making group purported to represent the values and interests of a larger constituency, or they may be generated by the legitimate preferences of a select few (Millikan, 1987).

Educational policy is an organised body of statements about formal education, together with the administrative practices that are intended to give effect to those statements (Marginson, 1993). Educational policies are developed and implemented by many people in a variety of roles and in a variety of contexts (Walker, 1993). Government ministers, senior public servants and educational administrators, leaders of church school systems, school principals, teachers and parents are all involved in educational policymaking (Walker, 1993). National and state educational policies can, and do, reflect the interests and influences of individuals, groups, schools, universities and colleges (Walker, 1993). The particular policy issues investigated in this thesis have been of concern to a number of interest groups that represent the views of significant stakeholders who have legitimate interests in the quality of education. The views of representatives of several of these interest groups have been sought in the course of this study.

Because policy-making is a reflection of the value systems of the policy makers it is appropriate when examining policy to utilise qualitative research methodologies, which acknowledge the influence of human values. The qualitative research paradigm
is derived from the humanities, with an emphasis on holistic information and interpretative approaches (Husen, 1988b). It is defined succinctly by Bogdan and Biklen (1992, p. ix) as “a research mode that emphasises description, induction, grounded theory, and the study of people’s understanding.”

Humes (1979) supported the notion of qualitative research through “analytical reflection of our experiences” (p. 144) as being characteristic of the broad field of educational theory. Such notions as the analysis of concepts, the uncovering of preconceptions embodied in practice, and the promotion of new values are as much a part of educational research as rigid empirical investigation (Humes, 1979). Important issues should not be ignored because they do not lend themselves to empirical scientific study. He suggested that significant contributions to the state of education in Scotland would be made by non-empirical investigations of, among other things, policy-making in the Scottish Education Department and the development of the General Teaching Council for Scotland, which had responsibility for teacher registration and accreditation of initial teacher education. It is hoped that this qualitative thesis can make a significant contribution to the state of education in Australia by focusing attention on some significant aspects of Australian educational policy-making, namely the potential for regulation of the teaching profession through registration, accreditation and advanced certification to improve teachers’ professional standing.
The early stages of the thesis are descriptive and inductive, drawing data for comparative analysis from documentary material. The later empirical stage is evaluative, using interviews. Scriven (1983) advocated that we should recognise the value of critical evaluation as a tool for educational research that would bring about improvements in practice.

The trends towards the use of qualitative methodologies for research into education and educational policy are discussed in the following section. It is important to consider in an historical context the reasons for that paradigm shift in order to understand why qualitative methods were chosen as most appropriate for this study of policy.

Qualitative versus Quantitative Methods in Policy Research

Logical positivism or neopositivism dominated social science and educational research from the 1940s (Cohen & Manion, 1996; Husen, 1988a). The positivist paradigms reflected the belief that empirical-analytic inquiry methods are the only sources of true knowledge (Booth, 1988). Positivists “take the social reality educational research deals with as a fact and take for granted that research can advance ‘objectively’ valid statements about that reality” (Husen, 1988a, p. 173). Much of the educational research conducted in the 1960s gave little attention to the individual and relied on the collection and statistical analysis of large amounts of quantitative data (White, 1983).

The 1960s saw the beginning of a major critical assault on the dominance of the positivist tradition in social science and educational research (Booth, 1988; White,
Researchers, who in the main used quantitative methods, were being accused of producing results that were of little use or relevance to practitioners (Husen, 1988a). Cohen and Manion (1996) have suggested that the findings of positivistic research in the social sciences were often perceived as “. . . so banal and trivial that they are of little consequence for those for whom they are intended, namely teachers, social workers, counsellors, personnel managers, and the like” (p. 25). Educational administrators, policy-makers and practitioners began to dismiss the outcomes of research as not relevant to their needs (Booth, 1988; Nisbet, 1988; Popkewitz, Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1979; Scriven, 1983; Williamson, 1994).

In the 1970s, Shulman (1970) suggested that the traditional—mainly quantitative—approaches to educational research had failed to produce much in the way of workable theories or to make significant contributions to practice. He argued for a reconstruction of educational research and suggested that researchers needed to identify clearly “the most fruitful routes towards the development of an empirically based discipline of education” (p. 371).

In the last two decades there has been an increase in the number of researchers who have gone further than Shulman to criticise explicitly the application of quantitative, scientific methodologies to educational research (Kallos, 1980). The alternative naturalistic paradigm for educational research—qualitative rather than quantitative—has gained great support (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Miles & Huberman, 1991; Scriven, 1983). Educational researchers have begun to make greater
use of qualitative methodologies that, by their nature, take into account the proclivities of human subjects (Nisbet, 1988; Popkewitz et al., 1979; Scriven, 1983; Williamson, 1994). There has been a significant increase in the use of qualitative methods in Australian educational research through the 1990s (McGaw, 1996).

The naturalistic paradigm explicitly allows value premises to enter into the research domain (Husen, 1988a). Quantitative methodologies are appropriate for some types of human research, but these methods often limit the capacity of the social scientist to conduct empirical research in a manner which best fits human subjects (Dunlop, 1995). Popkewitz, Tabachnick and Zeichner (1979), Scriven (1983), Nisbet (1988) and Williamson (1994) have been critical of the narrowness of quantitative techniques, and have questioned the net contribution to education of research based around the scientific paradigm. As well, they all take issue with just what constitutes research in the field of education and how the outcomes might be used to improve policy and practice. There is great international interest in the need to strengthen the links between educational research and policy development and practice (McGaw, 1996).

Williamson (1994) contended that in spite of the great deal of time and money expended over many decades on research using the standard paradigm, not much in the way of positive, applicable outcomes for educational policy and practice has resulted. He expressed agreement with Husen (1988a) who suggested that the credibility of researchers in pursuing on-going issues of policy and practice and the connections between the two is in decline because they cannot produce practical answers to the
problems that persist in those realms. A perception by practitioners that research is not very useful retards the dissemination and utilisation of new knowledge (Wiltshire, 1993). This distrust of research is of continuing serious concern in the 1990s (McGaw, 1996).

Two recent reviews of educational research in Australia recommended the development of stronger links between policy-makers, practitioners and researchers to maximise the probability that research and development would contribute more to long-term improvements in Australian education (McGaw, 1996). A paucity of linkages between researchers, practitioners and policy-makers has seriously inhibited the effective use of research findings in education in Australia (Wiltshire, 1993). Williamson (1994) suggested that, increasingly, many of the research questions asked in education will come from policy and practice, and that answers will be generated from the collaboration of researchers with teachers and policy-makers. He proposed that by adopting an approach which involves policy-makers and practitioners and utilising research paradigms beyond the traditional scientific paradigm, researchers will see an increase in the likelihood that real changes in policy and practice will occur.

The methodology used in this thesis goes beyond the traditional paradigm to use qualitative, inductive techniques in the analysis of policy. As well, it involves key stakeholders in evaluating the major outcome of the study. The use of interviews with spokespersons of key stakeholders in the evaluation is a response to the need to involve policy-makers and administrators in this policy-oriented research project.
Induction and the Use of the “Constant Comparative” Method

A great advantage of using qualitative methodologies in policy analysis and evaluation is that they are especially oriented towards exploration, discovery and inductive logic (Patton & Westby, 1992). The inductive process of beginning with specific observations and building towards general patterns is utilised in this study. The inductive approach begins with the researchers immersing themselves in documents in order to identify the themes that seem meaningful. It is the perceptions of the writers, or producers, of the documents that must be ascertained in order that the inductive categories will emerge from the data (Berg, 1995).

This thesis uses a particular form of inductive analysis, the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). It is utilised here to examine how the three policy mechanisms of registration, accreditation and advanced certification operate in educational systems of Australia and other places, namely England and Wales, Scotland, some states in the USA, New Zealand, and British Columbia and Ontario in Canada. Each educational system is considered to be a “multiple comparison group” (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, pp. 47, 49-60). Theories that result from the constant comparative investigations are “grounded” in the real-world patterns of the data (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). That is, the study does not draw from any prior, articulated theory, but allows theory to be generated as the data are collected and analysed.
Glaser and Strauss expounded grounded theory and the constant comparative method in the late 1960s. Bailey (1982) credits them with providing the “most comprehensive explication of grounded theory” (p. 55). Recent methodological texts, such as those of Bogdan and Biklen (1992) and Glesne and Peshkin (1992), still present the approach much as Glaser and Strauss (1967) originally had. The use of the constant comparative approach has become widespread, and grounded theory—upon which it is based—is even described as the “classic” method of the qualitative paradigm by Miles and Huberman (1991, p. 22).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) contended that, in the early years of the paradigm shift from quantitative methodologies to qualitative methodologies, there were two general approaches to the analysis of qualitative data:

1. The converting of data into a crudely quantifiable form so that hypotheses can be provisionally tested. This entails firstly coding\(^1\) all relevant data that bear on a point and then systematically assembling, assessing and analysing the data in an attempt to produce a proof for a given proposition.

2. The inspection of data for new properties of the analyst’s theoretical categories, with memoing\(^2\) of these properties in order to generate theoretical ideas—new categories and their properties, hypotheses and interrelated hypotheses. In this

---

\(^1\) Strauss and Corbin (1990) equate “coding” and “analysis” (p. 57), and describe these as the set of processes whereby data are “broken down, conceptualised and then put back together in new ways” (p. 57).

\(^2\) A memo is described in Miles and Huberman (1991) as “the theorising write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding... it can be a sentence, a paragraph or a few pages... it exhausts the analyst’s momentary ideation based on data with perhaps a little conceptual elaboration” (p. 69). Bogdan and Biklen (1992) described memos as “think pieces” (p. 122) written about the progress of the research.
case the analyst cannot be confined to the practice of explicitly coding all data first and only then analysing the data. Analysis only after the coding operation has been carried out would interfere with the analyst’s purpose, since the analyst is constantly redesigning and reintegrating theoretical notions while reviewing the material.

(Adapted from Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 101.)

The constant comparative method combines the coding procedures of the first of the approaches above with the mode of theory development of the second by using analytic procedures of “theoretical sampling” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45), whereby the analyst “jointly collects, codes and analyses his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop theory as it emerges” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45). The constant comparative method removes the need to resort to pseudo-quantification of the data in order to verify a priori hypotheses, as practised in the first of the above approaches, and systematises the analysis beyond the mere inspection approach of the second. Two analytic procedures are fundamental to this methodology: “the making of comparisons” and “the asking of questions” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 62).

Miles and Huberman (1991) describe data analysis of the constant comparative method as consisting of three concurrent flows of activity: “data reduction, data display and conclusion/verification” (p. 21). In using the constant comparative method in his study of worker behaviour, Hodson (1991) describes it as a process of comparing the
most recent data with previously obtained data in a search for consistencies, discrepancies, anomalies, and negative cases. Hodson's data consisted of responses to interviews, but his description would hold true for data taken from documents as in this thesis. In his analysis, he filed data according to an initial categorisation, then progressively reduced the data by comparing them with previous statements that had been filed in those categories, keeping running notes on the content of each category. The categories changed over time. Some categories disappeared, with their contents merging into other categories, while other, new, categories emerged out of previous categories as their content made them too heterogeneous. The analysis was halted when Hodson felt that additional interviews yielded very little new information.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) argued that this qualitative technique was particularly suitable for studies where the data were collected from library sources, that is, where documents were to be analysed. They felt very positive about the use of the constant comparative method with historical documents and other library material, believing that they represented concentrated sources of data on the comparative groups with respect to the categories that are generated while theorising.

The constant comparative method is used in this policy-oriented investigation to aid in the categorisation of data in much the same way as it was by Hodson (1991) in his study, described above. What follows now is a more detailed account of how the constant comparative method has been applied in this thesis, within the framework of a rational analysis model.
The Rational Analysis Model: A Framework for Policy-oriented Research

Booth (1988) described research that has direct application to current issues in educational policy or practice as “policy-oriented.” Nisbet (1988) defined policy-oriented research as research which is “designed, managed and reported with the specific purpose of informing policy decisions or monitoring their implementation” (p. 146). The purpose of policy-oriented educational research is to provide information for decision making with respect to educational policy and practice (Keeves, 1988). Clearly, the mode of research for this study is “policy-oriented.”

Nisbet’s definition extends to include evaluation. A policy study is a true evaluation. It is recognised as such because it sets out to identify or assess, for a segment of society, the merits of competing policies (Stufflebeam & Webster, 1980). Critical evaluative research has much potential for bringing about improvements in educational practice (Scriven, 1983). Evaluation constitutes the significant empirical aspect of this study.

Nisbet (1988) promoted a “rational analysis model” (p. 144) as a methodology suited to policy-oriented research. Generally, a rational analysis model depends upon a sequence of stages for solving problems (Nisbet, 1988). The following sequence of stages for a rational analysis approach to policy-oriented research is taken from Nisbet (1988, p. 144):

1. Identify the facts.
2. Specify the objectives.

3. Define the problem.

4. Consider a range of solutions.

5. Determine the implications of each solution.

6. Choose the most effective solution.

7. Communicate the decision.

8. Plan its implementation.

While the methodology used in this study was based upon this rational analysis model, some variation in the sequence was unavoidable due to the nature of the constant comparative approach. It is inherent in this method that as analysis of successive comparison groups progresses, some categories vanish and new categories emerge, and it becomes necessary to go back over data from earlier comparison groups and reconcile that with the new categories.

For convenience, the mode for analysis is described in three sequential stages. The first two stages, analysis (Stage A) and the construction of the model (Stage B), were carried out through the comparative analysis of documentary material for the sample systems. The third stage, the empirical stage of the study (Stage C), involved key stakeholders in an evaluation of the model for regulation of the teaching profession that arose from Stage A and Stage B.
Stage A: Analysis of the Current State of the Regulation of the Profession of Teaching in Australia

In Stage A, the facts were identified, the objectives specified and the problem defined.

It was necessary to establish the standing of teachers as professionals in Australia and the status quo of registration, accreditation and advanced certification in Australia and its states. This analysis was commenced in Chapter 1, where a broad analysis of the status of teachers and their morale was made. This is elaborated upon in Chapter 3, where a more detailed account is given of the application of the policy mechanisms of registration, accreditation and advanced certification in Australia.

There was the need to interpret documentary material from Australia that included journal articles, newspaper clippings, leaflets, state legislation, Hansard reports, curriculum documents and policy documents (cf. Appendix A). The constant comparative method, as used by Hodson (1991) and described above, facilitated the extraction of information from the written material and the simultaneous generation of analytical categories for the regulatory systems of the profession of teaching.

Stage B: The Construction of the Model for Regulating the Profession of Teaching in Australia

In Stage B, a range of solutions and the implications of such solutions were considered.

The goal of Stage B was the construction of a model linking teacher registration, accreditation and advanced teacher certification. From the documents available from overseas—the United States of America, Scotland, England and Wales, New Zealand,
and British Columbia and Ontario in Canada—where the mechanisms were currently operational, comparisons were made according to relevant categorical items. The major categories were registration, accreditation and advanced certification. Sub-categories such as the nature of the “Register,” qualifications required to be eligible for registration as teachers, procedures for registration, disciplinary procedures and ethics became apparent as the data from the comparison groups were analysed. Categorised items that were determined to be necessary or desirable were listed as critical issues at the end of each of Chapter 4 (registration), Chapter 5 (accreditation) and Chapter 6 (advanced certification).

The data gleaned from the documents in Stage A and Stage B that were categorised as necessary or desirable provided the basis for construction of the model, and, as Glesne and Peshkin (1992) suggested, shaped the directions for the evaluation in Stage C. The elements of document analysis are discussed later in this chapter.

Stage C: Evaluation of the Model

The choice of the most effective solution, communication of this and suggestions as to implementation constituted Stage C.

Stage C of the thesis is the empirical evaluation, that is, the evaluation of the model that was generated from the two preceding parts of the study. The evaluation involved interviewing representatives of significant stakeholder groups in order to establish their views as to how efficacious a solution the model might be. Questions posed in the evaluation were generated from the document analyses of Stages A and B. The sample
to be interviewed developed as the study progressed, and included senior representatives of the teachers’ unions, parent bodies, the Department of Education and Training, employers in non-government sectors, professional teachers’ associations, school principals’ associations and the tertiary sector.

The results of the evaluation have been used to suggest amendments to the model so that it represents what the “expert” participants judge to be the most effective model for teacher registration, course accreditation and advanced certification. The final chapters detail the outcomes of the evaluation, with consideration of the implementation of the results.

Selection of the Multiple Comparison Groups

Stages A and B of this study constitute a survey. But instead of surveying human subjects, these first parts of the study investigated a set of abstractions contained in documents and the literature appertaining to the three major dimensions of the study, that is, the policies of teacher registration, accreditation of teacher education and the matter of advanced certification of teachers in education systems of Australia and a sample of other countries. The systems chosen as samples for this thesis were treated as multiple comparison groups as in the constant comparative method. Documents relating to these systems were used as sources of data for generating the major conceptual categories.

The major criterion for selecting the systems that constituted the comparison groups was their theoretical relevance to the development of the conceptual categories. Glaser
and Strauss recommended that as wide a range of groups should be selected as the study dictates during its progression, so that as many properties of the categories as possible should be generated. For the fullest possible development of the categories, comparisons should be made of “any groups, irrespective of their differences or similarities, as long as the data apply to a similar category or property” (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 51). Whatever sets of fundamental differences or similarities exist, upon analysis they become important qualifying conditions under which the categories and properties vary.

Under the constant comparative method the use of comparison groups with minimal differences allows the generation of basic properties of categories and discovery of substantive theory, while selection of dissimilar groups propitiates the discovery of formal theory. The similarities and differences between comparison groups selected in this study ensure the generation of a substantial number of conceptual categories and properties for those categories.

The education systems chosen for the comparative phase of the study are from Ontario and British Columbia (in Canada), England and Wales, Scotland, New Zealand and the United States of America (USA), as well as those of Australia and its states. The systems of many other countries could have been chosen, but it was felt that the systems above have such diversity that they can provide valuable insights into what is happening internationally with respect to registration, accreditation and advanced certification. These comparative systems offer a range of administrative arrangements
and political traditions that allow meaningful comparisons to be made, and even permit
generalisations that can be applied in Australia to be drawn. Crump (1993) identified
these as the countries that are traditionally compared when Australian policy research
efforts attempt to reflect what is happening internationally.

It should be noted that, consistent with the criteria for selection of sample groups for
the constant comparative method, there are differences as well as similarities amongst
the systems. It is important, for example, to bear in mind the differences in the
constitutional provisions for education in the comparative groups (Whitty et al., 1998).
The systems of Scotland, England and Wales, and New Zealand are national, those of
Ontario and British Columbia are provincial, and those from Australia and the USA
are primarily state-based. As well, and of great importance in its significance in
generating properties of the conceptual categories, there is a variety of approaches to
the registration of teachers, accreditation of teacher education courses and advanced
certification required of teachers amongst them.

The similarities amongst the groups include the following. They are systems of
"western industrialised nations" (Whitty et al., 1998, p. 9). There are significant
cultural, economic and historical associations between them, and the predominant
language of these countries is English (Whitty et al., 1998). There is relatively free
interchange of information among these countries. All have both government and non-
government schools, albeit in differing degrees of significance in relationship to the
overall nature of the systems. In all of the sample countries the predominant mode of
teacher training is through degree-awarding institutions, either universities or colleges of education. Additionally, all have experienced waves of public criticism of the quality of teachers and their professional education (Cunningham, 1988).

Education and society in England and Wales, Scotland, New Zealand, Canada and the United States of America have much in common with Australian education and society, and this is why educational researchers in Australia often look to trends in those countries for guidance. Cunningham (1988) referred to the strong cultural similarities between the USA, the United Kingdom and Australia and similarities in their educational and social systems to justify comparing them in a critical evaluation of the accreditation of teacher education in Queensland. To complement a study of teacher appraisal in Australia, Wells (1989) referred to policy developments in that field in the United States, while for similar purposes Forde (1989) referred to what was happening in teacher appraisal in England. In an international comparison of the implementation of policies of key workplace competencies, Borthwick (1993) looked at developments in the United Kingdom, USA and New Zealand as well as in Australia, and found that what was happening in each of those four countries demonstrated “more similarities than differences” (p. 31). Whitty, Power and Halpin (1998) chose England and Wales, Australia, New Zealand, the USA and Sweden for similar reasons as are outlined above for their comparative study of the restructuring of education, Devolution and Choice in Education: The School, the State and the Market. More recently, Brock and Mowbray referred to the education systems of the same

**Data Collection through Document Analysis and Interviews**

Three data collection techniques, participant observation, interviewing, and document collection dominate in qualitative research (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Within each technique a “wide variety of practices can be carried out, some more common than others” (p. 24). Of the three techniques, collection of documents, together with analysis of those documents, has been used to provide important data in Stage A and Stage B, while the Stage C evaluation has utilised interviewing.

**Document Collection and Analysis**

Documentary materials are “singularly useful sources of information, although they have often been ignored, particularly in basic research and evaluation” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 276). It is impossible to gain a proper understanding of post-war educational issues, policies and institutional change without the use of public records, documents and secondary sources (Raab, 1980).

Glaser and Strauss (1967) provided the following as justifications for using documentary material: the accessibility of historical data via documents; the value of written material in overcoming problems of distance; the willingness of those who have committed their ideas to paper to be observed; cost; stability of records; speed of
data gathering; and, the opportunity to revisit the sites of data gathering (that is, the
documents) in order to review analyses. Lincoln & Guba (1985) provided very similar
justifications for using documentary material: they are readily available and
inexpensive; they represent a stable source of data that can be analysed and re-
analysed; they are contextually relevant and written in the natural language of the
setting; they can be statements that satisfy some accountability requirement; and, they
are non-reactive, unlike human respondents.

Documents can be useful to provide corroboration of observations made by the
researcher and could, thus, make observations more trustworthy (Glesne & Peshkin,
1992). More than just providing corroboration, though, documents in their own right
may shape new directions for observations and interviews and provide the researcher
with “historical, demographic, and sometimes personal information that is unavailable
from other sources” (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 52).

There is an enormous diversity of documentary material useable by researchers.
Amongst the written material which could be subjected to document analysis are
diaries, memoranda, graffiti, notes, memorials on tombstones, scrapbooks,
membership lists, newspapers, business and personal letters, autobiographies, minutes
from meetings, policy documents, proposals, codes of ethics, statements of
philosophies, dossiers, students’ records, letters to editors of newspapers, meeting
agendas, evaluation reports, newspaper articles, budgets, brochures, lunch menus,
minutes of meetings and rosters (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992;
Miles & Huberman, 1991). Thus the list of documents useful to researchers is “not quite endless, but very large” (Miles & Huberman, 1991, p. 51).

Lincoln and Guba (1985) felt that the complexity of analysing documents was exacerbated by there being so many “typologies into which documents can be sorted, all of which have relevance for analysis” (p. 277). Categories which they suggested for the sorting of documents included: the source of the document; whether “primary” or “secondary” (or, “hearsay”); “solicited” versus “unsolicited”; “comprehensive” versus “limited”; “edited” versus “unedited” (or, “complete”); “anonymous” versus “signed” (or, “attributable”); “spontaneous” versus “intentional.” Just these would provide some $2^6$, or 64, categories.

Others have suggested simpler, binary classifications. For example, Strauss and Corbin (1990) divided documentary material into two classifications, “technical” and “non-technical,” while Lincoln and Guba (1985) distinguished between “documents” and “records.”

The terms “document” and “record” are often used interchangeably, but Lincoln and Guba (1985) did make a terminological distinction by defining these each in different ways. The term “record” they used to mean “any written or recorded statement prepared by or for an individual or organisation for the purpose of attesting to an event or providing an accounting” (p. 277). Examples of records are: government directories; audit reports; birth certificates; memoranda; Hansard records; and, minutes of meetings. The term “document” was used to “denote any written or recorded
material other than a record that was not prepared specifically in response to a request from the inquirer” (p. 277). Examples of documents include such diverse items as: letters; diaries; speeches; newspaper editorials; case studies; television scripts; photographs; suicide notes; medical histories; and, epitaphs.

Whatever system of classifying written material is used during a document analysis, a researcher must be aware of the nature of the documentary material used and the significance of the documents as well as summarising them (Miles & Huberman, 1991). As Cohen and Manion (1996) have suggested, during the collection and analysis of data, judgements as to the reliability of the documents as sources of data and their worth for the purposes of the study must be made.

A cache of documentary material could be regarded in much the same way as a set of interviews or “conversations” with a sample of people or representatives of different groups. A cache of documents could be of great use in checking out, or correcting, or amplifying whatever hypotheses might be emerging in a study. As well, documentary or library research could provide useful comparative data.

In this study, a broad range of documents and records has been utilised to analyse the state of teacher registration, accreditation of teacher education, and advanced certification for teachers in Australia, and a range of documents from other countries has been analysed to determine how these three policy mechanisms have been dealt with overseas. A sample of the documents and records relating to registration, accreditation and advanced certification that have been derived from overseas sources
are listed in Appendix A, in order to give an idea of the breadth of documentary material used. These include leaflets, booklets, videotapes, annual financial reports and various forms of legislation. Not all of the wide range of documents that were read in the preparation of this thesis have been listed, since they did not all provide data that were useable in the text of the thesis. Data derived from some of the documents have been used in the text of this thesis, and where that has happened, the sources have been cited in the References section of the thesis. From the analysis of these documents a model for these mechanisms of teacher regulation has been designed (Stage B) and evaluated (Stage C). Many of the questions used in the evaluation interviews were generated from the analysis of the documents.

Use of Interviews in the Evaluation

The model was evaluated through interviews. Interviewing is used extensively in educational research to gather qualitative data, often in conjunction with other qualitative techniques. An interview is an encounter between two or more people that has a particular scope and purpose. As a form of naturalistic inquiry, interviews are concerned with providing insightful, descriptive data and formulating concepts that are analytic and sensitising. They allow the interviewer and the respondent to move backwards and forwards in time, to reconstruct the past, interpret the present and predict the future (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The “focus group interview” is one form of interview that has promise as a tool for evaluation (Vaughn, Schumm & Sinagub, 1996). A focus group interview is a means
for gathering data from groups of people through “informal discussion among selected individuals about specific topics relevant to the situation at hand” (Beck, Trombetta & Share, 1986, p. 73). Two particular characteristics differentiate focus group interviews from other qualitative interview procedures: they involve group discussion, and the respondents are specifically targeted rather than randomly selected. A focus group usually has between six and 12 participants, and is conducted by a “moderator” whose task is to use prepared questions and probes to elicit from the participants their perceptions, feelings, attitudes and ideas about a selected topic.

It was intended that focus group interviews would be used for evaluating the model produced in Chapter 7. Letters inviting representatives of stakeholder groups to participate in the evaluation interviews (cf. Appendix B) were sent to potential respondents. Unfortunately, the targeted respondents could not meet together for focus group discussions at convenient times. As a result, individual interviews were conducted.

The interviews were semi-structured, with a set of basic questions and issues to be explored, but neither the exact wording nor the order of the questions was predetermined. The schedule of questions for the interviews is given in Appendix C. This approach was considered to be appropriate since there was to be a small number of respondents and it was not necessary to gather the responses in any standardised form. A verbatim transcript of one of the interviews is provided in Appendix D.
The interviews served the following purposes:

- They contributed to verifying and validating interpretations that have been expressed in earlier chapters with respect to the attitudes of some of the participating interest groups towards registration for teachers. In this way, the interviews became elements of triangulation for validating data that have been gathered by other means, such as document analysis (Cohen & Manion, 1996).

- They have been used to gain some insight into the specific views of the stakeholder groups that have interests in whether the profession of teaching should be regulated.

- The data from the interviews have been used to provide amendments for the model that was being evaluated.

The participants for the evaluation interviews were not determined randomly, but were targeted. Each was a senior representative of a group of stakeholders who had an interest in the question of regulation of the teaching profession. If possible, contact was made in the first instance by telephone. In all cases, a formal invitation to participate was sent by mail (cf. Appendix B). After accepting the invitation, each participant was sent a copy of the model, as presented in Chapter 7 of the thesis, and given at least two weeks to study this in preparation for the interview. The interviews were held at times and dates determined by the participants and at sites chosen by the participants. All participants gave permission for the interviews to be audio-taped.
The selection of participants for the interviews was based on the composition of the State Teachers Registration Boards (STRBs) proposed in the model. The participants for the interviews were chosen from New South Wales, principally for the convenience of the researcher, who lived in that state. However, an important secondary reason for doing so was that, at the time of the evaluation, there was vigorous debate about the introduction of teacher registration in New South Wales through the Teaching Standards Bill that had been introduced into the state parliament. Those invited to participate had all been involved in various capacities in this debate. They included senior representatives of the New South Wales Department of Education and Training, the Association of Independent Schools of New South Wales Limited, the New South Wales Teachers Federation, the New South Wales Independent Education Union, the Joint Council of New South Wales Professional Teachers Associations, the tertiary area through a dean of a university’s school of teacher education, the Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations of New South Wales, the New South Wales Parents Council Incorporated, the New South Wales Secondary Schools Principals Council (for principals of government secondary schools), the New South Wales Branch of the Association of Heads of Independent Schools of Australia (AHISA), and the New South Wales Catholic Education Commission.

The stakeholder groups were chosen so that, in general, for each one that represented an interest group from the government school sector there was a corresponding group that represented views from the non-government sector. There is a limit as to how
many participants should be used in such evaluative interviews. It was considered that the groups selected would give a broad sample of views from the two school sectors, even though some other groups that might have legitimate interests in the questions at hand would be excluded. For example, the New South Wales Secondary Principals Council was invited to participate so that the views of a group that represents the views of a significant group of principals from government schools could be compared with the views expressed by the Association of Heads of Independent Schools of Australia that represents the interests of principals in independent schools. The Primary Principals Council was not amongst those invited to participate, since no counterpart organisation exists for primary school principals in independent schools. Most, but not all, of these stakeholders’ groups were subsequently included on the New South Wales government’s proposed Teaching Standards Board. As well, Senator Crowley, who chaired the Commonwealth’s Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee and produced the report, *A Class Act: Inquiry into the Status of Teachers* (1998), was invited to participate. All of those invited, except the representative of the Catholic Education Commission (CEC), accepted invitations to participate in the evaluation. Care was taken to have a reasonable balance between genders amongst the respondents, the result being that seven men and six women were interviewed.

The data gathered from the interviews were dealt with by the established methods of qualitative research as described by Lincoln and Guba (1985), Miles and Huberman (1991) and Bogdan and Biklen (1992). The data analysis followed a broad
organisational process, including: unitising and coding, where the information was
divided into units of information and coded with a designation for the respondent;
categorising, where units were clustered according to patterns and themes; and, 
relating, where each category was analysed in terms of its relationship to other
categories. This was done by firstly transcribing by hand each of the interviews, 
summarising the interviews in condensed form, and then transferring all salient points
arising from the interviews to file cards for each significant category relating to the
model. These views of the participants, so collated, were used to determine
amendments to the model.

Conclusion
This study of registration, accreditation and advanced certification is policy-oriented,
and as such, it is concerned with decisions based on human values. The qualitative
paradigm, which has been used with increased frequency in Australian research in the
1990s, lends itself to studies that are concerned with human values systems and has
been chosen as the basis for the methodology of this study. It has been argued that the
"traditional" quantitative paradigm is not appropriate, since it would limit the scope of
the study and bring about only narrow outcomes. The methodology is based on a
rational analysis model, and uses the constant comparative method, document
collection and analysis, and interviews.

Policy-makers and other key stakeholders are involved in the study through interviews
that are used in the evaluation phase.
Chapter 3

REGULATION OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION IN AUSTRALIA

This chapter investigates the professional regulation of teaching and teachers in Australia. It commences with a brief historical overview of how a person became a teacher in post-World War II Australia. This important historical background allows the reader to understand how teaching is evolving towards being a graduate entry profession and puts in perspective the significant influence that the universities, which prepare teachers for practice, have on the profession. Then it examines how professional practice is regulated in Australia, through certification in some systems in some states, registration in others and yet in some systems not at all. Certification and registration, the common forms of regulating the employment of teachers, are compared. Particular attention is given to the successful introduction of teacher registration in Queensland and South Australia, and more recent efforts to introduce teacher registration into Tasmania and New South Wales in 1997-98. Accreditation of teacher education and forms of advanced certification for teachers in Australia are examined. The efforts of the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQTL) Working Party on Professional Preparation and Career Development and the establishment and demise of the Australian Teaching Council (ATC) are discussed. These represent Commonwealth Government policy initiatives that attempted to define teachers' work and establish regulatory mechanisms for the profession of teaching.

Two more recent initiatives, the report of the Commonwealth's Senate Committee
inquiry into the status of teaching (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998) and the inquiry by the Australian Council of Deans of Education into standards for initial teacher education (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998), are also discussed.

Becoming a Teacher in Australia

In the early post-war years in Australia, pre-service teacher education\(^1\) could be undertaken through programs of two years, three years or four years duration. However, there were a number of teachers who trained under “emergency” conditions in the period of 1945 to 1960 and who commenced teaching with the equivalent of one year or less of formal preparation (Brennan, 1989). Teacher education for primary school teachers generally was via a two year course at a teachers’ college, while secondary teachers usually underwent three or four years of academic and professional education at a teachers’ college or university (Brennan, 1989). Teachers’ colleges that prepared those intending to teach in government schools were usually staffed and administered by the state’s department of education. Non-government teachers’ colleges were staffed by their respective employing bodies (for example, staffing of the Catholic teachers’ colleges was largely through the Catholic Education Office).

\(^1\) It is possible to distinguish between “training” and “education” when considering the preparation of teachers. However, the terms “training” and “education” are frequently used synonymously by policy-makers, administrators and commentators, including teacher educators, when referring to the academic and practical preparation of teachers. For example, in documents relating to England and Wales the commonly used term is “teacher training.” In this thesis, the term “teacher education” is preferred, to convey the idea that the preparation of teachers involves the acquisition of higher order knowledge and skills. However, the term “training” will sometimes be used in the general sense to cover both training and education.
During the 1960s and 1970s there was considerable change in the nature of pre-service preparation of teachers. By 1970 pre-service courses were no longer provided by teachers' colleges, but by colleges of advanced education (CAEs) and universities (Evans, 1987). No longer were programs of two years duration offered: CAEs provided courses of three years duration leading to the award of a Diploma of Teaching (Dip.T.), while universities typically offered a one year "end-on" Diploma in Education (Dip.Ed.) to those who satisfied the requirement of having graduated with a three year degree (usually a B.A., B.Ec., B.Com. or B.Sc.). It was not uncommon for entrants to Dip.Ed. programs to have honours degrees or higher degrees. There was also a pattern of four-year "concurrent" courses leading to the award of a bachelor's degree and Dip.Ed. or to the award of a four year Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) degree (Beeson, 1987).

During the 1980s there was a rationalisation of tertiary education that particularly affected teacher education. The Commonwealth Government’s Review of Commonwealth Functions in April of 1981 brought about a number of amalgamations of CAEs. The number of CAEs was reduced from 68 to 45, and a number of CAEs amalgamated with universities and non-government teachers’ colleges (Evans, 1987). In the late 1980s the "binary system" of tertiary education, which differentiated between universities and colleges of advanced education, was dismantled as a result of government policies that forced a large-scale amalgamation of the CAEs and existing universities, often producing multi-campus universities (Dawkins, 1988a; Dudley &
Vidovich, 1995). By the end of 1988 almost all higher education institutions had become universities (Dudley & Vidovich, 1995). As a result, since the late 1980s and through the 1990s, the provision of pre-service education for teachers has been almost exclusively through autonomous universities and not colleges administered by the employing body.

In the near future, it is likely that entry-level courses for the profession of teaching will be of four or more years duration, at least in those states where registration of teachers is mandatory. This outcome is consistent with the recommendations of significant reports such as the *National Inquiry into Teacher Education* (Auchmuty, 1980), the *Discipline Review of Teacher Education in Mathematics and Science* (Speedy, 1989), *Teacher Education in Australia* (Ebbeck, 1990), *Teacher Education: Action Plan* (New South Wales Office of Education and Youth Affairs, 1992), *Preparing a Profession* (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998) and *A Class Act: Inquiry into the Status of the Teaching Profession* (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998), all of which strongly support the idea that teaching should become an all-graduate four-year trained profession.

Considerable progress has been made towards this ideal, but it will not be fully achievable unless some form of registration that prescribes four years of training as a minimum qualification for entry to practice in all sectors of the profession is legislated for in all states and territories. Completion of four years of training was set as the minimum necessary for registration as a teacher in Queensland as from January 1,
1998 ("Four-year/Two-year pre-service . . .", 1996; Jansen, 1998; "Strengthening the Teaching Profession," 1996), and is being considered in South Australia (Kerin, 1994; "Nation Review," 1998) and Tasmania (Government of Tasmania, 1997; Wriedt, 1997). The Standards Council of the Teaching Profession in Victoria has affirmed its commitment to a four-year minimum standard of teacher qualification (Laird, 1995). In New South Wales all teacher education courses “are (or are moving towards) at least four academic years in length” (Ministerial Advisory Council on the Quality of Teaching, 1999, p. 40).

In states where registration for all teachers in all systems is not legislated for, and thus where minimum qualifications are not specified, it is possible for people with no formal training to teach (Kelly, 1996; Maling, 1995). For example, in New South Wales the reality is that there is no legal impediment to anyone being a teacher (Kelly, 1996). The same holds for Tasmania (Wriedt, 1997). There is no provision under the Education Acts or industrial awards for teachers in either state that prevents a person without even a minimum level of professional qualification from being employed as a teacher. Even the recent Teaching Standards Bill 1998 (New South Wales Government, 1998) did not require specific professional teacher education for a person to be registered, then employed, as a teacher in New South Wales. That Bill was intended to be “standards driven, not qualifications driven” (Aquilina, 1998b, p. 75).

While the trend in Australian schools has been towards an increase in the numbers of teachers with higher level qualifications (Senate Employment, Education and Training
References Committee, 1998; Williamson, 1994), progress has been slow. In some states there has persisted a substantial number of practising teachers who have only two, or fewer, years of pre-service training. A survey conducted in 1989 by the Australian College of Education of a representative sample of 9,895 teachers in Australian government and non-government schools, with a 65.41% response rate, showed that while the professional qualifications of practising teachers had improved to where 70% of the respondents had completed three or more years of training and 37% had completed four or more years of training, there was still 16% of the nation's teaching service who were two year trained and who had many years of service remaining before their retirement (Logan, Dempster, Berkeley & Warry, 1990). By 1998 more than half the Australian teaching force still had fewer than four years of training, although a quarter were upgrading their qualifications (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998).

Before registration was introduced in Queensland there were many teachers in non-government schools who had little or no teacher training, and the majority of those in state schools had completed only a one or two year teachers' college program. It took the first 21 years of the operation of registration for teachers in Queensland for the proportion of teachers with fewer than three years of training to fall from 60% to less than 10% and for the proportion of teachers with four years of training to rise from less than 20% to over 55% ("From the Chair," 1994).
In Queensland, minimum pre-service qualifications equivalent to four years of university study are now required of a person who wishes to become a registered teacher (Jansen, 1998). From the beginning of 1999 at least two years of that preparation must be accredited professional teacher education. Similar requirements have been considered for Tasmania, where the state government has expressed support for a School Teachers Registration Bill (Government of Tasmania, 1997; “Nation Review,” 1998; Wriedt, 1997). The Teaching Standards Bill, which was introduced into the New South Wales parliament late in 1998 (Aquilina, 1998a, 1998b; New South Wales Government, 1998), was intended to apply to teachers in all schools in New South Wales, but had some weaknesses with respect to the protection of qualifications standards for teachers. The Bill did not mandate any minimum level of teacher education qualifications for a person to be registered as a teacher.

It has been shown above that in the post-war years in Australia the level of academic and professional preparation generally expected of teachers has increased. Most, but not all, teachers now entering the profession have four years of academic and professional education. However, only two states, Queensland and South Australia, enforce this as the normal entry level qualification through mandatory registration for all teachers in all schools.

It will be shown in the next section that the only way to enforce high standards for the academic and professional preparation of teachers is through a system of mandatory registration that applies to all teachers in all sectors. Some school systems have forms
of certification that apply only to teachers in those school systems. However, as will be shown, the protection for qualifications standards that such forms of certification provide is limited, since the employer can unilaterally change requirements for a person to be employed as a teacher in those schools. Furthermore, since certification is only required of teachers in a specific system, it does nothing to prevent other school systems from employing people who are inadequately qualified as teachers.

Occupational Regulation of Teachers in Australia

In some school systems in some states there are strict, legally established requirements that a person must meet in order to be employed as a teacher. In others, as Maling (1995) has pointed out, anyone can be employed as a teacher. Because of the variations in the rigidity of control of entry to the profession from state to state, teaching in Australia has been called a partially regulated occupation (Boston, 1997; Government of New South Wales, 1997). Where regulation exists, it is usually through one of two mechanisms: certification or registration. In this section, differences between the ways in which teachers are regulated in Australia are exemplified by referring to how teachers become certificated in Australia's largest government school system, that of New South Wales, and how teachers must be registered in Queensland and South Australia. Under certification in New South Wales, the employer sets standards for employment, while under registration as practised in Queensland and South Australia a statutory registration authority sets standards.
Teacher Certification

The New South Wales government school system is used here as an example of a system in which teachers become “certificated” rather than “registered.” Certification, in this sense, is the granting of a credential unique to a school system—such as the “Teacher’s Certificate” of the NSW Department of Education and Training—that signifies a teacher’s eligibility for continued employment beyond probation in that system. It is a status granted by the employer who, in the case of the New South Wales government school system, is the Director-General of Education and Training. As needs arise, the Director-General—as statutory head of the state’s Department of Education and Training—can make variations in the minimum qualifications required for a person to be eligible for initial and continuing employment as a teacher and for certification (Dixon, 1996).

A person can become a teacher in a New South Wales government primary school through five pathways. These are:

1. Completion of higher education studies endorsed by the Department of Education and Training.
2. Recognition of teacher qualifications obtained from other states and overseas.
3. Retraining to convert prior teaching qualifications to a primary school teaching qualification.
4. Gaining credit for experience as a teacher in another sector.
5. Having prior learning, industry experience and special skills recognised as part of an advanced standing process in a teacher education program in a tertiary institution.

(Adapted from New South Wales Department of School Education, 1997, p. 1.)

There are similar pathways for a person wishing to teach in a New South Wales government secondary school. Tertiary qualifications that are endorsed by the Department of Education and Training include Diplomas in Teaching and integrated Bachelor of Teaching or Bachelor of Education degrees of at least three years duration. Other pathways are four or five years of preparation via a bachelors degree with a postgraduate Diploma in Education or a Master of Teaching. The tertiary qualifications should have been earned at a university in New South Wales, or another state of Australia, or may be from overseas if they are recognised as the equivalent (New South Wales Department of School Education, 1997).

The above qualifications standards for employment of teachers in government schools in New South Wales are determined by the Director-General of Education and Training, who may take into account recommendations of a Teacher Qualifications Advisory Panel (the TQAP). Decisions on standards by the TQAP relate only to government schools. As its name suggests, this panel is “advisory” to the Director-General of Education and Training, who may choose to accept or ignore the recommendations of the TQAP. The Director-General has the statutory power to vary qualifications requirements and employ untrained and unqualified people as teachers.
as he or she so determines (Dixon, 1996). Teaching in the government schools sector is one of the few occupations where the employer alone determines who can or cannot practise (Kelly, 1996).

After satisfying the Director-General’s current qualifications requirements for employment in a state school, and then securing a teaching position, the neophyte is regarded as a probationary teacher for a period of one full year of teaching. Certification is granted if, during the probationary period, the neophyte shows signs of effectiveness in the classroom and demonstrates a professional approach. Examples of professional behaviour from the certification document (New South Wales Department of Education, 1992) include marking work on time, being punctual, attending assemblies and completing playground duties. The probationer must attend prescribed in-service activities, including a “beginning teacher in-service program.” After earning a satisfactory report from the school’s principal, based upon having satisfied the criteria referred to above, the successful neophyte is granted a “New South Wales Teacher’s Certificate” (New South Wales Department of Education, 1992).

Certification is “recognition that the teacher has satisfactorily completed the first stage of a continuing growth process” (New South Wales Department of Education, 1992, p. 4). It is indicative of satisfactory performance rather than a measure of high level achievement in the school environment, and further development in competence is expected as the teacher gains more experience.
Attainment of the New South Wales Teacher’s Certificate is highly dependent upon the professional judgement of the neophyte’s principal in the school, although usually the principal will rely on reports from those members of staff who have a delegated responsibility for observing the neophyte at work. It should be noted that an external agent only assesses the neophyte if he or she appeals against the refusal of certification.

Failure to gain certification can have two outcomes. The neophyte may be granted more time to qualify, continuing as a “conditionally certificated” teacher, or the principal may recommend termination of the teacher’s services. Certification granted in New South Wales holds no legal status in other states or systems, but may be a factor in allowing the teacher to qualify for employment as a teacher in another state or in another school system. Failure to gain certification in New South Wales does not prevent a teacher from applying to be registered in another state, nor does it prevent a person from being employed in, for example, the Catholic system or an independent school.

Because non-government schools do not have a system-wide method for assessing the standard of a beginning teacher, no terminology equivalent to “certification” is used in their industrial awards. Employment as a teacher in a non-government school in New South Wales is, to all intents and purposes, unregulated.
Systems of Teacher Registration in Australia

Registration is meant to ensure that people who seek to enter and practise a particular occupation are qualified and competent to do so (Ingvarson 1995; Jansen, 1997; Kelly, 1996). Registration of the practitioners of a profession serves the purpose of providing a public safeguard by establishing high standards for entry to a profession (Ingvarson, 1995; Jansen, 1997; Kelly, 1996). Ingvarson (1995) felt that such a public safeguard was needed to ensure that aspirants to the profession of teaching were “fit and proper” (p. 7) people suited to teaching, and to ensure that employers “will act in the interests of the public they serve” (p. 7). Registration also shapes the quality of training for practitioners through periodical review and modification of the standards used for assessing and accrediting university programs for that profession (Ingvarson, 1995).

In Australia, many professionals are regulated by a registration or licensing system. Examples include legal practitioners, doctors, accountants, occupational therapists, veterinarians and engineers (Brennan, 1990; Kelly, 1996). It is typical for these professions to have licensing requirements through a state or national body—their profession’s registration board (Brennan, 1990). For example, the Psychologists Act of 1989 empowered the Psychologists’ Registration Board of New South Wales to set the conditions under which a person can be registered and allowed to enter into practice as a psychologist. As well as granting licence to practise, a profession’s registration body usually has disciplinary powers. For instance, the Legal Profession Act of 1987
conferred upon the Law Society the power to issue or cancel a solicitor’s practising certificate, without which he or she cannot practise law (Nelson, 1990).

Mandatory Registration for All Teachers in Queensland and South Australia

The existence of an autonomous standards board is the “hallmark of a profession” (Jansen, 1998, p. 13; Wise & Liebbrand, 1993, p. 155). The only two such bodies for teachers in Australia are the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration and the Teachers Registration Board of South Australia. Both are independent statutory authorities. The compositions of the two existing teacher registration boards are shown below in Table 1.
Table 1: Composition of the Teachers’ Registration Boards of South Australia and Queensland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH AUSTRALIA (From the South Australian <em>Education Act 1972</em>)</th>
<th>QUEENSLAND (From the Queensland <em>Education (Teacher Registration) Act 1988</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAIR.</strong> Appointed by the state’s Governor on the nomination of the Minister.</td>
<td><strong>CHAIR.</strong> Appointed by the Governor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two appointees of the Director-General.</td>
<td><em>Three nominees of the Director-General (at least two must be practising teachers).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Six persons (of whom at least one is a teacher employed by a non-government school) elected by the Institute of Teachers.</em></td>
<td>Two representatives of non-government bodies employing teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One appointee representing the South Australian Independent Schools Board of Headmasters and Headmistresses Incorporated.</td>
<td><em>A nominee of the Queensland Teachers’ Union (who must be a practising teacher).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One nominee of the South Australian Commission for Catholic Schools.</td>
<td><em>A nominee of the Queensland Association of Teachers in Independent Schools (who must be a practising teacher).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>One nominee of the Association of Teachers in Independent Schools.</em></td>
<td><em>A nominee of the Professional Officers’ Association (who must be a practising teacher).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>One representative of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia (a member of staff of a teacher training institution).</em></td>
<td><em>Two representatives of institutions of higher education (both must be practising teacher educators).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A nominee of the Director of Children’s Services.</td>
<td>A parent nominated to represent community groups involving children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Three elected, registered teachers.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A nominee of the Minister if additional representation is considered desirable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These ensure that the majorities of the 14 members of the South Australian board and of the 16 members of the Queensland board are practising teachers or teacher educators.
It is a function of the registration board of a profession to protect the autonomy of the profession, and it generally does this by developing a form of self-government that sets rules or "standards" for the profession (Brennan, 1990). Comprised principally of practitioners, professional registration boards are usually responsible for professional registration and accreditation of pre-service courses, and in some cases are seeking to ensure that practitioners undergo continuing professional development. Criteria for admission to the profession, educational standards, licensing or other formal entrance examinations, career paths, and areas of jurisdiction for the profession are set by the registration boards (Brennan, 1990).

The establishment of the registration board for teachers in Queensland was due in no small part to the angry reactions of Queensland teachers to the introduction of the Emergency Adult Teacher Training Scheme (EATTS) in 1968 ("Eight week teacher training plan . . .", 1991; Jansen, 1997, 1998). This scheme was designed to overcome a shortage of secondary teachers. Adult graduates would undergo just eight weeks of professional training and then be appointed to teach in schools (Jansen, 1997). There is great doubt as to the effectiveness of such emergency schemes (Kramer, Moore & Baker, 1991). Porter (1990) described such emergency credentialing as "weak" (p. 150). The Queensland Teachers' Union staged a highly public industrial campaign to have the scheme withdrawn. While not fully successful, the campaign did force the government to modify the scheme to a slightly more acceptable form. In the aftermath of the EATTS struggle, teachers resolved that there should be a registration body to
protect established professional standards. Teacher registration was seen as a first significant step towards the dual objectives of achieving the best possible education for Queensland children and of gaining professional recognition for Queensland teachers (Board of Teacher Registration, Queensland, 1990).

In 1970 the Committee to Review Teacher Education (chaired by G.K.D. Murphy, Queensland’s Director-General of Education) recommended the establishment of a board that had responsibility to the Minister for teacher registration (Board of Teacher Registration, Queensland, 1990). The Queensland government accepted the recommendation, and in June 1971 the Queensland Board of Teacher Education was formed under amendments of the *Education Act (1970)*. Through it, a system for the voluntary registration of teachers in Queensland schools was introduced on 1 February 1973. Registration became compulsory for primary and secondary teachers in 1975, for pre-school teachers in 1981, and for teacher educators who have a need to enter schools to supervise or assess the work of a practising teacher or student teacher in 1989. Under the *Education (Teacher Registration) Act 1988* the Board of Teacher Education was replaced by the Board of Teacher Registration in 1989.

Statutory regulation of the profession by way of registration was seen to represent the “legislature’s concern for the public interest” (Board of Teacher Registration, Queensland, 1990, p. 1). The purpose of teacher registration in Queensland is to “ensure that standards of entry into the profession [are] established and protected so that, in the public interest and in the interests of students in particular, only qualified
teachers should be licensed to practise in Queensland schools” (Board of Teacher Registration, Queensland, 1990, p. 1). Without registration a person cannot teach in any pre-school, primary school or secondary school in Queensland. Nor can a teacher educator supervise a student teacher’s practicum without being registered (Board of Teacher Registration [Queensland], 1995, 1996).

There are two levels of registration in Queensland, “provisional” and “full.” Usually, an applicant with appropriate qualifications and evidence of good character will be granted provisional registration and be issued with a registration certificate attesting to this. After a year of being provisionally registered, and upon gaining a satisfactory report from the school’s principal, the teacher may be granted full registration. In rare cases, worthy applicants may be granted full registration at the outset under the Board’s “exceptional entry” provisions (Board of Teacher Registration [Queensland], 1995). The teacher is personally liable for the fees for seeking and maintaining registration. Registration is renewable annually.

In South Australia, registration of teachers and administrators in pre-schools, primary schools and secondary schools was made mandatory under the Education Act of 1972, which established the South Australian Teachers Registration Board. The purpose of registration of teachers in South Australia is embodied in Section 60 (Clause 1) of the South Australian Education Act (1972) where the functions of the Board are described as being “to establish, maintain and operate a system of registration for teachers with a view to safeguarding the public interest in pre-school, primary and secondary
education by ensuring that it is undertaken only by competent persons” (Government of South Australia, 1972, p. 25). An applicant for registration must satisfy the Board that he or she is a “fit and proper person to be registered,” and that he or she has at least the prescribed minimum qualifications. Initially a successful applicant should expect to be granted “provisional registration.” A person with more than 200 hours of teaching experience may be granted full registration at the outset. In South Australia, registration must be renewed every three years, although consideration has been given to making it renewable annually (Kerin, 1994).

While registration of teachers in South Australia and Queensland appears, in principle, to be similar to certification in New South Wales, there are significant differences. In particular, under registration it is not the employer that sets minimum academic and professional training standards for the profession, but the profession and other stakeholders, including employers, through representation on the registration board. Furthermore, unlike the situation in New South Wales, registration can be required of teachers in non-government schools as well as in government schools in South Australia and Queensland. In addition, the two registration boards make recommendations as to the suitability of tertiary programs of teacher education, that is, “accreditation.”

The registration boards also monitor continuing professional standards and can take disciplinary action against teachers who do not maintain certain standards of professional behaviour. Section 39 of the Queensland Education (Teacher
Registration Act 1988 explicitly gave the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration the power to inquire into cases of alleged misconduct or incompetence and to discipline teachers who have transgressed acceptable standards. By May 1994 the Queensland Board of Teacher Education (which existed between 1970 and 1989) and its successor, the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration (established in 1989), had considered some 61 misconduct reports to be so serious as to warrant official inquiries. These resulted in the deregistration of 27 teachers, suspension of seven and the cautioning of a further 18 (“From the Chair,” 1994). Fifteen of those inquiries were conducted after the new registration board was established, and resulted in eight of the deregistrations, one suspension and three cautions (“Teachers Deregistered,” 1994). Two examples of such disciplinary action are given from June of 1995, when one teacher had his name removed from the Register of the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration following investigations of 13 counts of indecent dealing with a girl under 12 years, and another had his registration suspended after he pleaded guilty to wilfully exposing a child under 16 to an indecent publication (“Names Removed . . .,” 1995).

Division IV of the South Australian Education Act (1972) sets conditions under which an inquiry may be held and under which registration in that state may be cancelled. The conditions, essentially, are gross incompetence, disgraceful or improper behaviour, and mental or physical incapacity that prevents a teacher from properly discharging required duties. Each year about six teachers in South Australia lose their licences to teach (“Teachers face new discipline penalties . . .,” 1995).
Registration establishes obligations for teachers and for schools. In the public interest, schools that are subject to registration are obliged to forego the right to employ any person (Jansen, 1998), that is, schools may only employ as teachers those who are registered. Teachers are obliged to maintain their registration. People who are not registered may not be employed to teach. Under the [Queensland] *Education (Teachers' Registration) Act* of 1988 the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration has the power to take action against teachers who have not satisfactorily maintained registration. In October 1991, the Board issued 14 teachers with notice of intention to initiate proceedings under the *Act*. All 14 subsequently completed their registration requirements, avoiding further action ("Teacher census . . .," 1991). Similar powers are available to the South Australian Teachers Registration Board under that state’s *Education Act (1972).*

Queensland and South Australia, the two Australian states that presently have registration boards, have mutual recognition agreements that specify conditions under which people teaching in other jurisdictions may teach in those states. Teachers registered in South Australia or Queensland need not meet additional conditions to be registered in the other state ("Mutual recognition agreement . . .," 1994). Further, cross-Tasman mutual recognition agreements have been entered into which allow teachers registered in Queensland and South Australia to have the benefit of "streamlined" processing of their registration applications if they seek registration in New Zealand ("Mutual recognition across . . .," 1995).
**Partial Registration in Victoria**

Registration in Victoria is mandatory only for teachers in non-government schools. The replacement of the Victorian Teachers Registration Board by the Standards Council for the Teaching Profession (SCTP) in 1993 has already been discussed in Chapter 1.

**Recent Moves to Introduce Teacher Registration in Other States**

During 1996, the New South Wales Minister for Education and Training referred the issue of registration for teachers in New South Wales to the Ministerial Advisory Council on the Quality of Teaching (MACQT) (Eltis, 1997d; "Teaching Registration under Consideration in NSW," 1996). In October 1997, a Ministerial Discussion Paper was released for public comment (Eltis, 1997d; Government of New South Wales, 1997). Submissions were collected by MACQT and forwarded to the Minister for his further action. The outcome of these inquiries, to be discussed in later chapters, was the announcement on 26 October 1998 by the Premier of New South Wales of his intention to introduce mandatory registration for teachers in government and non-government schools in New South Wales by the end of 1998 (Carr & Aquilina, 1998). To effect this, a *Teaching Standards Bill* was introduced into the New South Wales Parliament on 11 November 1998 (Aquilina, 1998a, 1998b; New South Wales Government, 1998). In the second reading of the *Bill* in parliament, the Minister, Mr. Aquilina, described it as an anomaly for a state not to grant to school teachers the status and professional recognition signified by having their own registration body (Aquilina, 1998a).
The New South Wales *Teaching Standards Bill* failed to be sent to the Upper House before parliament was prorogued for an election in December of 1998. This, effectively, defeated the *Bill*. Subsequently, at the 1999 annual conference of the New South Wales Teacher Education Council, the Minister for Education and Training, Mr. J. Aquilina, announced that the government would not proceed with the reintroduction of similar legislation without “overwhelming community and professional support [for it]” (“Off the register,” 1999).

Despite the Minister putting the issue aside, in a major report on initial and continuing teacher education, the Ministerial Advisory Council on the Quality of Teaching (1999) recommended that teacher registration be reconsidered at some point in the future. They emphasised in their recommendation that any teacher registration authority that might be instituted should ensure the portability of registration of teachers between all states and territories (Ministerial Advisory Council on the Quality of Teaching, 1999).

It should be noted that at a major conference called to publicly discuss the issue, the concept of registration for teachers in New South Wales was given qualified support by Dr. K. Boston, the then New South Wales Director-General for Education and Training. Boston decried the view reported in the Ministerial Discussion Paper (Government of New South Wales, 1997) that teaching, as a partially regulated occupation, should be fully deregulated under the National Competition Policy Agreement, to which New South Wales is a signatory (Boston, 1997). It was Boston’s view that teaching should be a fully regulated profession, and that teacher registration
could demonstrate a net public benefit as required under the National Competition Policy Agreement. Boston (1997) saw the involvement of practising teachers with their professional registration authority as crucial if teaching were to be recognised as a profession. Then, teachers themselves would take the responsibility for defining their standards of practice and code of ethics. They would also need to take responsibility for disciplining members who breached codes of behaviour (Boston, 1997).

In 1997, the Labor opposition in Tasmania attempted to introduce registration through the School Teachers Registration Bill, 1997 (Government of Tasmania, 1997; Wriedt, 1997). The proposed Tasmanian Bill had registered teachers in the minority on the council of the registration authority. The then Liberal government in Tasmania opposed the Bill (Bingham, 1998). The Minister for Education and Vocational Training, Mrs S. Napier, considered the Bill to be an expensive process and disputed that teacher registration would do anything to increase teacher quality (Napier, 1998). Before a decision could be made, the Tasmanian parliament was dissolved and an election held. The Tasmanian Labor party gained power, and the new Minister for Education, Ms. Paula Wriedt, has stated that one of the new government’s priorities would be to reintroduce the Bill and see to its successful passage (personal communication, 1998).

While the parliaments of New South Wales and Tasmania actively debated teacher registration between 1997 and 1999, albeit without a positive outcome, the government of Western Australia has only recently commenced tentative investigations of the
issue. Western Australia’s Minister for Education, the Hon. Colin Barnett, has commissioned a discussion paper to explore the issue “without any commitment” (Nation Review, 1999, p. 5). The paper is to be developed by a cross-sectoral reference group, chaired by Mr. Peter Browne. It is expected that the paper will be presented to the Minister by June of 1999.

Some Generalisations Drawn from an Examination of the Two Major Forms of Regulating Teachers in Australia: Registration and Certification

From the foregoing material of this chapter, a comparison of the properties of the two major mechanisms associated with the regulation of teachers in the Australian context has been made. This is summarised in Table 2.
### Table 2: Comparison of Certification and Registration of Teachers in Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification is a regulatory mechanism of the body that employs the teacher.</td>
<td>Registration is the granting of a licence to practice, under the laws of the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification is granted by the employer – the state’s Director-General of Education.</td>
<td>The legally constituted registration board, not the employers, grants registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employer, who has the power, as statutory head, to vary these, determines minimum qualifications.</td>
<td>Minimum qualifications are set by the registration board, which ideally is remote from the employing body and represents the views of the profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional discipline is the domain of the employer.</td>
<td>Professional discipline is the domain of the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary action that disqualifies a person from teaching in the government sector may not prevent a person from gaining employment as a teacher in a school of another sector.</td>
<td>Disqualifying behaviour would prevent a person from teaching anywhere in the state, and perhaps even in other states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification is system-specific. That is, a teacher certificated by the NSW Director-General to teach in NSW government schools is not licensed to teach in another system.</td>
<td>Depending on the legislation, registration may be system-specific or universal. In Queensland and South Australia it is universal, or mandatory for all teachers in all systems. In Victoria it is mandatory for teachers in non-government schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification in one state does not give the certificated teacher formal recognition in other states.</td>
<td>There is mutual recognition of the registration status of teachers between Queensland and South Australia, as well as agreements between those states and New Zealand that facilitate trans-Tasman registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification has a “probationary” phase.</td>
<td>Registration has a “ probationary” or “provisional registration” phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher educators need not be certificated teachers, since universities are out of the control of the Director-General.</td>
<td>Teacher educators who need to enter schools to supervise students undertaking the practicum must be registered teachers in Queensland, but not in South Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification is granted once in the teacher’s professional life. It does not have to be renewed or maintained. So long as the teacher does not incur disqualifying disciplinary action or have competence questioned, certification is perpetual.</td>
<td>Registration is periodically to be renewed. Unless a teacher maintains a registered status action can legally be taken by the registration board to prevent the teacher from practising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registration as established in South Australia and Queensland is embedded in each state’s laws, and applies to teachers in all sectors of school education within the
respective state. In Queensland and South Australia, the registration boards are statutory bodies that are largely representative of the profession itself.

A registration board can effectively guard professional standards, and contribute to raising the status of teachers. At the same time, a registration board ensures the right of the public to have a quality teaching profession. Jansen (1998) has said, “teachers themselves are not the prime beneficiaries [of registration] . . . The ones who will gain most . . . are those most directly affected—the students who attend our schools” (p. 3). Registration boards have responsibilities for:

- setting qualifications standards for entry to the profession;
- ensuring that those who are admitted to the profession are “fit and proper” persons to practise;
- monitoring the standards of institutions that offer programs for the preparation of teachers for service;
- establishing codes of professional practice and ethics; and,
- disciplining those who fail to adhere to the required standards of professional and ethical behaviour.

A registration board, established through legislation, can have jurisdiction beyond single systems to all teachers in the state. With mutual agreements on standards between states, and with enabling Commonwealth legislation, matters such as the privileged exchange of relevant information as to the registration status of teachers
transferring between states could be facilitated, for example, to guard against a person who has been disqualified from teaching in one state or system from obtaining further employment as a teacher by moving interstate.

Accreditation of Teacher Education in Australia

In the context of higher education, accreditation means that a university, a program of study or a course has satisfied certain predetermined standards. The Australian Council of Deans of Education (1998) was careful to distinguish between the terms approval and accreditation as used by higher education institutions. For universities, approval usually relates to “agreement between parties on the broad objectives and content of a course and its appropriateness to the educational profile and academic plans of the institution” (p. 38), while accreditation is the result of “a detailed examination by academics in the discipline and their peers of course objectives, curriculum, assessment processes, resource requirements, teaching delivery approaches, and graduate attributes” (p. 39). Generally in this thesis, where accreditation is used, it is to be understood in this more technical sense, as defined by the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE).

Taylor (1981) suggested that accreditation should be an external process conducted by an appropriate body that can confer upon an institution, a program of study or a course “academic or professional authority . . . which implies release from direct supervision” (p. 11). In this thesis, a process of recognition by a professional body that a program meets the standards required by the profession to prepare graduates for initial practice.
will be referred to as external accreditation. Explicit external accreditation of initial professional education courses is conducted by many professional bodies (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998).

An alternative approach to accreditation by an external authority is that of self-accreditation. Self-accreditation is practised by universities and was seen by West (1998) as one of the great strengths of tertiary education institutions in Australia. Typically under self-accreditation, universities require all programs to be reviewed regularly and systematically by a Committee of Review that includes representatives from the employing bodies, unions, the community and students, as well as the faculty. Information about each program is sought from all stakeholders. The structure and content of programs and all assessment and evaluation processes for those programs are examined by the Committee. Sometimes individual subjects are sent to experts outside the faculty for evaluation. Any subsequent recommendations for modifications to programs are then considered by the faculty boards and finally the Senate of the university. In the case of teacher education programs such reviews take place every three to five years (Ministerial Advisory Council on the Quality of Teaching, 1998).

Two significant forms of accreditation are program accreditation and institutional (or provider) accreditation. Program accreditation focuses on the suitability of individual courses or a set of courses (that is, a program) as a preparation for professional practice. The now defunct Australian Teaching Council had prepared draft guidelines for program accreditation which acknowledged that, while higher education
institutions are responsible for developing and monitoring their initial teacher education programs, they have a responsibility to ensure that their courses do prepare graduates who are suitable for professional recognition, that is registration, as teachers (Australian Teaching Council, 1995b). Institutional accreditation ensures that the university, or other provider, has the staff, facilities and other infrastructure to deliver effective teacher education programs.

There is a strong case for the establishment of accreditation standards at state and national levels in order to further develop the status of teaching as a profession in Australia (Williams, 1995a). In 1998, the ACDE published a report, Preparing a Profession (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998), in which they recommended that institutional and program accreditation for teacher education should be established on a national basis. An accreditation body would be established and the ACDE’s national standards and guidelines for initial teacher education would be used as the basis for accreditation. The standards and guidelines represent a significant consensus of stakeholders, and these are discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Accreditation of teacher education in Australia originated in 1970 with the establishment of the colleges of advanced education (CAEs) (Cunningham, 1988). External accreditation of courses as academic awards applied only to courses taught within CAEs. The establishment and maintenance of standards in advanced education was the domain, at the national level, of the Australian Council on Tertiary Awards (ACTA) which operated under agreement of the federal and state ministers of
education. When CAEs were established in Australia under the binary system—to complement university education—each state set up a statutory agency with responsibility for the financing, planning, co-ordination and accreditation of CAE courses. The state agencies, such as Queensland’s Board of Advanced Education (BAE), had considerable control over the colleges in their respective states for two main reasons. Firstly, the number of CAEs that were established—some 68 (Evans, 1987)—was greater than a federal body would have been expected to control, and secondly, the colleges were considered to lack the degree of maturity and responsibility needed for them to function autonomously. Since the new CAEs lacked the status of the long established universities, external accreditation of their courses was seen as necessary to assure the public that standards were being maintained and that their students were being well served by the colleges (Cunningham, 1988).

It was by this policy process that teacher education in the CAEs was accredited on a state-by-state basis through this national body, ACTA. The definition of accreditation used by ACTA was the “[provision of] certification that the standards of a course are appropriate to the award to which it leads and that the course and the methods adopted in delivering it are likely to achieve the purpose for which the course was introduced” (Australian Council on Tertiary Awards, 1988, p. 23).

After the closure of the CAEs, under the Ministry of Dawkins in the late 1980s, the provision of teacher education became the domain of the universities. The forty public universities listed in the Higher Education Funding Act and private tertiary institutions
such as Notre Dame University, Bond University, and the Melbourne College of Divinity—not all of which provide teacher education—are self-accrediting (West, 1998). Consequently, there is now no accreditation of teacher education through an external, centralised, national agency such as ACTA (Williams, 1994). It is only in South Australia and Queensland that teacher education must be accredited, on a state basis, by the respective teacher registration boards.

In Queensland and South Australia, the responsibility for accreditation of teacher education is set very purposively in legislation. Section 6(1) of the Education (Teacher Registration) Act (1988) of Queensland (Board of Teacher Registration [Queensland], 1995) and Section 60(2) of the Education Act (1972) of South Australia (Government of South Australia, 1972) each addresses the matter of accreditation of teacher education programs for the purpose of preparing students for initial registration as teachers, and specify their respective teacher registration boards as the statutory bodies that have the responsibility for accreditation. In the next few paragraphs, the way that accreditation is managed by the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration is examined.

While the CAEs functioned, the Queensland body that had the authority to accredit CAE courses as academic awards and submit applications to ACTA for registration was the Queensland Board of Advanced Education (BAE). In accrediting programs of teacher education, the BAE would seek advice from the Board of Teacher Education (which subsequently became the Board of Teacher Registration). The Board of
Teacher Education had the responsibility, specified in the *Education Act*, for the accreditation of teacher education programs in both CAEs and universities as being suitable for the purpose of preparing students for registration as teachers in Queensland. Since the dissolution of the binary system and the demise of the CAEs, the Board of Teacher Registration has retained responsibility for the accreditation of university programs that prepare students for registration as teachers in Queensland (Cunningham, 1988).

There are four stages or procedures for course providers in developing teacher education programs acceptable for purposes of teacher registration in Queensland. Collaboration between the course providers and the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration are essential at all stages. The following descriptions of the stages are taken from *Guidelines on the Acceptability of Teacher Education Programs for Teacher Registration Purposes*, a document published by the Board of Teacher Registration (Queensland) (1999).

The first stage is the “Preliminary Consultation” (p. 21). This is a mandatory, formal requirement where an institution aims to provide teacher education courses for the first time. Where an existing teacher education course provider wishes to introduce a new program or make major changes to an existing program, a preliminary consultation is highly advisable. In the latter case, it is the institution that initiates the preliminary consultation. The preliminary consultation is meant to be part of a collaborative
process by which the Board can provide advice as to the likely acceptability of the planned courses.

In the second stage “Provisional Acceptance” (p. 23) of programs is sought. The institution submits appropriate documentation to the Board. The purpose of this stage is to discover any likely impediments to registration of the graduates of the program. After considering the documentation, the “Professional Education Committee” makes recommendations to the Board as to the provisional acceptance of the program for the purposes of teacher registration in Queensland.

“Confirmation of Acceptance” (p. 24), the third stage, occurs at an appropriate time after the program has been given initial acceptance. Provided that the program has been introduced in a manner consistent with the intentions of the documentation submitted to and approved by the Board, and subject to a satisfactory self-report by the institution as to the implementation, operation and future directions of the course, the Professional Education Committee would make a recommendation to the Board to confirm acceptance of the program.

The fourth stage, the granting of “Continuing Acceptance” (p. 24), depends upon the institution supplying the Board with an annual statement of any changes to the program, to its teaching processes and to its forms of assessment. Every three years the Board will have representatives visit the institution in order to review the on-going implementation of the program with staff of the institution.
In accrediting courses for the purposes of registration of their graduates as teachers, the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration performs a function similar to that performed by the legally constituted registration bodies of many other professions (for example, the professional boards for architects, psychologists, dentists, veterinarians, doctors and lawyers) that register as qualified to practise in those professions only those people who have successfully completed certain approved courses (Cunningham, 1988). The Queensland Board of Teacher Registration may refuse to register graduates of programs that do not meet the standards of the Board’s *Guidelines on the Acceptability of Teacher Education Programs for Teacher Registration Purposes* (Jansen, 1998).

In respect of the assessment of teacher education courses in Victoria, Laird (1995), Chairman of the Standards Council of the Teaching Profession, stated that a set of standards by which the courses could be viewed as a whole rather than as discrete units of separate knowledge must be developed. Such standards, he stated, should result from an integration of theory and practice and be expressed in terms of outcomes rather than the specific content of the courses. This approach, he claimed, can enhance the quality of teacher education courses. The Standards Council has involved teachers, school principals, university faculties and other stakeholders in investigating how teacher education courses can deliver desirable outcomes without prescribing the curriculum content of those teacher education courses. As a result, a set of *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teacher Education Courses* (Standards Council of the Teaching
Profession, 1996) was produced. In the guidelines, the Council viewed the means by which courses are delivered and how assessment is designed and implemented as the prerogative of the providers of the teacher education programs (Laird, 1995; Standards Council of the Teaching Profession, 1996). Specified in the guidelines for evaluation of teacher education courses are outcomes such as what graduates should be expected to know and do, but not “what inputs they should have [encountered] en route” (Laird, 1995, p. 16). Outcomes such as knowledge of subject matter to be taught, skills in managing classes, ability to assess learning and report it to parents, and skills in working with colleagues are specified. The guidelines also emphasise the importance of selecting for courses only people who have personal capabilities likely to lead to good teaching practice. They must have the potential to gain a sound knowledge of the academic disciplines of the courses and to develop skills and practices appropriate for teaching (Laird, 1995; Standards Council of the Teaching Profession, 1996).

Williams (1994) warned that the situation in Australia, where in most states accreditation of teacher education is only via the internal monitoring processes of the universities, will not continue. Teacher educators must investigate what is happening overseas and while they still have the opportunity, determine for themselves what standards should apply to teacher education in Australia. By being pro-active in the area of course accreditation, teacher educators can “contribute towards the creation of a genuine teaching profession in Australia” (Williams, 1994, p. 2).
Advanced Certification for Teachers in Australia

Teacher education should not be considered to end when a person graduates and is granted an initial license to teach. Teacher education should be viewed as a continuing process of developing and enhancing the skills and knowledge of teachers throughout their careers, from entry to pre-service education and on to advanced in-service programs for experienced teachers (British Columbia College of Teachers, 1991; Hall & Hord, 1981; Ministry of Colleges and Universities & Ministry of Education, Ontario, 1990). It is a conceptual convenience to divide teacher education into pre-service education, which is delivered in universities, and in-service education, which is often referred to as continuing professional education (CPE). Wise (1996) promotes the concept of a continuum of teacher education and development through three phases: pre-service education; extended clinical preparation and assessment; and, continuing in-service professional development. This section looks at the provision of CPE in Australia, the utilisation of CPE by Australian teachers and how teachers’ continued registration might be linked to prescribed levels of involvement in continuing professional education.

Registration is acknowledgement that the teacher has satisfactorily demonstrated the “minimal levels of competence” (Williams, 1994, p. 5) that are expected at the beginning of a teaching career. Certification signifies no more than that, either. However, once registered or certificated, in states such as New South Wales, a teacher is not required to provide evidence of further professional education nor undergo
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further tests of skills, knowledge and performance in his or her professional lifetime unless the teacher’s professional performance is called into question or he or she wishes to seek promotion.

The complexity of teaching and the rate at which change in society must be accommodated by schooling have important implications for the professional development of teachers after they enter practice. On a global level, Delors (1996) points out the need for high standards for entry to teaching and continuing education that is relevant to the changing needs of teachers throughout their careers. Continuing economic and technological changes, increased cultural diversity in Australian schools and higher expectations of schools by society have brought about dramatic changes to teacher needs in knowledge, skills, attitudes and values appraisal (France, 1990).

The quality of learning outcomes in schools is directly related to the knowledge and skills of teachers and their access to continuing learning experiences (Ingvarson, 1997). There are a number of professional development objectives that must be achieved by teachers if they are to continue to meet the needs of the young people that schools cater for and to contribute to the provision of quality education in schools (France, 1990).

The achievement of these objectives could be promoted through a requirement that teachers undergo continuing professional development as a condition for continuing registration. France (1990) expressed surprise that, in view of the need, participation in CPE was not mandatory for continuing registration as a teacher or even for leadership roles.
Williamson (1994) sees continuing professional development as a necessary aspect of career development for teachers, stating that teachers must break away from the concept that initial training makes them competent for the entirety of their careers. He links performance appraisal and the need for teachers to meet competency standards with CPE. The profession must involve itself with linking mandatory continuing professional education (CPE) and credentialing for teachers. Laird (1995) states that teachers need on-going, sustained professional development and this needs to be related to promotion criteria. Williamson (1994) cites Bluer (1990), who relates teachers' career development to continuing professional development and sees the need in Australia for teacher employing bodies, universities and other higher education institutes to co-operate in the provision of continuing professional education for teachers.

From 1973 to 1986, the Commonwealth Government provided large amounts of money to the states' Development Committees for the CPE of teachers through what was known as the Professional Development Program (PDP) (France, 1990). The policy frameworks of governments, both state and Commonwealth, determine CPE opportunities for teachers (Logan et al., 1990). The professional development of teachers following their initial or pre-service training has been dominated by "on-the-job" training complemented by in-service training. Since the 1970s there has been an overwhelming reliance upon the in-service short course as a means to improve teaching (France, 1990). In-service courses, demonstration lessons, teacher exchanges
and advice through inspectorial systems have been the responsibility of state employers of teachers, although after 1945 teachers became more autonomous in their further professional education as subject associations and other professional groups such as the Australian College of Education and the Australian Council for Educational Administration brought them together in forums that facilitated informal learning from peers.

The purpose behind any form of continuing professional education for teachers is the enhancement of “professionality” (France, 1990). Professionality is defined by Hoyle (1980, p. 44) as “the attitudes towards professional practice among members of an occupation and the degree of knowledge and skill they bring to it.” Initial pre-service training equips the beginning teacher with certain skills and attitudes, but the practice of teaching is dynamic in that its basis is in a body of knowledge and skills that is continually modified and improved by research (France, 1990). On-going in-service training is necessary if teachers are to increase their professionality, be aware of new developments, and be able to use those to the benefits of students and the profession.

A particular demographic factor that signals the need for formal and monitored continuing professional development of teachers is that of the ageing of the teaching force. In 1989, the median age of teachers throughout Australia was 37.4 years, with 65% of them between 31 and 50 years of age and 25% between 41 and 50 years old. In 1963, only 34% fell into the 31 to 50 years age group, with 15% between 41 and 50 years (Logan et al., 1990). Dinham (1995a) estimated the median age of teachers in
1995 to be in excess of 43 years. This is largely an outcome of the high rate of
recruitment of teachers in the 1960s and 1970s to enable schools to accommodate the
“baby boom” children of the post-war era, followed in the 1980s and 1990s by
relatively low rates of teacher recruitment (Dinham, 1995a). As the median age of
teachers increases, so too does the temporal distance between the teacher and his or her
initial training. There is a need for CPE to keep practising professional teachers, who
are distanced from their initial training, in touch with more recent advances in the
theory and practice of education.

There is evidence that in the late 1980s and early 1990s many teachers showed a high
level of motivation and commitment to furthering their professional development
(Williamson, 1994). The Australian College of Education reported that in 1989 there
was a high rate of participation by teachers in bachelor degree and postgraduate
diploma courses, with about 14% of teachers engaged in masters degree studies.

About 1% was engaged in doctoral programs. It could be argued that, for a significant
number of teachers, the motivation for participating in award courses that led to higher
academic qualifications was that success in those courses usually led to increases in
salaries or to increased opportunities for career advancement. During the 1980s, a
large number of teachers eschewed in-service course participation, perhaps because
they were not specifically linked to career or salary advancement. Over the two-year
period from 1987 to 1988 one quarter of teachers in Australia reported that they had
attended in-service activities for only three days or less (Logan et al., 1990).
As the end of the 1990s approaches, university authorities have reported a serious decline in the number of teachers participating in postgraduate coursework programs (Ministerial Advisory Council on the Quality of Teaching, 1999). The decline has been attributed to the introduction of fees for these courses (Ministerial Advisory Council on the Quality of Teaching, 1999). It should be of serious concern for the profession that fewer teachers are undertaking these important forms of professional development.

The figures above suggest that the involvement of teachers in CPE activities is sensitively linked to incentives such as potential career or salary rewards and to disincentives such as costs for course participation. The situation may very well justify relating a teacher’s continuing right to practise with mandatory participation in CPE. Similarly, there could be a case for participation in both award and non-award courses to contribute to a teacher’s certification status, for example as a form of advanced certification, provided that such CPE is prepared and presented by accredited course providers. This is done in Victoria where the Victorian Professional Development Network advises on standards for a range of courses that will lead to formal credit and career progression (Laird, 1995).

In the early 1990s there was a possibility that some form of national advanced certification might be linked to the concept of “Advanced Skills Teacher” or “Senior
Teacher” that was embodied in teachers’ salaries awards (Williams, 1994). The AST\textsuperscript{2} classification was meant to provide recognition for improvements in the quality of teachers’ knowledge and skills, and provide salary increases that would encourage highly skilled teachers to stay in the classroom, where they could use “their broader range of more complex skills” rather than seek a promotion that took them away from children and classes (Kennedy, 1993, p. 107).

The AST classification system aimed to create a career path based on experience and skill for teachers in both the government and non-government school sectors throughout Australia. It failed to do this (Burrow, 1996; Chadbourne & Ingvarson, 1995; Dinham & Scott, 1997). There were inconsistencies in the way the AST classification was administered in different states. There were also inconsistencies between the implementation of the AST system in government and non-government school sectors within each state, and even from school to school within the same system. The unions and employers could not agree on what were common criteria or standards for a valid assessment process necessary to create a genuine national framework for assessing teachers for the award of AST (Burrow, 1996). Employers perceived that there should be quotas on ASTs, that AST status should be difficult to gain, and that the award of AST status should carry with it extra duties.

\textsuperscript{2} Senior Teacher and Advanced Skills Teacher classifications are essentially the same, and both will be referred to as AST. The name Advanced Skills Teacher was generally used in government school systems, while Senior Teacher was the title given to this classification in non-government schools. In the Northern Territory, the name “Master Teacher” is used.
Some officers of the union movement and teachers themselves looked upon the AST classification merely as a backdoor way of obtaining a salary increase (Burrow, 1996). As it turned out, more than 90% of applicants were granted AST status by the school-based assessment boards which had quite general criteria upon which to base their decisions. The implementation of AST was not much more than the granting to experienced teachers of a de facto salary increment, with only token conditions that had to be met (Chadbourne & Ingvarson, 1995).

The AST system failed to provide a valid nationally recognised form of advanced certification (Maling, 1995). However, Burrow (1996) credits it with being a “brave start” (p. 107) and a “symbol of a significant professional victory” (p. 107). Chadbourne and Ingvarson (1995) described the failure of the AST initiative, which had the potential to be a great professional breakthrough in advanced certification, as “opportunity lost” (p. 286).

In the late 1990s, following the failure of the AST initiative, some states are developing standards against which the performance of teachers can be judged. Some of these are in the spirit of the concept of advanced certification promoted in this thesis. Others are used to assess teachers for a variety of reasons, including completion of probation, and promotion.

In their discussion paper, *Towards Identifying Professional Teaching Standards for New South Wales Schools* (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998), Brock and Mowbray suggest that the Level 3 (L3) Classroom Teacher project in
Western Australia holds promise as a system of performance-based assessment of teachers for promotion and in many ways appears consistent with the spirit of the AST initiative. The L3 Classroom Teacher would be involved in classroom teaching, but also have responsibilities for induction of neophytes, curriculum development, the professional development of colleagues and school-based research.

The Victorian Standards Council of the Teaching Profession (SCTP) has set in place a program of enhanced professional development for teachers that is linked to stages of teachers’ careers, recognising that different levels of performance might be expected of teachers at various stages of their professional life (Laird, 1995). In its publication, *Professional Standards for Teaching and Dimensions of Teaching*, the Standards Council of the Teaching Profession identifies five dimensions of teaching and sets out generic standards for Beginning Teachers, Experienced Teachers at Level 1, Leading Teachers at Level 2, and Leading Teachers at Level 3. Teachers have the opportunity to undertake courses of their choice based on these standards which have been defined by the profession. These courses concentrate on the development of teachers as learning managers, the use of information technology in teaching, reflective practice and mentoring. They also include long term programs meant to enhance teaching and learning for the teacher and in the school.

The state initiatives described above are admirable. However, there is no existing governmental policy that promotes advanced certification for teachers on a national basis.
Significant National Initiatives in the Quest for a System for the Regulation of the Profession of Teaching and Teachers in Australia

There are great similarities in the ways that education is organised across Australia. Differences that did exist in many areas have been reduced, largely as the result of post-1988 Commonwealth Government policies, which have been designed to bring about some consistency among the states. Examples of such Commonwealth policies are those initiating "common and agreed goals" for schooling, the national framework for curriculum and the development of national profiles (Maling, 1995). Despite the number of Commonwealth initiatives designed to reduce the differences across the states with respect to school education, there has been little success in bringing uniformity to matters such as teacher registration, the minimum qualifications required of teachers in schools, accreditation of teacher education provided in universities throughout Australia, and the provision of advanced certification for teachers.

The Commonwealth Government attempted to remove some of the anomalies in the regulation of teachers across the nation by establishing the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQTL) and the Australian Teaching Council (ATC). The hope promised by these bodies faded when, with changes in government, successive Commonwealth ministers closed them down. Important further initiatives have recently been taken by the Australian Council of Deans of Education with the development of the National Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998) and the Commonwealth Government through the report, A Class Act (Senate Employment, Education and Training References
Committee, 1998). Following are descriptions of these significant projects that have attempted to define teaching as a profession at a national level.

The National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (NPQTL)

At the beginning of the 1990s the Commonwealth Government established the National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning (the NPQTL), whose "Statement of Purpose" set three priorities: to examine teachers and their work; to examine teachers and their profession; and to examine teachers and their education (National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning, 1991). The second of these priorities, "to examine teachers and their profession," aimed to encourage the development of a "nationally consistent framework for teachers' qualifications including options for mutual recognition, national accreditation and possibly national registration, and portability of entitlements" (National Project on the Quality of Teaching and Learning, 1991, p. 8).

In May 1993 the NPQTL commissioned three consultancies of the Working Party on Professional Preparation and Career Development (chaired by Professor Jillian Maling) to develop frameworks of generic competencies for beginning teachers at the end of their pre-service training and at the end of their probationary period (Peacock, 1993). Masters and McCurry (1990) believed that the articulation of such competency frameworks would provide an operational definition of occupational competence that would, in practice, become more important than statements that described "standards" for an occupation. The NPQTL hoped that by making explicit what competent
professional teachers need to know and be able to do and by establishing agreed standards and making them public, the perceived decline in public confidence in teaching would be halted and teachers’ self-confidence restored (Peacock, 1993). They agreed that the establishment of national standards could:

- assist teachers to improve their work organisation and their workplace performance by encouraging them to reflect critically on their own practice, individually and collaboratively;

- inform professional development to support improvements to teaching;

- boost teachers’ self esteem and their commitment to teaching by enhancing their awareness of the nature of their teaching competence;

- underpin a national approach to improving teacher education programs, including curriculum and pedagogy;

- underpin a national approach to improving induction programs in schools and systems;

- possibly form the basis for a nationally consistent approach to registration and probation; and,

- provide a good basis for communication about the nature of teachers’ work and the quality of teaching and learning within the education community and among education interest groups.

(Peacock, 1993, p. 8.)
A major outcome of the NPQTL’s Working Party on Teaching Competency Standards was the publication of the *National Competency Framework for Beginning Teachers* (Australian Teaching Council, 1996a). This Framework was distinguished from other attempts to describe the qualities, knowledge, skills and attributes needed by teachers in that it was nationally based, founded on research, and was developed through teacher-centred processes (Australian Teaching Council, 1996a). The Framework was perceived by the NPQTL as being a useful tool for teachers to help them reflect on and talk about their practice and identify their professional development priorities. It was also seen to be the basis upon which further co-operative work on initial teacher education at universities, research into schools and teaching might be conducted an instrument that might overcome problems of mobility of teachers between systems.

The development of a set of competencies was the first stage of the NPQTL project. The second was to investigate the wider implications of implementing competency standards, that is, to investigate other purposes and possible uses of competency standards including registration, induction and probation (Peacock, 1993).

The NPQTL had been formed in the climate of the “new federalism” during the Ministry of Mr. J. Dawkins when the Commonwealth Government expected that collaborative, tripartite policy-making by the Commonwealth, the states and the unions would bring about new schooling policies on a wide range of matters, including a national curriculum and national standards for teaching. In July of 1993, the then Commonwealth Minister for Education, Mr. K. Beazley, who perceived that the
NPQLT had reached an impasse with respect to this policy-making vision, announced simultaneously the disbanding of the NPQLT Working Party and its replacement by a new Commonwealth funded body, the Australian Teaching Council (Pope, 1993).

The Australian Teaching Council (ATC)

On NPQLT recommendations, the Labor Commonwealth Government in 1992 established the Australian Teaching Council (ATC) as a body for developing coherent national policies with respect to registration of teachers, accreditation of teacher education, and the provision of advanced certification for teachers. The ATC made significant progress in formulating proposals for nation-wide regulation of the education profession, but was disbanded before these could become policy when the newly elected Liberal coalition government removed funding.

The purpose of the ATC was to “help teachers sustain and extend respect, recognition and status for their profession” (Australian Teaching Council, 1995c, p. 2). Among the objectives of the ATC, stated in its constitution, were the establishment of a framework of teacher registration, the establishment of a national register of teachers, the establishment of nationally consistent entry standards for the profession, the “recognition and accreditation of advanced professional skill and high quality school leadership [that is, advanced certification]” (p. 2), and the “improvement of initial teacher preparation in collaboration with teacher educators and employers [that is, accreditation]” (p. 2). Other objectives included improvement in professional development, the development of national guidelines for induction and probation for
beginning teachers, the setting of professional work standards for teachers at various stages of their careers, and the establishment of an ethical and professional framework for the teaching profession.

The governance of the ATC was via a board of 65 members, 40 of whom were elected practising teachers from both public and private schools and 25 of whom represented teacher educators, employers, unions, the business and wider community, parents and the federal government.

The actions of politicians upon change in regime or administration can bring about “rearrangements of issues” (Husen, 1988a, p. 174). Politicians have party allegiances that influence what they perceive as relevant or as dangerous, and they tend to be selective in their interpretations of evidence. This sometimes leads to their discarding that which does not support their views. As Harris (1994) has pointed out, governments “. . . are extremely powerful and sophisticated, and have little compunction in promoting ideas and values which serve particular interests, or in delegitimising conceptualisations and practices which work against [their] perceived interests” (p. 25). Perhaps this explains why, after a change of Commonwealth Government in 1996, the new Minister for Schools, Vocational Education and Training, Dr. D. Kemp, had determined to support an alternative national professional body at the expense of the ATC. Funding for the ATC was withdrawn and as a result, in September 1996, the operation of the ATC ceased.
In a speech at the *Status of Teaching* Conference of the Australian College of Education, in Melbourne on 30 April 1997, Kemp stated:

It has been suggested that some scheme of national teacher registration will enhance the professional standing of teachers. The Commonwealth does not believe that the external imposition of registration will necessarily improve the education offered in our schools nor enhance the professional standing of teachers. (Kemp, 1997, p. 10.)

Kemp’s anti-registration sentiments are reinforced in the *Commonwealth Literacy Policies for Australian Schools* that were released by his successor as Minister for Schools, Vocational Education and Training, Mr. C. Ellison. The policies state:

“Australian schools and their students will be best served by innovation and flexibility and not by the imposition of bureaucratic registration requirements” (Commonwealth of Australia, 1998, p. 7). Kemp has been reported by Maslen (1998) as maintaining that registration of teachers will not do anything to improve standards of teachers or teaching, yet he supports national accreditation of teacher education as a quality assurance mechanism that will make clear the quality and standards that would apply to new teachers (“Why registration won’t work,” 1998).

In its short existence, the ATC had made promising moves towards its objectives. Because of its untimely demise, nascent policies of the ATC did not advance beyond “draft” form. The following draft policies were developed by the ATC: course accreditation (Australian Teaching Council, 1995b); a draft ATC Induction Kit (Australian Teaching Council, 1995a); a draft policy on student assessment; and, a draft policy on “nationally consistent practices to protect schoolchildren from those
unfit to teach," which promotes national registration as the best way to protect children (Australian Teaching Council, 1996b). As well, the ATC had commenced investigations towards the development of common national policies and practices for teacher registration (Australian Teaching Council, 1996c).

The ATC guidelines on accreditation—which were based strongly on the guidelines for accreditation that had been developed by the Queensland Board of Teacher Education, and which later formed the basis for a national inquiry by the ACDE—specified that initial teacher education preparation should be the equivalent of four years duration and that two of those years should be of professional studies. The guidelines specified that trainee teachers should undertake at least 100 days of practical experience, including at least 80 in schools. These were cited as the minimum levels of experience necessary for the achievement of the competencies desirable in a beginning teacher. As well as specific requirements for practical experience during the four years of professional preparation, there were guidelines as to the selection of students for teacher education programs, the structure of programs and the curriculum, assessment methods and the levels of experience and training expected of those presenting the programs. The ATC was to be the central body to co-ordinate the accreditation of programs, while Committees of Recognition of Initial Teacher Education Programs were to be established in each state to carry out the detailed consideration of course proposals on behalf of the ATC.
In its *National Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education*, the Australian Teaching Council (1995b) acknowledged that it should be the responsibility of higher education institutions to develop and assess their own programs, but that adherence by the institutions to the guidelines would facilitate the development of programs whose graduates would be eligible for professional recognition as teachers in Australia through membership of the ATC. This link between accreditation and registration is of paramount importance. If teachers are to be registered, then the courses that prepare them must be assessed as suitable by the registration body for the profession.

The draft accreditation document of the ATC provides a clear link between program accreditation, registration and career-long CPE, if not specifically advanced certification. In the document's preamble, it is stated that the ATC's suggested national guidelines relate to courses that prepare students for entry to the profession, and that at the beginning of their careers neophytes need in-servicing by way of induction programs and then on a continuing basis for the duration of their careers.

What the ATC advocated was that teaching practitioners must control standards for the profession through registration and accreditation. The ATC no longer exists, but clearly it perceived itself to be the central body that was to register teachers, accredit teacher education courses and direct much of future CPE on a national basis. Whether or not the ATC was the appropriate body to have responsibility for these significant functions for all teachers was never tested.

In July of 1996 the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE) was given funding by the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Youth Affairs (DEETYA) to develop national standards and guidelines for initial teacher education (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998). The outcomes of this Commonwealth Government funded project, the *National Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education*, will bear significantly on the question of accreditation of teacher education. The National Guidelines were largely based on work already done by the Australian Teaching Council and the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration and have been generally welcomed (Jansen, 1998).

In its significant report, *Preparing a Profession*, the ACDE supported external national accreditation of teacher education programs and universities (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998). The report was supportive of the establishment of a national teacher registration authority that would approve programs as suitable for preparing their graduates for professional registration as teachers. Universities usually consider themselves to be autonomous self-accrediting bodies, but as the ACDE acknowledged, in many professions registration bodies external to the universities accredit initial professional courses (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998).

The report suggested that the *National Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education* could be used for internal university course development or review, and may be an effective instrument for program accreditation or approval purposes. Six principles that could
be used in the development of professional teaching standards were enunciated (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998; New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998). As well, the report included three options for managing accreditation. These are:

1. An accreditation body made up of major stakeholders, but independent from any one particular stakeholder, with a small national secretariat.

2. An accreditation system managed by the Australian Council of Deans of Education with a reference panel of representatives of the major stakeholders.

3. A devolved structure with a national reference panel of representatives of major stakeholders.


The proposal by the ACDE for national accreditation of teacher education was "enthusiastically endorsed" (Maslen, 1998, p. 1) by the Commonwealth Education Minister, Dr. D. Kemp, when it was released in March 1998. Kemp promised to work for consensus on national accreditation at the March 1998 MCEETYA meeting in Hobart. He felt that the introduction of national accreditation would “advance the quality of teacher education” (p. 1) and attract young people into the teaching profession. Kemp reaffirmed his support for accreditation, and opposition to registration, in a later interview with Maslen (“Why registration won’t work,” 1998).

While the Commonwealth, through Kemp supported the ACDE proposals, the state education ministers soundly rejected them, claiming that they attacked the states’ rights
with respect to education and that they would lead to the imposition of another federal bureaucracy (Maslen, 1998). Maslen (1998) reported that spokespersons for the education ministers of Victoria, South Australia and New South Wales expressed scepticism about the plan, claiming that it was an attempt to “bring education under a national umbrella” (p. 1). The only state minister to express support, albeit guardedly, was Mr. C. Barnett from Western Australia.

The President of the ACDE, Professor R. Bates, and the Chairman of the committee that prepared the report, Professor K. Adey, expressed concern at the states’ rejection of the proposals. They felt that by rejecting national accreditation, the states were losing an opportunity to advance the professional standing of teachers and teaching (Maslen, 1998).

The Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee Report: A Class Act: Inquiry into the Status of the Teaching Profession

A significant step towards formally acknowledging the importance of the association between registration, accreditation and advanced certification came with the release in 1998 of a report into the status of the teaching profession by the Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, chaired by Senator Rosemary Crowley. The report of the Senate Committee, A Class Act: Inquiry into the Status of the Teaching Profession (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998), recommended that a national standards and registration body should be established for teaching and that it should have responsibility for accreditation of teacher education and advanced certification of teachers. It should be
noted that the report was a reflection of the views of the Labor opposition senators who constituted the majority of members of the committee. The Liberal Government senators, who were in the minority on the committee, dissented on the matter of recommending to the Commonwealth Government the establishment of a national registration body. They saw it as inappropriate for the committee to make suggestions to the Commonwealth Government about future arrangements for standards and registration of teachers on the grounds that schools are primarily the responsibility of the state and territory governments. They agreed that there was a need for national consistency on registration standards and mutual recognition of teaching qualifications, but felt that concerns about these issues should be directed in the first instance to each state and territory government and then to the Ministerial Council on Employment, Education and Training (MCEETYA). The preferred option of the minority members was that MCEETYA should establish a framework for mutual recognition of teaching qualifications and registration arrangements once the states have put in place their own registration arrangements.

There were 19 recommendations of the majority committee. Recommendation 1, the most pertinent to this thesis, is that the Commonwealth Government should facilitate the development of a national professional teaching standards and registration body which would:

- establish standards of professional practice that take into account what teachers should know and be able to do to facilitate student learning;
▪ certify levels of entry to the profession, criteria for registration, and recognise advanced standing in the profession;

▪ accredit programs of initial teacher education and develop a framework for professional development for maintaining professional expertise of teachers;

▪ consider and act upon complaints of professional incompetence and assist teachers to improve their skills;

▪ manage a register of teachers who meet and maintain professional standards and who are eligible for employment as teachers in government and non-government sectors of education;

▪ establish levels of advanced certification for teachers that reflect teachers’ experience, professional development and additional roles such as mentoring (Levels of remuneration for teachers would reflect that a teacher had advanced certification.);

▪ establish sound induction programs for neophytes;

▪ have responsibility for accrediting professional development providers and courses; and,

▪ promote the value of teaching to the general community.

(Adapted from Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1997.)
The Senate Committee emphasised that teachers must be adequately represented on the accreditation body in addition to university teacher education departments, employing authorities, unions and teachers' professional associations. The committee suggested that the standards and registration body should have jurisdiction over teachers from all sectors of education, including those in early childhood, government and non-government schools, vocational education and training, TAFE, adult and community education, and eventually universities. It recommended that the registration body should establish a system of induction for beginning teachers and, further, develop a system of advanced certification, linked to remuneration, that reflects a teacher’s experience, professional development and additional roles, such as mentoring. The registration authority should have responsibility for accrediting courses and providers of courses of professional development. It recommended that participation by teachers in continuing professional development be a prerequisite for their continued registration. The national registration authority would be funded by governments and by teachers’ registration fees.

By heightening accountability and strengthening the professionalism of teachers, the recommendations of the Crowley Report hold promise for enhancing the status of the teaching profession nationally (Bowman, 1998). As yet, however, no action has flowed from its release. There has been no official response from the Government to the report. As has already been pointed out, the Commonwealth Minister for Schools, Vocational Education and Training, Dr. Kemp, has expressed his support for national
accreditation of teacher education, but expressed strong opposition to any form of registration for teachers.

Conclusion

In this chapter an historical approach has been taken to put into perspective how the profession of teaching is regulated in Australia. In post-World War II Australia, teaching has progressed to the stage where the recognised standard for teacher preparation is at least three years of university study and where, in the near future, all teacher preparation programs are likely to be of four or more years of academic and professional study. Teacher education, generally, is now through autonomous universities rather than institutions that are directly administered and staffed by employing bodies. Teachers need to be well prepared for their complex and demanding profession. They need to have sound academic and professional preparation. The best guarantee of competence of a teacher is an extended pre-service program of professional study, with rigorous assessment, well-supervised practicum experience, and socialisation into the demands and expectations of the profession (Goodlad, 1997). However, there are school authorities that employ as teachers people who do not have recognised teacher education qualifications (Maling, 1995; Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998; Wriedt, 1997). The employment of unqualified people as teachers is only possible because in most school systems in most Australian states, it is still the employer who sets standards for employment and therefore entry to the profession.
In Chapter 1 it was demonstrated that teaching in Australia is facing a range of serious dilemmas, including the following:

- Over the last decade teaching has become a partially regulated occupation, with the result that there is little consistency across states or between systems as to what is required of a person to become a teacher, and in some systems in some states anyone can be employed as a teacher—whether qualified or not.
- The Wood Royal Commission in New South Wales found that pre-employment screening of potential teachers to reduce the possibility of known paedophiles or people with serious criminal records entering the profession was inadequate.
- Because practitioners are denied control over standards for practice, there is a dilemma about whether teaching can claim to be a profession or not.
- The public perceives teaching as a low status occupation.
- The morale of teachers is low, and declining.
- Few academically able students are choosing to enrol in teacher education programs.
- There are predictions of shortages of teachers as the new millennium approaches.

It was proposed in Chapter 1 that a system of registration for teachers would help overcome many of these interrelated dilemmas. The question is, though, what system is most appropriate for Australia?
Recently, two Commonwealth Government funded reports have brought some light to bear on this question. The Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE) and the Commonwealth’s Senate Employment, Education and Training Committee have made interesting recommendations with respect to accreditation, registration and advanced certification for the teaching profession. The full implementation of the recommendations of these reports would have profound effects on the teaching profession. Together, they have provided the three basic principles which could underpin the model that is described in Chapter 7 of this thesis. That is:

1. The profession of teaching should be regulated on a national basis by a registration authority that is empowered to set and maintain high standards for registering teachers, accrediting teacher education programs and assessing experienced, skilled practitioners for advanced certification.

2. While major stakeholders should be represented, teachers should hold the majority of representative places in the peak regulatory authority and thus have significant rights and responsibilities for establishing and maintaining standards for their profession.

3. No person should be employed as a teacher, or undertake a teacher education practicum, or supervise any student teacher who is undertaking a teacher education practicum in a school or pre-school unless he or she has been granted an appropriate level of registration by the national registration authority.
In the next three chapters, the ways that standards for teachers and teaching are managed in educational systems overseas are examined. From this examination, the details for a model for the professional regulation of teaching in Australia are determined. The model, based around the three principles above and the outcomes of examining overseas systems, is presented in Chapter 7.
Chapter 4

REGISTRATION OF TEACHERS IN OVERSEAS SYSTEMS

Chapter 3 ended with the contention that the status and morale of teachers in Australia were low, but could be improved if teachers themselves had responsibility for professional standards on a national basis through an autonomous regulatory body. This body would register teachers, discipline those whose professional behaviour was not acceptable, accredit teacher education and award advanced certification to exceptional practitioners. This chapter looks at teacher registration in particular, and how it is managed in educational systems overseas, in order to determine what alternatives might be possible for the management of registration in Australia. In Chapters 5 and 6 respectively, accreditation and advanced certification in overseas systems are examined for similar purposes.

The mode of analysis used is the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The essence of this method is that it utilises induction to generate categories. As the data are gathered, theory emerges. Under the constant comparative method, not all comparison groups yield data for all of the categories. That is, some of the groups may yield nothing at all with respect to some of the categories. The comparison groups examined in this chapter are taken from the following:

- Scotland;
England and Wales; the United States of America (USA); New Zealand; and, British Columbia and Ontario in Canada.

This chapter has two main parts. In “Part 1: Registration in Overseas Systems,” descriptions are given of how teacher registration is implemented in the overseas comparison groups. In “Part 2: Attributes of a System of Teacher Registration,” the data from this chapter for the overseas systems and the data for Australia that has been generated in Chapter 3 and to some extent in Chapter 1 are organised into categories that are used for the construction of the model in Chapter 7.

Part 1: Registration in Overseas Systems

The types of documents that were consulted in order to compile the information contained in this section on registration overseas ranged from leaflets and videotapes that were intended to give simple explanations of registration through to more complex material that included handbooks, books of by-laws, legislation, annual reports and financial statements. Much was read to provide background data while other documents provided substantive data for this section. Where substantive data have been derived, the relevant sources have been cited in the text against appropriate entries in the References section of the thesis.
The General Teaching Council for Scotland (the GTC)

Samples of documents used in gathering data for this section are listed under the heading “General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTC)” in Appendix A. If used in the text, they have been cited in the References section.

In the 1950s and 1960s there was a great deal of public dissatisfaction with standards in Scottish schools (Whiteford, 1993). Much of the dissatisfaction arose from the employment of unqualified persons at times when teacher shortages had forced a relaxation of controls over entry to the profession. In response to expressions of concern, the government set up a committee of inquiry under Lord Wheatley. The committee recommended the establishment of a General Teaching Council for Scotland that, subject to appropriate safeguards, was to control entry to the teaching profession (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992; Sutherland, 1993). The recommendation was accepted by the Secretary of State, and formal establishment was provided through the Teaching Council (Scotland) Act of 1965 (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1995b; Sutherland, 1993). The first meeting of the General Teaching Council for Scotland was held on 11 March 1966 (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

The GTC is comprised principally of teachers, but has representatives from Scottish educational authorities, universities and other higher education institutions, the churches, industry and commerce, educational administrators and teacher trainers (Sutherland, 1993; Whiteford, 1993). Parents were not specifically represented on the
Council until after the Scottish Office Education Department Policy Review in 1992, when the GTC itself called for a parent category to be included in the Council membership (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1992). The presence of other stakeholders was seen by Mr. William Ross, the then Secretary of State who had responsibility for education in Scotland, as “right” since the education system “is vital to us all” (Whiteford, 1993, p. 22).

The establishment of the GTC gave teachers unprecedented control over entry to the profession and standards of professional practice through the registration procedures and exceptional admissions policies of the GTC (Galt, 1993). Within five years of its inauguration, the GTC was successful in ridding the system of unqualified teachers (Whiteford, 1993).

The GTC was established as a statutory body “in which . . . control of the entry to the teaching profession should be vested” (Sutherland, 1993, p. 26). The Council is completely independent of the Scottish Office Education Department, although it has links with and works closely with Department officials on matters of mutual concern. The GTC does not involve itself with industrial matters such as salaries determinations, which are left to the unions and the Education Department (Williams, 1995b).
The Council has 49 members. Some of the members of the Council are elected, some are appointed and some are nominated by the Secretary for State for Scotland, as follows:

(a) **Elected members.** Thirty are elected members. All elected members are registered teachers, eleven of them from primary schools, eleven from secondary schools, five from the Colleges of Education, and three from the further education sector. They are elected for a term of four years.

(b) **Appointed members.** Scottish universities, the central institutions, the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, and the Churches appoint fifteen of the non-elected members.

(c) **Nominated members.** The Secretary of State for Scotland nominates the four remaining members. These are usually parents, industrialists, accountants or solicitors able to provide dimensions of expertise and experience not otherwise available within the constituted membership.

(Adapted from General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1993.)

As well, the Scottish Office Education Department provides two assessors to be present at many Council meetings.

The GTC is funded through the registration fees of members. To be registered, a fee for initial registration and annual re-registration fees are required. Non-payment sees
the person's name removed from the Register (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1995a). A government grant of £38,000, given initially in 1986, represented only 10% of the Council's running costs for that year (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992). Since then the Council has become self-funding, and so is financially independent of the employing authority (Whiteford, 1993).

The role of the Council is to maintain and enhance professional standards for teaching in Scotland (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992). The work of most of the Council's committees can be linked with some aspect of quality assurance and control. In order to protect professional standards, the GTC:

- keeps a Register of those permitted to teach in maintained schools (schools that receive government funding) in Scotland;

- oversees standards of entry to the profession by keeping under review the standards of education, training and fitness to teach appropriate to persons entering teaching, and making recommendations concerning these standards to the Secretary of State;

- oversees the probation of provisionally registered teachers;

- has responsibility for the accreditation of initial teacher education courses at universities and other teacher education institutes in Scotland;

- considers and makes recommendations to the Secretary of State on the matter of supply of teachers;
♦ exercises disciplinary functions under stringent safeguards in relation to registered teachers;

♦ determines, on the basis of reports from schools or further education establishments, if a teacher has successfully completed the required probationary period of service; and,

♦ provides advice on supply of teachers to the Scottish Office Education Department.

(Based on: Scottish Office Education Department, 1992; Sutherland, 1993; Whiteford, 1993.)

It should be noted that the General Teaching Council for Scotland deliberately determined not to formulate a code of ethics. The GTC considered that such codes in themselves were not guarantees of professional behaviour. However, it did allow to be published in 1974 a statement of principles of professional behaviour to which the Council itself subscribed (Whiteford, 1993).

The GTC meets four times each year. There is provision for special meetings in addition to these. Four main committees carry out the day-to-day business of the Council. These are (a) the Chairman’s Committee which is a steering group that helps to shape policy and to give direction to the work of the Council, (b) the Communications Committee which is concerned with improving communication within the profession, (c) the Education Committee which deals with a broad range of
issues, including the preparation of responses to national reports and consultative
papers, together with consideration of a wide range of professional questions raised by
colleagues within the schools, and (d) the **Finance and General Purpose Committee**
which takes care of the Council’s administration, finance and its legal and business
affairs. As well, there are three significant committees to carry out the statutory
obligations of the Council. These are the **Investigating Committee**, the **Disciplinary Committee** and the **Exceptional Admissions Committee**, whose roles are explained
in some detail later in this chapter.

Registration has been described as “the passport to teaching in Scotland” (Scottish
Office Education Department, 1992, p. 2). It is illegal for a nursery (early childhood),
infants, primary, special or secondary school that is subject to registration to employ as
a teacher any person who is not on the General Teaching Council Register. As well,
College of Education staff concerned with the training of teachers must be registered
with the GTC (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1995a). The GTC instituted a
“Teaching Qualification (Further Education)” program that provides further education
college lecturers, including College of Education staff who did not have teacher
education qualifications, an avenue through which they can gain registration with the
GTC (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1992).

Professional discipline of teachers in Scotland is vested with the GTC. If this were not
so, discipline of teachers would have to be dealt with by the individual educational
employment authorities. This would increase the burden on the individual authorities
in conducting discipline inquiries and checking the suitability, or otherwise, of applicants for employment as teachers. As well, the loss of national control of professional discipline would increase the risk that a teacher dismissed by one authority could subsequently be employed by another (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

Concerns about the conduct or background of teachers are dealt with initially by an Investigation Committee that comprises nine GTC members. Serious cases are referred to a Disciplinary Committee that is made up of 15 members, nine of whom must be serving teachers. Nine members of the Disciplinary Committee consider serious cases referred by the Investigating Committee at a Discipline Hearing. The Discipline Hearing has a quasi-judicial role, and is assisted by a Queen’s Counsel. The teacher can appear, with legal representation, to defend the action (Smith, 1997). The three options available to the Discipline Hearing for disposing of a case in which a teacher has been found guilty are to (a) take no further action, (b) defer any decision for up to two years, or (c) remove the teacher’s name from the register. Those removed from the register can apply for restoration after a period specified by the Disciplinary Committee (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

**Summary of Requirements for Registration as a Teacher in Scotland**

The GTC has produced a publication that is issued to all who intend to become teachers. This reference, *The General Teaching Council for Scotland Handbook* (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1993), provides details of, amongst other
things, qualifications required for admission to the Register, the categories of registration and arrangements for probation and induction. The following descriptions are drawn from that reference.

The candidate for admission to the Register must have met prescribed requirements in general education and academic or technical education and, as well, must have completed a prescribed course at a College of Education. Normally, a teaching qualification will only be granted if a person has gained specified levels of attainment in final secondary school examinations, and has successfully completed a three-year university degree and a one-year course at a Scottish College of Education, or a four-year College of Education course (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1993). In effect, a teacher shall have completed the equivalent of four years of training in approved courses. A candidate shall also have satisfied a medical officer that he or she is medically fit to teach. The GTC screens all applicants for registration to ascertain whether or not they have criminal convictions (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

There are three categories of registration, full, provisional and provisional (conditional):

- **Full registration** is for those who have satisfied all conditions as set down by the Council.
- **Provisional registration** is granted to those who have an appropriate teaching qualification, but who have not yet completed their probation period.

- **Provisional (Conditional) registration** is granted to those whose teaching qualifications do not fully satisfy the Council requirements. Usually a period of time is specified by which the conditionally registered teacher must acquire a qualification that will satisfy the Council's requirements.

There is provision for teachers trained outside of Scotland to be registered. An Exceptional Admissions Committee determines the acceptability of qualifications of candidates for registration who have trained elsewhere. This committee, comprised of 16 members selected for the suitability of their academic qualifications, professional training and experience in teaching in Scottish schools, is involved in much research into the equivalence of United Kingdom qualifications and those gained elsewhere (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

An Accreditation and Review Committee has a statutory right to visit teacher education institutes to determine the suitability of programs for preparing competent new members of the profession. Accreditation by the GTC guarantees that students of a course will be granted provisional registration upon graduation (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).
In 1992 there were 76,625 names on the Register. Of those, some 6,671 were provisionally registered and 66 were conditionally registered. It was estimated that 60,000 were teaching at that time (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

People granted provisional registration must undergo two years of probationary service. The Probation Committee of the GTC considers probation to be a formative period “of measured progress and supportive improvement” (Whiteford, 1993, p. 28). During the probation period there is an expectation that colleagues will provide guidance, counselling and support. However, there must be a summative conclusion, when new teachers are judged on how well they have demonstrated their competence to teach, competence in classroom organisation, management and control, their conscientiousness, and their abilities to manage relationships with pupils, colleagues and other members of staff (Morris, 1993).

Summative reports on the probationary teacher’s progress are submitted to the General Teaching Council at the end of the first and second years of teaching. If the reports are satisfactory, full registration may be granted within the speciality practised during the probationary period (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1997; Morris, 1993; Scottish Office Education Department, 1992). In the case of an adverse report, the probation may be extended or the teacher’s registration may be cancelled (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1997; Morris, 1993; Sutherland, 1993). Few decisions of the Probation Committee are contested (Smith, 1997). A Probation Appeals Board,
comprising eight members, can consider any appeal against a decision to refuse or withdraw registration (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992).

Before the existence of the GTC, the assessment of probationers was the responsibility of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Schools. It is now the head teacher within the school who reports upon the provisionally registered teacher at the end of the first and second years of service (Whiteford, 1993). The fact that it is members of the profession itself who judge the worthiness of aspirants for full registration reinforces the concept of teaching as a profession able to set and judge the standards of competence of practitioners (Whiteford, 1993).

One difficulty that has arisen with respect to probation is the degree of casualisation in Scottish schools. There has been a large growth in temporary and part-time contracts for teachers. It is difficult for new entrants to the profession to gain full-time, stable postings, and thus gain uninterrupted, supported experience. The fragmented experience of casual, supply teachers is not acceptable for completion of probationary conditions, and probation can last for more than two years for many neophytes (Smith, 1997).

There is provision for service in other parts of Great Britain and overseas to satisfy the Scottish probation conditions, but the teaching must be relevant to the registration sought, and must be predominantly in English (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1997).
Registration of Teachers in England and Wales

Documents used in this section are listed in Appendix A, under the headings “General Teaching Council: England and Wales” and “The Teacher Training Agency,” or if used in the text they are cited and listed in the References section of the thesis.

In the absence of a body such as the GTC for Scotland, the arrangements for certifying a person as eligible to teach and the accreditation of initial teacher education courses or institutions in England and Wales are quite different to those in operation in Scotland. There is no national system for registering teachers in England and Wales (Barlow, 1999). However, there are standards for professional practice of teachers in England and Wales that are the responsibility of the Secretary of State for Education and Employment and the Teacher Training Agency (TTA). While the Teacher Training Agency was predominantly concerned with initial teacher education, its brief has broadened with time. It is now the main agency that sets and maintains teacher standards in England and Wales (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998).

A person needs to have what is called Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) to be able to teach in a grant-maintained school, a county school or a voluntary school (Teacher Training Agency, 1994a; Teacher Training Agency, 1997b; Williams, 1995b), but not in a private school. QTS is a level of qualification determined by the state. It is based upon a set of detailed criteria and competencies determined solely by the Secretary of
State (Thompson, 1997). The standards required for the award of QTS can be found in Circular 10/97 of the Department for Education and Employment (1997).

Usually only students who have graduated from institutions accredited by the TTA can be awarded Qualified Teacher Status by the Secretary of State (Teacher Training Agency, 1994a; Teacher Training Agency, 1997b), but it is possible under a "licensed teacher scheme" for candidates with acceptable, but not standard, qualifications to be taken on by local education authorities (LEAs) and to gain QTS through on-the-job training over two years (Howarth, 1990; Williams, 1995b). The licensed teacher route to QTS requires candidates to be at least 26 years of age, to have attained the equivalent of Grade C in both English and Mathematics at secondary school finals, and to have successfully completed two years of full-time tertiary education. The candidate is placed in primary or secondary school teaching post and must undertake a teacher training program tailored to the candidate’s individual needs (Howarth, 1990).

Teachers were required to serve a probationary period before being eligible for QTS, but that requirement was abandoned because so few were disqualified when a probationary period was enforced. The government considered that it was both unwarranted and uneconomical (Williams, 1995b). Further considerations behind this decision were that probation did not apply to private sector schools and there were anomalies in the supervision of probation (General Teaching Council [England and Wales], 1992). However, probation has been reintroduced from 1 May 1999, under
the new performance management program for education in England and Wales
(Department for Education and Employment, 1999b).

A notable aspect of the regulation of the teaching profession in England and Wales is that the regulator, the Secretary of State, is an instrumentality of the major employer of teachers, the government. The government has very significant, if not quite total, control of what constitutes professional preparation of teachers (Thompson, 1997).

An On-going Pressure for the Formation of a Profession-based Registration Body for Teachers in England and Wales

Registration of teachers is not a relatively recent idea in England and Wales. As early as 1899 the Education Act established provision for a register of teachers. The Board of Education Act of 1901 made it a duty of the Board to establish a Teachers’ Registration Council. However, civil servants drafted proposals for legislation that were quite divisive, stymieing plans for the introduction of teacher registration until 1912 when an Order of the Privy Council revived the concept and an acceptable Teachers’ Registration Council was established. The Teachers’ Registration Council later, in 1929, became the Royal Society of Teachers (General Teaching Council [England and Wales], 1992).

The Royal Society of Teachers had the statutory responsibility for establishing and maintaining standards of academic attainment and professional training of teachers. Those who had reached the required standards were admitted to registration in the Society as Associate Members, and those who subsequently completed a period of
approved teaching experience were designated full Members with the right to use the post-nominem, MRST (General Teaching Council [England and Wales], 1992).

The Royal Society was a voluntary body, and was to be the precursor to registration for all practising teachers through legislation intended for inclusion in the 1944 *Education Act*. The necessary, relevant legislation was not included in the *Act*, and the Royal Society of Teachers was wound up by an Order in Council in 1949 (General Teaching Council [England and Wales], 1992).

Pressure for the establishment of a registration body for teachers in England and Wales arose again in 1957 (General Teaching Council [England and Wales], 1992). In 1968 the incoming Secretary of State, Edward Short, declared his intention of establishing a General Teaching Council for England and Wales. He formed a working party, chaired by Sir Toby Weaver, which included representatives from all the teachers’ unions and associations, universities, teacher trainers and school administrative authorities, to facilitate its formation. The resulting *Weaver Report* of 1970 indicated that there was a well-established case for a professional Council, but the recommended structure, which divided functions under two Councils, failed to gain professional support. Successive governments over the next decade declared support for such a body, provided that teachers’ associations could come to agreement on the structures. By the time this occurred, government ministers had become divided on the issue (General Teaching Council [England and Wales], 1992).
Interest in the formation of a General Teaching Council was renewed in 1983, when the teachers' associations of England and Wales joined with the Universities Council on Teacher Education (UCET) in a movement to establish a body to give teachers greater control of their profession. The consortium, believing that the profession in England and Wales should be largely self-regulating, formed an independent body that is called the General Teaching Council (England and Wales) to lobby the government to establish a statutory GTC. The General Teaching Council (England and Wales)—which is not a statutory body—is supported by over thirty professional organisations (Meyenn et al., 1995).

The Council has two registered companies, the GTC (England and Wales) that has the aim of bringing about the establishment of a statutory council, and the GTC (England and Wales) Trust that aims to develop and recommend good professional practice (Meyenn et al., 1995).

In 1988 the GTC (England and Wales) prepared a proposal for a statutory General Teaching Council for England and Wales, representative of the profession itself, and in 1992 put forward a draft bill for legislators to consider. However, this was not supported by the Government of the day (Williams, 1995a). The proposed Council was to have 68 members, 50 of whom were to be elected or nominated practising teachers. The Council would determine levels of teacher qualifications, monitor accreditation for initial and in-service teacher education and beginning teacher induction, oversee teacher registration, apply professional discipline that included
deregistration of teachers (subject to the right of appeal) where necessary, and monitor teacher supply. Registration fees would be levied and periodic re-registration would be required (General Teaching Council [England and Wales], 1992).

Those supporting the formation of the Council felt it could fulfil the needs to:

- have a single body to regulate and articulate high professional standards for teaching;
- safeguard the public as learners and clients, particularly young people who are required to attend schools;
- bring about, under the force of the law, explicit, professionally-recommended criteria for the selection of those who are fit to be teachers;
- regulate and promote professional mobility within the European Communities and elsewhere;
- make teaching a self-regulating profession, not dependent on a government department to regulate competence and fitness to teach;
- have professional standards regulated by a body that is not ultimately the employer;
- have a fully representative professional body able to advise the government on the accreditation of teacher preparation courses, and eventually to assume this responsibility (currently the domain of the Teacher Training Agency) as its own; and,
have a single body to advise on the training and induction of teachers, and to promote their continuing professional development.

(Adapted from General Teaching Council [England and Wales], 1992.)

In 1998, both the government and the National Union of Teachers reaffirmed their commitments to the formation of a General Teaching Council (National Union of Teachers, 1998). The government intends to institute a General Teaching Council, and this will commence operation in September of 2000 (Department for Education and Employment, 1999a; Morris, 19 May, 1998). The TTA has expressed its enthusiasm for the new General Teaching Council, which will give teachers an influential professional voice on every teaching issue, from teacher recruitment and supply, training and induction, to professional development and conduct (Millett, 1999).

As well as promoting the General Teaching Council as a means for establishing “clear high standards of conduct for teachers” (National Union of Teachers, 1998, p. 2), and providing “an effective check on the quality of teacher performance” (p. 2), the Government’s proposals include a “possible role for the General Teaching Council in ensuring that grossly incompetent teachers are not to be able to teach again” (p. 2). The General Teaching Council would also “advise Government on the barring of people from teaching on the grounds of misconduct” (National Union of Teachers, 1998, p. 2).
All teachers would be required to be registered with the General Teaching Council before they could teach in a maintained school (Department for Education and Employment, 1999a; National Union of Teachers, 1998). Other fully qualified teachers would be encouraged to register (Department for Education and Employment, 1999a).

Teachers would form a significant part of the membership of the Council. The planned General Teaching Council for England is to have 64 members. Of those, 25 are to be elected teachers, nine will be teachers appointed by the main teaching unions, 17 will be appointed by various representative bodies from within the education system, and 13 will be appointed by the Secretary of State (Department for Education and Employment, 1999a).

The necessary legislation, the *Teaching and Higher Education Bill*, will establish separate Councils for England and Wales as from September 2000, and later for Northern Ireland (Department for Education and Employment, 1999a). The government will pay all costs to set up the three GTCs. Teachers will pay a tax-deductible annual fee, expected to be in the order of £20. The plan is for the Councils to be self-funded, thus guaranteeing their independence from the government of the day (Department for Education and Employment, 1999a).

More details of the operation of the proposed General Teaching Council are given in Chapter 6, where its impact on advanced certification is discussed.
Registration (or Licensure) of Teachers in the United States of America

Documents used in this section are listed under the headings “The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)” and “National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)” in Appendix A. Material that has been used in the text has been cited and referenced.

The terms “licensure” and “certification” are commonly used in reference to the professions in the USA. In teaching, licensure and certification mean “two quite different processes, realised at different times in one’s teaching career” (Fenstermacher, 1992, p. 157). Initial state licensure for teaching is based upon minimal standards that are there to protect the public interest and provide assurance that a “teacher will do no harm” (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1990, p. 2). Certification usually implies a higher level of competence, based upon standards that are often set by the profession itself through its governing board (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1990). Certification is acknowledgement on a national basis that the practitioner has met stringent requirements set by the profession’s governing body (Darling-Hammond, Wise & Klein, 1995; Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992).

The American use of the term “licensure” corresponds to what is defined as “registration” in this thesis, while “certification,” as used in the American context, usually corresponds to “advanced certification” as discussed further in Chapter 6.
However, quite often in the American literature of the 1980s and the 1990s pertaining to the teaching profession, the terms licensure and certification are used interchangeably to signify the initial granting of a state license to teach (Fenstermacher, 1992; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992). In the following discussion, this is how the terms licensure and certification are used—to denote initial teacher licensing. Where authors intend to refer to what in this thesis is called “advanced certification,” that intention will be made clear.

Professional boards determine educational and other standards for entry to the established professions such as nursing, medicine, architecture, accounting and law in the USA, but until the 1990s few such boards have existed for teaching. Most such registration or standards boards for teaching were created after 1990 (Darling-Hammond, 1999). The number of autonomous professional standards boards for teaching tripled between 1988 and 1995, so that by 1995 there were 10 states with such boards (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). By 1996, boards existed in 12 states (Scannell & Wain, 1996), and by 1997, 14 states had established fully independent or quasi-independent professional standards boards (Darling-Hammond, 1999). In those states, teachers, other educators, and significant stakeholders set and enforce standards for teacher education and licensing via their representative boards instead of having state legislatures or state boards of education assume the rights to make these significant professional judgements (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Darling-Hammond et
al., 1995; Scannell & Wain, 1996). In other states, requirements for the licensure of teachers are determined by the state legislatures.

In the USA, detailed standards for accreditation of teacher education programs and for the licensure of teachers are not merely administrative rules or regulations, they are embedded in the laws of each state (Fry, 1994; Sanders, 1985). State boards of education usually set standards for licensure, although in some states this is done through independent standards commissions (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Sanders, 1985). In general, the states guard their autonomy and independence in these aspects of education with great intensity: “No self-respecting state in the USA would ever accept the proposition that if someone was good enough to teach in one state he or she should be automatically recognised as good enough to teach in any other state!” (Fry, 1994, p. 4). Consequently, there has evolved a complex array of licensure requirements across the states that present very real barriers to interstate recognition of qualifications of teachers and make interstate movement of teachers difficult (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995).

All 50 states and the District of Columbia have established minimum standards for regular licensure (Deer et al., 1995). In every state the basic qualifications required for initial teacher certification are a university or college degree and the completion of a teacher education program deemed acceptable by the state. When Fry (1994) investigated American teacher licensure requirements in 1994, he reported that 13 states required that the degree should be in education or that the degree should include
a major study in education. Eight states allowed a degree in a field other than education. Another state allowed a degree in a field other than education for secondary teaching but not for primary teaching. Additionally, 41 states required completion of additional courses that might not be part of the degree program. These included, in various states, courses in special education, health and nutrition education, drug and alcohol education, inclusive education and mainstreaming, and computer or technology education. Some states required knowledge of the US Constitution or basic American history, while some required courses in Indian studies, multicultural studies, human relationships, and recognition and reporting of child abuse. Others required all teachers to have studied approaches to teaching gifted and talented students (Fry, 1994). Sanders (1985) noted that despite the disparities in the states’ approaches to teacher preparation and licensure, there were some states with marked similarities in requirements. He recommended that the states’ accreditation standards for teacher preparation programs should be made similar, in order to facilitate “reciprocity in the certification of teachers” (Sanders, 1985, p. 14). Darling-Hammond (1999) supported reciprocity in standards across states to facilitate the mobility of teachers from states that have surpluses of teachers to states that have shortfalls.

Most states require proof that the teacher has an adequate background in his or her subject area and has associated pedagogical knowledge. Some specify a grade-point average in the whole degree or in subjects associated with the teaching area. Many states require that the candidate for teacher registration has gained specified scores on a
variety of tests of subject area knowledge, basic teaching skills and professional knowledge (Anrig, 1986; Fry, 1994).

There has been strong support from the public and also from teachers for satisfactory test results to be a condition for entering the teaching profession (Anrig, 1986). There are, however, limitations on what tests can measure. No test result can guarantee that a person will be a good teacher. Tests should be viewed as aids in determining whether or not a prospective teacher has mastered the basic knowledge required of a teacher. Provided that tests are not biased, they can be useful indicators of the professional knowledge of prospective teachers. Before 1977 only three states included such tests as a condition of teacher licensing. By 1986 competency tests were mandatory in all but four states, and by 1995 only three states did not test teachers for licensure (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). In 1993-1994 the National Teacher Examinations (NTE), conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) of Princeton in New Jersey, were used by 20 states for testing subject area knowledge and by 19 states for testing professional knowledge. Eight states were using their own tests and five accepted test results from higher education institutions that were approved by state authorities. The Praxis Series of Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers (conducted by the ETS, but then in an early stage of development) were being used by seven states (Fry, 1994).

In 1994, some 35 states conducted mandatory checks on the applicant’s fitness to teach. That usually involved a criminal record check at state or federal level, or both.
In 15 states the applicant’s fingerprints were taken and checked against state and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) fingerprint files. The fingerprints were kept on file. If the applicant had been or subsequently was charged with an offence anywhere in the USA the employing body was notified (Fry, 1994).

At the time that he conducted his investigation, Fry (1994) found that licensure of teachers was usually specific for particular levels of schooling. A teacher would be licensed to teach in elementary (primary) schools, in middle or junior high schools, or in secondary schools. At elementary school level most states required that the applicant should have a range of subjects appropriate to the particular curriculum to be taught. At middle school level some states required qualifications in only a few subjects while others required that the teacher had knowledge across a large number of subject areas. At secondary level most states required the applicant to have a major in the subject area that he or she wished to teach. As well, some states had extra requirements for certification to teach in areas such as military science, safety education, driver education.

Despite the great diversity in licensing requirements for teachers that has arisen through individual states having responsibility for licensure, reciprocal agreements between some states do exist with regard to recognition of teacher education and certification. During his investigative visit to the USA, Fry (1994) established that thirty states and the District of Columbia had mutual recognition of teacher education through the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and
Certification (NASDTEC) interstate agreements. Of these, 10 recognised qualifications from all other participating states and the others recognised qualifications from at least 22 of the participating states. However, those teachers who sought interstate registration in states with NASDTEC agreements were still required to undergo any testing required by the system and to meet any other conditions prescribed by the receiving state (Fry, 1994). Twenty states that had interstate agreements and four that did not participate in such agreements accepted interstate qualifications from institutions that had National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or state accreditation (Fry, 1994).

Of the states that had policies on mutual acceptance of interstate teaching certificates, some issued certificates comparable to their own while some issued certificates with specific limitations to those with interstate qualifications. Thirteen states accepted specified teaching experience in another state as equivalent to the completion of an approved program (Fry, 1994).

In most states the matter of recognition of overseas qualifications has been of little concern for there have been few overseas teachers who apply for posts. However, some states, such as California, have large immigrant populations and their growing teaching services have attracted overseas-trained people. These states require overseas applicants for teaching positions to supply some evaluation of the equivalence of qualifications gained outside of the USA. There are a number of independent
organisations that provide this service. While state education commissions make use of such services, they are not obliged to accept the determinations (Fry, 1994).

Barlow (1999) has reported that 42 states in the USA have mandatory continuing professional development requirements for maintaining licensure. Of those 42 states, 32 require the teacher to meet some portion of the cost for CPE. In Oklahoma and Pennsylvania, the state or school district meets the cost for CPE. Seven require teachers to meet the full cost of mandatory CPE (Barlow, 1999). Since licensure as a teacher in most states usually is for specific subjects or for levels of specialisation, the required CPE is associated with the renewal of a particular certificate. Consequently, if a teacher holds a certificate in more than one area, then he or she will have to complete the CPE requirements for all of those certificates.

Emergency and Alternative Pathways into Teaching

Despite the embodiment of initial licensing requirements in state laws, some 46 states had emergency schemes that allowed untrained people to teach for a limited time—two months to three years—and more than 30 states had alternative certification programs that could lead to licensure (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). Emergency certifications do not usually lead to a teaching license, but many of the alternative certification programs, which are designed for people who do not have the usual qualifications through university or college professional studies, do lead to licensure (Deer et al., 1995; Fenstermacher, 1992; Hawley, 1992). Between 1985 and 1990 some 200,000 teachers had been certified through alternative programs in the USA (Otuya, 1992).
Alternative teacher education schemes are aimed at the recruitment of people in industry who might bring with them special expertise, and are sometimes used to increase the representation of people from disadvantaged minority or ethnic groups in teaching services (Kramer et al., 1991). When conventionally educated teachers are not to be found, some see the employment of people who will undertake formal, alternative programs as a better option than filling positions with persons who are given emergency certificates that entail little training (Fenstermacher, 1992; Hawley, 1992).

Alternative routes to certification are based on programs of study and experience that are defined by the state authorities. They may or may not involve institutions of higher education (Hawley, 1992). Alternative programs lead to licensure through altered sets of requirements (Cornett, 1992). For example, they may limit the number of education courses required, and licensure requirements might be met by passing tests, through demonstrating competency at on the job evaluations, or through the completion of supervised internships (Cornett, 1992). Alternative certification requires supervision, mentoring, and a course of professional study, while emergency certification is “merely a way of getting someone in front of a classroom in times of shortage” (Fenstermacher, 1992, p. 161).

Many of the alternative licensing schemes entail substantial and rigorous academic work over a significant period of time. For example, in Maryland alternative certification is via a rigorous 12-month program (Darling-Hammond, 1992). The
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) recognizes and encourages such courses when they acknowledge the strengths of potential teachers from non-traditional backgrounds and aim to prepare those candidates to meet the same standards as have been established for others who enter the profession through more usual preparatory courses (Fry, 1994). The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) also endorses many of the alternative teacher preparation schemes, particularly those that offer a streamlined, carefully constructed curriculum that integrates courses on learning theory, child development, teaching methods and subject knowledge with an intense, supervised internship. Such programs, tailored to the needs of the recruit, can concentrate preparation into a 9 month or 12 month period and provide the mentoring required to prepare a teacher (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

However, some alternative teacher education programs require only a few weeks of preparation before the entrant is given full responsibility for a class (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). Such programs, prepared by some state and district authorities or by contracted external providers, consistently have shortcomings (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996). Studies show that recruits who have entered teaching through such courses are often dissatisfied with their training. They have difficulty with teaching, with managing the classroom, and with diagnosing pupils’ learning needs. Their students learn less, especially in areas such as reading and writing. Principals and colleague teachers rate those who have undertaken
such courses lower in teaching skills. In addition, those who have entered teaching through these short-term schemes leave teaching at a higher than average rate (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996). Short-term crash courses on subjects that the candidates have not majored in at a tertiary institution are described as “dubious indeed” by Kramer, Moore and Baker (1991, p. 25).

Bypassing the regular forms of teacher preparation is often a response to shortages of qualified entrants in specific subject areas or a response to difficulties in staffing schools in less popular regions (Cornett, 1992; Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Hawley, 1992). Provided that the candidates for the programs are carefully selected capable university graduates, and that the programs are substantial, both in content and duration, such alternative certification programs can be of great value in attracting and training teachers for hard-to-staff, often socially and economically disadvantaged, neighbourhoods (Kramer et al., 1991). The danger with some of the alternative pathways to teaching is that they may involve reducing or waiving the professional studies required for certification (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Fry, 1994).

The more substantial of the alternative certification schemes that allow progression to continuing certification require applicants to have a university or college degree to qualify for internship in the program. In most, the interns undergo a substantial program of coursework together with on-the-job learning and coaching by a mentoring team. A continuing certification may be issued to the intern upon achieving
satisfactory recommendations from the school and other members of the team, and performing satisfactorily in content knowledge and pedagogical skills tests (Fry, 1994).

The two largest alternative certification schemes in the USA are the California District Intern Program and the Texas Alternative Certification Program (Fry, 1994). These are discussed below.

The California District Intern Program

The California District Intern Program was first implemented in 1983. Applicants with baccalaureate degrees, who have passed the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), and who have surpassed certain scores on the National Teacher Examinations in relevant speciality areas may be issued with a District Intern Certificate (once known as a Teacher Trainee Certificate). Valid for two years, this allows them to be employed as “interns.” During the internship, the school district is required to create a professional development plan for the intern and provide mentor teachers. Some 120 hours of coursework in child development and teaching methods and 150 hours of other coursework must be completed during the internship. Upon successful completion of the professional development plan, the intern may be issued with a “professional clear credential” (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1991). District Intern Programs have been implemented by some 20 school districts. The Los Angeles Unified School District, for example, hired 1829 interns under the scheme between 1983 and 1994 and of those, 1223 completed the
program (Fry, 1994). In 1998 some 1500 teachers undertook District Intern Programs in Los Angeles (Streisand & Toch, 1998).

In California, teacher shortages have reached crisis levels, and in 1998 the states employed some 29,000 teachers with emergency credentials (Streisand & Toch, 1998). Dropout rates are high amongst emergency teachers, but some 80% of those prepared under the District Intern Programs stay on for five years (Streisand & Toch, 1998).

Alternative programs have existed in California for many years. Files of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing date basic teaching credentials back to the beginning of the twentieth century. Provisional or emergency credentials date back to the 1920s. In the 1990s, as well as the District Intern Programs that have been discussed above, California had some 25 “alternative routes to being certificated to teach in a self-contained classroom” (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1991, p. 20).

The Texas Alternative Certification Program

Interns taken into the Texas Alternative Certification Program must have a baccalaureate degree with an overall grade-point average of 2.5 and a grade-point average of 2.5 in the subjects to be taught as well as attainment of acceptable scores on the state’s standardised basic skills tests in mathematics, reading and writing (Fry, 1994).
There are three modes for the program: (1) the **higher education mode** in which a university provides coursework; (2) the **education service centre mode**, in which general supervision of the teacher is provided by a university; and (3) the **local district mode** which involves a minimum of university work. After some initial coursework in curriculum theory, teaching strategies, classroom management and the teaching of reading and technology, the teacher is assigned to a school and designated as a “teacher of record.” As such the intern is paid the same as a first year teacher. A mentor/master teacher is provided and a support team from an alternative certification provider is assigned to the intern. The intern may have to contribute to the cost of supportive mentor supervision. Time must be provided for the mentor and the support team—drawn from a local higher education institution, the school district or the regional educational service—to confer, and for observations to be made.

After the internship year, the intern is appraised under the Texas Teacher Appraisal System (the TTAS). When the internship program has satisfactorily been completed, the intern sits the state exit/certification test (ExCET). If the intern is successful, the program director and the school principal may, jointly, recommend the intern for state certification.

Under the Texas Alternative Certification scheme there were 2408 interns in 23 programs that involved 378 school districts in 1992-1993. In the 1994-95 school year 28 alternative programs were being offered in Texas (Fry, 1994).
Some Criticisms of Alternative and Emergency Licensing Schemes

Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein (1995) raise the criticism that alternative certification programs and emergency licensing schemes can result in a lowering of standards of teaching. They are critical that many endorsed alternative paths leading to registration of teachers in American states do not expose trainees to sound professional preparation. Inadequate preparation for the task of teaching was at the top of the list of complaints by the 20% of Los Angeles alternative-route teachers who failed to complete their service before they had completed their programs in 1984 and 1985. This was also a source of criticism for those who had succeeded under the program (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995).

Further, Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein (1995) reported a study by Gomez and Grobe (1990) in which alternative-pathway entrants to teaching in Dallas, Texas, were rated lower than traditionally trained teachers on factors such as their knowledge of instructional techniques and their abilities to use different instructional models. In this study, alternative entry teachers were from two to 16 times more likely than traditionally trained teachers to be rated “poor” on each of the teaching factors evaluated. Other studies have supported the view that alternative entry teachers have difficulties with curriculum and pedagogic content knowledge, dealing with students’ individual differences, class management and student motivation (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995).
Support for Rigorous Standards for Initial Licensure

Teacher registration is strongly supported by Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein (1995) who believe that reform of current registration practices is necessary if the quality of teaching in American schools is to be improved and if teaching is to be established as a respected and responsible profession. They argue for rigorous professional standards for entry to the teaching profession. Standards should create “meaningful and inviolable screens to entry” (p. 6), and if this occurs, they argue, salaries may rise to levels at which teaching can compete in the marketplace for a steady supply of talented and well-prepared entrants.

Recently in a number of states in the USA, such as Minnesota, there has arisen an interest in using performance-based standards for assessing teachers for both initial licensure and advanced certification. Performance assessment is the basis for licensure in a number of other professions, for example in medicine through the clinical assessment of interns (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Dilworth & Imig, 1995; Wise, 1996). Performance-based standards for teachers describe what teachers should know, be like and be able to do rather than just list a series of courses that teachers should have taken during their initial preparation (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992).

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)—a body that was created in 1987 by the Council of Chief State School Officers with the mission of establishing a set of common licensing standards, designing new methods
of teacher assessment, and providing professional support for new teachers—has developed performance-based standards for initial licensing of teachers (Ambach, 1996; Wise, 1994). The public response to the INTASC standards has been very positive. Educators, members of state boards of education, and representatives of a variety of educational agencies who participated in focus groups have agreed that the standards represent a broad consensus of what beginning teachers should know and be able to do. By 1996, some 36 states were actively involved in INTASC projects (Ambach, 1996).

The INTASC standards for beginning teacher licensure are consistent with the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), which was directed towards advanced certification. The INTASC standards describe what a teacher should know and be able to do in order to practise responsibly and develop the sort of expertise required of a highly accomplished practitioner (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, 1992; Wise & Liebbrand, 1996). The INTASC standards are articulated through ten principles. Each principle is presented in terms of the knowledge, skills and dispositions desired of teachers, that is:

Knowledge about people and social organisations, cultures, epistemology, specific disciplines, human growth and development, communication and language, scientific inquiry, and research on effective learning and teaching.

Skills associated with assessment, planning, instruction, evaluation, social behaviour management, and role modelling.
**Dispositions** toward self, toward the learner, toward teaching, and toward the profession.

(Darling-Hammond et al., 1995, p. 38.)

The ten principles are quoted below. Together they provide a basis for evaluating evidence about what it takes to achieve the standard, and so provide guidance for teacher preparation and assessment (Wise, 1994).

**Principle #1.** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

**Principle #2.** The teacher understands how children learn and develop and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.

**Principle #3.** The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

**Principle #4.** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

**Principle #5.** The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behaviour to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active social engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

**Principle #6.** The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, non-verbal and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

**Principle #7.** The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.
Principle #8. The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual and social development of the learner.

Principle #9. The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Principle #10. The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well being.


This system of standards is grounded in the idea that teachers should be creative, thoughtful people who use a set of principles and strategies derived from an informed personal philosophy of education and the multiple demands of learning contexts.

These standards are embodied in Minnesota’s Vision for Teacher Education: Stronger Standards, New Partnerships (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995), and require teacher education programs to implement research-based, results-oriented curricula and to lead to a system for assessing beginning teachers. Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein (1995) have created for Minnesota a structure for a teacher licensing and assessment system that incorporates the performance-based principles outlined above. The suggested structure for licensing of teachers is illustrated in Figure 1. This structure incorporates general education through the completion of an initial degree with a liberal arts bias and a professional teacher education program at a university. Testing
to ascertain if the candidate should be granted an initial internship license follows this preparation. Then the candidate undergoes a period of internship in a special development school. This phase is terminated by performance testing of knowledge and skills. Success in the performance-based evaluation of teaching skills is necessary before a professional teaching license is awarded.
PRE-SERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

1. Liberal education with an academic major.

2. University-based teacher education.
   - May include portfolio and other assessments of developing teacher knowledge and skill
   - Successful completion is required to sit for assessment of teaching knowledge.

Assessment of Teaching Knowledge.

Written and performance assessments of knowledge about

1. learners and learning
2. curriculum and teaching
3. contexts and purposes

Successful completion is required for internship license.

INITIAL INTERNSHIP LICENSE AWARDED

3. Internship in a professional development school.

On-site long-term assessment of teaching skills and dispositions.

- Evaluation by on-site mentors using approved criteria.
- Successful completion required to sit for assessment of teaching skills.

Assessment of teaching skills.

Performance assessments of applied knowledge and skills in

1. assessment
2. planning
3. instruction
4. management
5. evaluation.

- Developed by specific subject area and level (e.g. secondary science, elementary education).
- Successful completion required to receive a professional teaching license.

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING LICENSE AWARDED.

Figure 1. Structure for a Licensing and Assessment System. From Darling-Hammond et al., 1995, p. 109.
Minnesota has a “Code of Ethics” or charter of “Standards of Professional Conduct” for teachers that is specifically supportive of the concept of licensing for teachers. It entreats teachers not to delegate authority for teaching responsibilities to unlicensed personnel and forbids a person from accepting a teaching position if he or she is not “properly” or “provisionally” licensed for that position (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995, p. 202).

The knowledge base for the Minnesota vision was developed inductively and is similar to the foundational classification of teaching knowledge of Shulman (1987). The NBPTS, INTASC and Minnesota standards are based on the principle that a teacher’s actions should depend upon many kinds of knowledge. The definitions of each principle in these systems are elaborated through sets of knowledge, dispositions and performances in ways that allow for the collection of evidence about the achievement of the standards. They are explicit about the kinds of considerations that should be taken into account and the areas of knowledge that should inform decisions, and thus provide guidance as to both preparation and assessment.

Being performance-based, the standards described above may help to clarify the criteria required for certification of teachers, placing emphasis on the teacher’s developed abilities and genuine professional knowledge rather than on just how many hours he or she spends in a classroom. Performance-based assessment of teachers may allow greater diversity and innovation in teacher preparation courses by assessing
outcomes rather than just regulating the inputs of such courses (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995).

The Significance of Teacher Education and the Work of the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future

Research shows that teacher education matters a great deal and that teachers who have been fully prepared and certified in both their discipline and education are more successful with students than those who have had no professional preparation (Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1997; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1998). Repeated studies from Texas, Alabama, New York, Tennessee and elsewhere are cited by Darling-Hammond and Berry (1998) to support this contention. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) has assembled more than 200 research studies which show that teachers with greater preparation in their subject matter and in education (that is, knowledge of teaching methods, learning and development) are more effective teachers in fields ranging from science and mathematics to elementary reading and early childhood education, and are more effective in developing students’ higher order thinking skills and in meeting the needs of a diverse range of students (Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1997). There is a need to ensure that all children have access to well-prepared, competent, qualified teachers (Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1997).

Despite the great deal of evidence that student achievement is linked to the quality of preparation of teachers, in the USA the traditional response to teacher shortages has been to lower standards for employment (Darling-Hammond, 1996). About a quarter
of newly hired teachers in American schools do not have teacher education qualifications. Many do not reach minimal state standards, yet are employed to teach. By 1994, more than 50,000 teachers were entering service annually in American schools after having undertaken emergency or temporary courses that offered little or no preparation at all. Most of those were hired to teach in low income inner city or poor rural area schools, perpetuating the educational disadvantages of students in those areas (Darling-Hammond, 1994, 1996; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) has recognised that relatively poor levels of preparation of teachers in many American schools has resulted in poor educational outcomes for American children. The Commission has proposed that standards for teaching must be attended to through systems of accreditation of teacher education, licensing (that is, registration), certification (that is, advanced certification), and on-going teacher professional development that extends across the nation. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future has proposed a continuum for teacher development that involves the following:

- Recruitment to a teacher education program based on academic background and the ability to work with children.

- Pre-service preparation in an accredited school of education.

- A period of induction and internship where early career mentoring is provided and INTASC testing of subject matter and teaching knowledge is conducted.
A continuing licence that depends upon performance evaluations of the teacher.

Continuing professional development that is necessary for continuation of the teaching licence.

Acknowledgement of high levels of skill and teaching knowledge through National Board for Professional Teaching Standards assessments.

(Adapted from National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996, p. 67.)

Teacher Registration in New Zealand

While Australia and New Zealand obviously have their unique social and educational environments, there are political, historical, social, geographical and economic relationships between the two countries which suggest that whatever happens with regard to registration, accreditation and advanced certification in one should be closely observed by the other. In 1996 New Zealand took a lead with the introduction of compulsory registration at the national level for all teachers. The following gives an historical and political outline of the development of the system of teacher registration in New Zealand. Much of the following is taken directly from the 1964 and 1989 [NZ] Education Acts and the 1996 [NZ] Education Amendment Act as well as from documents written by Mr. P. Barlow, Director of the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board, and annual reports of the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board. Documentary material consulted for this section is listed in Appendix A.
The provision for the registration of teachers in New Zealand (sometimes referred to by the Maori name, “Aotearoa,” in official documents) dates back to 1924, and was originally intended to regulate those working in state primary schools. Over years it was extended to cover teachers in secondary schools, teachers’ colleges, technical institutes and community colleges (Barlow, 1996).

Registration for teachers in all government schools was made compulsory in 1964 under Section 131 of the [NZ] Education Act (1964), which stated that “no person shall be eligible to be appointed to be, or continue to be, a teacher, unless his name is registered in the Register of Teachers . . .” (New Zealand Government, 1976).

However, the implementation of this policy was fraught with problems, not the least of which stemmed from governmental reviews of New Zealand educational policies by committees dominated by bureaucrats and business organisations that took little notice of the views of educationalists. As a result, although registration was defined in legislation, it became at times a relatively meaningless, voluntary state and at other times a mandatory state that was impossible to enforce. It is only recently—in September 1996—that amendment to New Zealand legislation\(^1\) introduced unambiguously the compulsion for all teachers in all school sectors in New Zealand to be registered (New Zealand Government, 1996).

The original intent of registration was to facilitate the compilation of an official list of “certificated” or “classified” teachers currently teaching in state schools. Registration

\(^1\) The relevant legislation, the Education Amendment Act (No2) 1996 was passed by parliament on 21 August 1996, to be operational from 1 January 1997.
was to be a device by which the Director-General of Education, in whom disciplinary powers over teachers were vested, could remove from service in public schools those who proved to be unfit to teach. Eligibility for the Register was by "certification" in the case of primary teachers or "classification" in the case of secondary teachers. Only those who were certificated or classified and currently employed in a state school or institution were admitted to the Register. No documentation was issued to signify that a teacher was registered.

In New Zealand, certification and classification of teachers was similar to the certification system in use in the New South Wales state school system. It was based on the aspirant having gained certain qualifications, then undergoing an induction program that was coupled to probation, and ultimately earning the recommendations of a school principal and an Inspector of Schools (Barlow, 1996). Failure to gain registration prevented employment as a teacher in a New Zealand state school, but not in a non-government school (New Zealand Government, 1976; Barlow, 1996).

Operated by the New Zealand Department of Education, the Register then was merely a list of certificated and classified teachers employed by, or deemed to be suitable for continued employment by, the state. Not only did the major employing body control the Register but it controlled the rules for the qualifying teacher education courses and the criteria for entry to those courses (Barlow, 1996). Consequently, standards for entry to the profession could be altered according to the needs of the state’s education department, perhaps to the detriment of the standing of the profession when it was
difficult to find fully qualified teachers to staff state schools. The licensing system was not to reflect the interests of teachers and of teaching as a profession. It was designed around the administrative needs of the Department of Education.

In 1978 a review by the Marshall Committee identified significant weaknesses in the registration provisions of the 1964 *Education Act*. These were:

- Different criteria were used to register primary and secondary teachers.
- There were no criteria utilised for registering tertiary teachers or kindergarten teachers.
- Teachers in independent schools were not subject to the registration system.
- There were no provisions for teachers who worked in the community rather than in schools.
- There was an imposition of a judicial function for the Director-General and the Minister for Education via their roles in procedures for cancellation of registration.
- There was a dependence on the printed Register as the sole legal instrument that determined the registration status of a teacher.

(Adapted from Barlow, 1996.)

It was the recommendation of the Marshall Committee that the New Zealand Government should establish an independent Teacher Registration Board. The
Marshall Committee also recommended a system of disciplining teachers. The suggested Teachers’ Disciplinary Board was opposed so strenuously by teacher organisations that many of the other outcomes of the report were stalled or became impossible to implement. It took until 1987 for the independent Teacher Registration Board that had been mooted by the Marshall Committee to be legislated for under the *Education Amendment Act (No2)(1987)*. However, late in 1987 the government announced an intention to review the administration of education, thus making it impossible for the Board to be formed and commence operation (Barlow, 1996).

The review, conducted by the Picot Committee, transformed the Department of Education into a Ministry (New Zealand Department of Education, 1988) and recommended the establishment of an independent registration board for teachers, “able to determine who is a suitable person to be a teacher in an early childhood, primary or secondary institution” (Barlow, 1996, p. 5). The grounds for the recommendation were that, with the new Ministry shedding this administrative function, it was unrealistic to expect that individual schools should have the resources to carry out the required complete check on the backgrounds of prospective teachers. The board was to be a small independent body, representative of employers and teachers, funded by teachers themselves through an annual fee for a practising certificate (Barlow, 1996).
The board was also to have a disciplinary role, being able to determine whether or not a teacher's name should be removed from the Register and thus become ineligible for employment as a teacher (Barlow, 1996).

In working party discussions on the formation of the board, tensions became apparent over the need to maintain national educational standards through the regulation of who could teach and the reticence of employing authorities to sacrifice their autonomy in choosing who should work in their schools. At the same time the question of whether registration should be compulsory or voluntary was raised (Barlow, 1996).

In March 1989, the Minister for Education made clear his intentions that there should be a registration board for teachers, that registration was to be compulsory, and that the new system was to apply to private schools as well as to government schools. There was, however, to be some flexibility to allow those with special skills (e.g. Maori elders) to assist in the classroom, provided registered teachers supervised them.

However, when the appropriate legislation, the Education Act (1989), was enacted compulsion was not extended to those teaching in independent schools (possibly due to strenuous objection by a number of small Christian schools) nor to those teaching in the tertiary sector or early childhood services (Barlow, 1996).

Initially, teachers' unions were wary of the Teacher Registration Board that was established. The unions felt that since the Minister appointed members of the Teacher Registration Board it could not directly represent the interests of teachers or the teachers' unions. There was also concern about the imposition of a $30 fee for a
practising certificate that had previously been given at no cost. However, as teachers accepted that the Board was prepared to be consultative and was concerned about the protection of professional standards, most objections faded (Barlow, 1996). The Teacher Registration Board, having five members and a staff of six, eventuated on 1 October 1989 (Barlow, 1996).

Sections 122c, 123c and 124 of the *NZ Education Act (1989)* required the Teacher Registration Board to determine that an applicant for teacher registration “is satisfactorily trained to teach” (New Zealand Government, 1993, p. 70). Section 124A(2)b of the Act specified that in so doing the Board was to take into account whether or not the applicant had undertaken training “recognised by the Registration Board as suitable for people wanting to teach” (New Zealand Government, 1993, p. 70). There were transition provisions that allowed teachers 12 months to gain admission to the register. The task of initially registering those already teaching throughout New Zealand was enormous and the task was not completed until 1991, when the Board had overseen the registration of some 50,000 teachers (Barlow, 1996).

The 1990 *Education Amendment Act* served to tidy up the legislation with respect to registration, and brought kindergarten teachers under the umbrella of compulsory registration (Barlow, 1996).

Pressure from business groups and a change of government in 1990 resulted in a further review of the registration provisions. The Ministry and the Board itself supported compulsory registration. Not one submission to the review suggested
removal of the mandatory nature of registration, yet in 1991, while agreeing that retention of the Teacher Registration Board was indeed desirable, the review committee recommended removal of the provision for compulsory registration from the *Education Act*. This repeal was completed by the passage of the *Education Amendment Act (No2)(1991)*. The removal of compulsion generated immediate criticism from teacher groups, the press, and even from members of the government (Barlow, 1996).

Although from 1991 teacher registration had become voluntary as the result of amendments to the *Education Act*, the concept of professional registration was well received by teachers, and as of 30 June 1996 there were 64,515 names on the Register of teachers (New Zealand Teacher Registration Board, 1996a).

Funding of the Registration Board, essentially, comes from the renewal fees of $30 per teacher each three years for a registered teacher’s “practising certificate.” As from July 1996 the Board has been responsible for its own funding and thus for all intents and purposes is financially independent of the government.
In September 1996 licensing of teachers in state and private schools and kindergartens in New Zealand became compulsory again, and the Registration Board has had its powers and responsibilities in the maintenance of standards of accountability for teachers increased (Barlow, 1996, 1999). Under the *Education Amendment Act (No 98) (1996)* the role of the Teacher Registration Board is to:

- determine the policies and procedures under which teachers will be registered;
- maintain a Register of teachers;
- approve registrations of different categories ("provisional," "subject to confirmation" and "full") and to issue Practising Certificates;
- determine if a teacher’s name should be removed from the register and the conditions under which this might be done;
- provide boards of trustees of schools with the names of those removed from the register or deemed unfit for placement on the Register; and,
- report to the Minister.

(Adapted from New Zealand Government, 1996; New Zealand Teacher Registration Board, 1996a.)

Under the newly inserted Section 138A of the *Education Amendment Act (No 98) (1996)*, it became incumbent upon a court to notify the Registration Board of the conviction of any person it reasonably believes to be employed as a teacher if the conviction carries a sentence of three months or more. It also became necessary for a
school authority to notify the board if it has dismissed a registered teacher from a
teaching position (New Zealand Government, 1996). Reliable information on the
criminal background of applicants for teaching positions is provided through police
computer checks of all New Zealand applicants. As well, there is an exchange of
information between the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board and some
Australian, US and United Kingdom authorities that aids in the determination of an
applicant’s fitness to teach (New Zealand Government, 1996a).

Teachers in New Zealand must renew their Practising Certificates each five years
(Barlow, 1999). This entails providing evidence to the Teacher Registration Board of
satisfactory teaching experience for at least two of the previous five years, and
providing evidence of some continuing professional development in each year of
service (Barlow, 1999).

The Teaching Council Aotearoa

The Teacher Registration Board is not completely independent of government or non-
government employers of teachers. It is a semi-independent government agency
(Barlow, 1999). It was the belief that teaching should have a professional
representative body completely independent of employers that led to the establishment
in 1993 of the “Teaching Council Aotearoa” (Barlow, 1996).

The formation of the Teaching Council Aotearoa was prompted by the close economic
ties between New Zealand and Australia, the work being done by the NPQTL in
Australia and the formation of the Australian Teaching Council. There was a
perceived need for New Zealand to have a body distinct from teachers’ unions to enable teachers to take responsibility for their own professional needs and standards (Barlow, 1996). A discussion paper emphasised that there would be advantages in New Zealand and Australia having a common form of licensing system for teachers.

The Teaching Council Aotearoa was formed as a voluntary organisation in 1995 with a membership of only 1,200 in its first year. Its aims included enabling teachers to take responsibility for standards for the profession, providing a strong unified teachers’ voice on professional issues, strengthening teacher registration, and encouraging teachers’ professional development (Barlow, 1996; Teaching Council Reference Group, 1994). The Council had similar intentions to the ill-fated Australian Teaching Council, encompassing aspects of teacher registration, course accreditation and continuing professional education for teachers.

Despite its small membership, there is support for the existence of the Teaching Council. Some politicians and teachers have a strong opinion that the teaching profession should be acting as its own guardian and standard setter. However, the advent of compulsory registration for teachers in New Zealand and the consequent strengthening of the powers of the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board have affected the significance of the Teaching Council during its emergence (Barlow, 1997, personal communication), and, although the Council is still functioning, it will be difficult to convince a large enough number of teachers to join it so that might become a body that can seriously represent to views of teachers.
Teacher Certification and Registration in Canada

Documentary material used in this section is listed in Appendix A.

In most provinces of Canada, the basic qualification required for teacher certification is a four-year Bachelor of Education degree or a degree together with a subsequent professional teaching qualification. However, when Fry conducted his inquiries in 1994, he observed that Quebec does issue a teaching permit to those with a three-year degree.

The teaching permit issued by a number of provinces is an initial license, with a limited duration of from one to five years. In those provinces, permanent certification is dependent on the successful completion of a specified period of teaching (Fry, 1994).

Between some Canadian provinces there are reciprocity agreements that facilitate exchange of teachers. Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan have mutual agreements that give teachers certified in one province automatic eligibility for certification in each of the other five. There is the provision, however, that if they do not meet the standards required by the receiving province they may be given interim certification until they meet those requirements through further training (British Columbia College of Teachers, 1995). Ontario, New Brunswick and Quebec have bilateral agreements with one another through which
teachers certified in one province may be certified in the other if they satisfy specified minimal requirements (Fry, 1994).

Until 1996 British Columbia was the only Canadian province in which teacher registration was compulsory. Ontario introduced teacher registration in 1996. The arrangements for registration of teachers in British Columbia and Ontario are discussed next.

**The British Columbia College of Teachers**

The British Columbia College of Teachers was established in 1988, under the *Teaching Profession Act*, to handle teacher registration (British Columbia College of Teachers, 1995; Williams, 1995a; 1995b). There are significant similarities between the British Columbia College of Teachers and the General Teaching Council for Scotland. It is funded from fees paid by its members. It is independent of the employers and the union and has its own Council (Williams, 1995a, 1995b).

To qualify for membership, a person must be a permanent resident of British Columbia (Williams, 1995b) and must be of “good moral character, be a fit and proper person to practice the profession of teaching, and have completed an acceptable program of professional and academic or specialist studies” (British Columbia College of Teachers, 1995, p. 4). Procedures in place to determine eligibility for membership include a criminal record check. Confidential referees’ reports are required and documentation must be validated (Williams, 1995b).
The College has five categories of membership:

- **The Professional Certificate**, which requires at least four years of preparation in academic and professional areas, including basic teacher education and a degree or its equivalent acceptable to the College.

- **The Standard Certificate**, which requires at least four years of preparation in academic and professional areas, including basic teacher education acceptable to the College.

- **The Basic Certificate**, which is attainable by those who held qualifications prior to the establishment of the College, but who do not meet requirements for the Standard Certificate or the Professional Certificate.

- **The First National Language Certificate**, which requires the teacher to be a proficient speaker of a First Nation language.

- **The Developmental Standard Term Certificate**, which is an interim certification requiring the completion of qualifications suitable for reclassification into one of the above three certifications.

(Adapted from British Columbia College of Teachers, 1995.)

The College has a disciplinary jurisdiction. As well, the College has jurisdiction over the accreditation of teacher education courses, via its function of approving programs or revisions to programs of teacher education faculties of universities. (British Columbia College of Teachers, 1995).
The College of Teachers meets monthly. There are 20 members of Council, 15 of whom are elected from geographic zones from within the province. Of the others, two are appointed by the Provincial Cabinet, two by the Minister for Education, and one is nominated to represent the Deans of Education of the three major universities and their colleges. There are five standing committees, dealing with qualifications, professional development, discipline, finance and communications (Williams, 1995b).

The Ontario College of Teachers

The second Canadian province to introduce registration for teachers was Ontario. A report in 1994 from the Royal Commission on Learning in Ontario recommended that compulsory registration for teachers was in the best professional interest of all educators. It recommended that unless teaching were given full professional status and governance issues were transferred to a newly created provincial professional body, the Ontario College of Teachers, “the profession of teaching will remain in a state of limited development” (Ontario College of Teachers, 1997, p. 3). The Ontario Teachers’ Federation fiercely opposed the establishment of the College (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998).

Initially funded by the provincial government, the Ontario College of Teachers was established by legislation proclaimed in July of 1996. The 1996 legislation vested the College of Teachers with authority to license, govern and regulate the practice of teaching through control of compulsory registration, professional development and discipline for teachers and to be responsible for teacher education standards. It has the
authority to regulate qualifications required of teachers, set its membership criteria, enrol members, and create a provincial register of teachers. It also has power to investigate complaints that involve members, conduct hearings into allegations of professional misconduct and to take appropriate disciplinary action. The primary functions of the College are to articulate clear standards of practice, ensure sound professional learning goals and co-ordinate and monitor career-long, accredited professional learning for teachers (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998; Ontario College of Teachers, 1997). In 1998, the Ontario College of Teachers produced a set of Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession (Ontario College of Teachers, 1998) that is meant as a guide to what makes the profession of teaching unique. The Standards contains statements about students, student learning, professional knowledge, teaching practice, leadership and community, and on-going professional learning.

There are 31 members of the governing council of the Ontario College of Teachers. Seventeen councillors are elected, and most of those are teachers. The Provincial Cabinet appoints fourteen members. The appointed councillors represent parents, school trustees, faculties of education, business and the community (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998; Ontario College of Teachers, 1997). It is hoped that the College will emulate the long-term positive outcomes that the General Teaching Council for Scotland has had on Scottish education and the Scottish teaching profession ("Strengthening the Teaching Profession," 1996).
Anyone who wishes to teach in publicly funded schools in Ontario must qualify for membership of the Ontario College of Teachers, but many employers in private schools also demand that their teachers be registered through the College (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998). Those eligible for membership of the College include qualified teachers in both public and private schools, unemployed qualified teachers, members of faculties of education in universities, and all qualified teachers who work in the Ministry of Education and Training, in colleges, in universities or in the private school sector. There is an application fee for initial registration and an annual membership fee. The fees are the same for full-time and part-time teachers (Ontario College of Teachers, 1997). By 1998 there were some 170,000 members of the College (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998).

The College ensures that there is a clear separation of professional concerns of the College and matters that are properly the business of the Ontario Teachers Federation (OTF), which is the industrial union for teachers. The OTF has a role in representing its members at disciplinary hearings. The power to cancel a teaching certificate has been moved from the Minister of Education and Training to the Ontario College of Teachers, which represents the profession (Ontario College of Teachers, 1997).

Charges of professional misconduct against members are heard by the Discipline Committee. If the teacher is found guilty of charges, the discipline Committee can:

- revoke any teaching certificate the member has;
• suspend a teaching certificate for up to two years;
• impose conditions on any certificate held by the teacher;
• reprimand, admonish or provide counselling for the teacher;
• fine the teacher up to $5000;
• publish the outcomes of the hearing in whatever ways the Committee deems appropriate;
• require the teacher to complete courses of study;
• fix a period for which the teacher is ineligible for reinstatement; and,
• fix costs to be paid by the teacher for the hearing.

( Ontario College of Teachers, 1997.)

The College also has a Fitness to Practise Committee. This Committee makes judgements as to whether or not physical, mental or other conditions might render a member of the College unfit to carry out his or her professional duties. The Committee can suspend or revoke a teaching license, or require the teacher to provide evidence that the condition has been removed or resolved before allowing the teacher to resume practise.

Part 2: Critical Issues: Attributes of a System of Teacher Registration
The collation of data from documents relating to registration, accreditation and advanced certification in the comparative groups in Australia and overseas constituted
the major part of Stage A of this study. Chapter 4 has been concerned with registration in overseas systems. Analysis of the data occurred simultaneously with the collection of the data. From the analysis of the data that relates specifically to registration, the following analytical categories were identified:

1. Teaching standards: Should registration be state or national?

2. The registration authorities.

3. The register and the nature of the teaching “licence.”

4. The jurisdiction of registration: Who must be registered?

5. Qualifications for admission to the Register.

6. Alternative pathways to teacher registration.

7. The internship: Probation, provisional registration and induction practices.

8. A code of ethics.


11. Continued registration and continuing professional development.

12. Funding.


These categories are discussed below. Issues that arose in each category were considered to be critical issues if they featured in all, or most, of the comparative
systems. The critical issues have been used to determine attributes that are necessary, or at least highly desirable, for a system of registration for Australia, and were used to construct the model, which is displayed in Chapter 7. Some attributes of teacher registration systems, referred to in the earlier discussion, have not been included, but could be considered if the model were ever to be adopted and expanded.

1. Teaching Standards: Should Registration be State or National?

The determination of who should teach could be made at a school level (as in independent schools in some Australian states, for example New South Wales), system level (for example, the certification of teachers by the New South Wales government school system), state level (as in Queensland, South Australia, the USA, Ontario and British Columbia) or at national level (as in New Zealand, Scotland, England and Wales). It is argued here that school-level and system-level regulation do little to protect standards for teaching and education in those states where they exist, and may have adversely affected the professional status of teachers in Australia. The form of occupational regulation that can ensure high educational standards for school students and enhance the status of teaching is registration, at state or national level.

If teaching is unregulated, in the sense that the determination of qualifications required of teachers is left to authorities in individual schools, then it is quite possible for a school to employ anyone, without requiring that they hold professional qualifications. Cases where this has occurred have been referred to earlier. Regulation at system level—referred to in this study as certification—protects standards in the particular
system, but does not prevent unqualified people from teaching in schools outside of the system. The existence in some states of ad hoc school-level determination of standards of qualification for teachers and system-specific certification of teachers has led to a perception that teachers do not require significant levels of professional education and has contributed to the low professional status of teachers in Australia. Thus, school-based or system-based determination of who becomes a teacher allows the public to hold the perception that anyone can teach.

State governments in Australia have responsibilities and powers for school education. These powers extend beyond government school systems to all schools within the state. It should be a major aim of a state government to ensure that all school students in its state have access to highly qualified, competent teachers. Registering teachers on a state basis is a way that governments can ensure that all teachers are qualified and fit to teach.

If registration or licensure is administered state-by-state, however, problems can occur with respect to the comparability of standards across the nation, and the occupational mobility for teachers can be hindered. This is exemplified in the United States where there are similarities in qualification standards for initial licensure of teachers from state-to-state, but there are enough underlying differences in requirements to make it difficult for even quite highly qualified teachers to practise their profession if they transfer between some states. With its multiplicity of states and school districts, and a parochialism that has led to the states jealously guarding their legislative powers over
education, it would be a difficult task to establish uniform standards for national licensure for teachers across the USA. However, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) is attempting to do just that, establish consistent standards across the USA for assessing beginning teachers for initial licensure.

In Australia, on the other hand, with only six states and two mainland territories, prospects for co-ordinating professional standards for teachers across the nation would be greater than in the USA. Uniformly high standards could be accomplished for Australia by having a national registration body through which the profession itself has the power to establish and maintain standards for entry to the profession and standards for practice. A starting point for defining teaching standards for Australia could be the National Competency Framework for Beginning Teachers that was developed by the Australian Teaching Council (1996c), together with the work on standards that has been developed in some of the states. An example the latter is the set of expectations of new teachers in New South Wales that is articulated in Desirable Attributes of Beginning Teachers (New South Wales Ministerial Advisory Council on Teacher Education and the Quality of Teaching, 1994).²

² In 1994, the New South Wales Ministerial Advisory Council on Teacher Education and the Quality of Teaching (MACITQ) published a set of Desirable Attributes of Beginning Teachers (New South Wales Ministerial Advisory Council on Teacher Education and the Quality of Teaching, 1994). The purposes of this document were to “make explicit the nature and qualities of teaching expected of beginning teachers and to provide guidance to universities for program structuring and to employers for their planning of recruitment, induction and career development” (New South Wales Ministerial Advisory Council on Teacher Education and the Quality of Teaching, 1994, p. ii). It was not meant to be a checklist to be used for assessment of teachers for certification, although it could have been a valuable guide for both beginning teachers and their assessors as to what qualities needed to be developed at the end of the induction period.
Registration would need to be introduced firstly in the states and territories, since school education is the responsibility of each of those governances. Then, co-ordination of registration requirements and procedures could be facilitated through the establishment of a national registration body that is representative of the profession. The states would need to forego some of their rights over education to the Commonwealth, and to the profession, to enable this to occur. The alternative, as supported by the government senators on the Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee (1998), would be for the states individually to introduce registration and then to co-operate through the Ministerial Council for Education, Employment and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) in establishing “a common framework for mutual recognition of teacher registration arrangements adopted by boards of registration in each state” (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998, p. 254). Under this latter arrangement, establishment of standards for the profession would remain under the power of the state governments, not the profession.

Teacher registration on a state-by-state basis may, however, be in contravention of national competition policy and mutual recognition agreements. In the early 1990s, the need for states to conform to the requirements of these policies led to the dismantling of the Tasmanian system of teacher registration, major modification of the Victorian system, and to the Registration Boards of South Australia and Queensland developing policies that ensured that interstate mobility of teachers would not be unfairly restricted
(Government of New South Wales, 1997; Teachers Registration Board of South Australia, 1995). It would be necessary for the states and the Commonwealth to cooperate to overcome these legislative difficulties.

In view of the above, in order to maintain comparably high standards for teachers across state borders and to facilitate interstate occupational mobility for teachers, it is considered a necessity that teacher registration in Australia should be established on a national basis, through a federated set of state registration boards that are co-ordinated by an overarching national board. The forms of legislation needed to do this should be developed jointly by the Commonwealth Government and the state governments, who have the powers to overcome whatever hindrances might be encountered, for example, by modifying requirements for compliance with the national competition policies.

2. The Registration Authorities

Teachers form the majority on the governing boards of the registration authorities for Scotland, British Columbia and Ontario in Canada. Teachers will be in the majority on the proposed General Teaching Councils for England and Wales (Department for Education and Employment, 1998a, 1999a). In Australia, a majority of those serving on the two existing state teacher registration boards, namely Queensland and South Australia, must be eligible for registration as teachers.

The Director of the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration, Dr. Marie Jansen, acknowledged that a wide range of stakeholders could provide valuable contributions through involvement with a teachers’ registration authority. However, she also
asserted that since such an authority would exist to set standards for the profession of
teaching, the majority membership of the governing body should be practising
registered teachers elected by the membership (Jansen, 1997).

The literature supports the view that practising teachers should hold the balance of
power in a teacher registration authority. (Beare, 1992; Chadbourne & Ingvarson, 1995;
Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Dunkin, 1995; Ingvarson, 1995, 1997; Jansen, 1997;
Lee, 1989, 1997; Maling, 1995; Meyenn et al., 1995; Sutherland, 1993; Williams,

There is a significant number of stakeholders who have legitimate interests in the
nature and quality of education that is delivered to the young people who will be the
next generation of adults in Australia. A teachers’ registration authority that allows
stakeholders to be represented fairly, while teachers have significant professional
power, would enable the teaching profession to forge beneficial relationships with
stakeholders and create a greater confidence in the profession by the wider public
(Eltis, 1997d). However, the need for teachers to constitute the majority of members
of the major regulatory bodies for their profession should be regarded as a necessity.
This is the way that the profession itself can take the major responsibility for standards
of practice. At the end of Chapter 3, the need for teachers to hold the balance of power
with respect to their profession’s standards has been signified as one of the three
fundamental principles for any teachers’ registration authority that might be instituted
in Australia.
3. The Register and the Nature of the Teaching “Licence”

It was determined from examining the way registration is administered in the
comparison groups that initial registration should be considered to be an official
acknowledgement that a person has the prerequisite qualifications for teaching, and
therefore should be required once only in a teacher’s professional life. However, it
was also considered that the right to teach should be reviewed regularly, and to
facilitate this the model in Chapter 7 proposes a regularly renewable “Practising
Certificate.” Incorporated in the procedures for gaining or renewing the Practising
Certificate are updating of records for such matters as the currency of probity checks
and the teacher’s record of involvement with continuing professional development.

After applying to become teachers, people who have the required qualifications and
who have satisfied all other requirements of the registration authority, may have their
names entered into the Register of Teachers. The Register might also, as in the case of
New Zealand, have the names of those deregistered or disqualified from teaching. The
names of those persons listed as registered, and the currency of their Practising
Certificates, should be available to employers of teachers and to the public. In
Australia there are over 200,000 teachers in schools (Ministerial Council on Education,
Employment and Youth Affairs, 1995). A computerised National Register would be
the most efficient means of maintaining records and facilitating inter-system and
interstate checks on the registration status of teachers. This would greatly reduce the
risk, which currently exists, that teachers found unsuitable in one state or system could find employment as teachers in another.

4. The Jurisdiction of Registration: Who Must be Registered?

Scotland, British Columbia and Ontario require almost all teachers in all educational systems to be registered. New Zealand now requires that all teachers in all schools—primary and secondary schools, teachers’ colleges, technical institutes and community schools, whether government or non-government—must now be registered. In most states of the USA, including those that have profession-controlled registration boards, all teachers must be licensed by the state. England and Wales do not have registration per se, but to teach in grant-maintained schools in England and Wales, a person must have Qualified Teacher Status (QTS).

In Queensland, teachers in pre-school centres, kindergartens, primary schools, secondary schools and special schools must be registered. As well, teacher educators need to be registered if they are to enter schools to supervise student teachers undertaking the practicum. The Education Act (1972) of South Australia prescribes that only registered persons may teach in government or registered non-government pre-primary, primary and secondary schools in that state. Victoria has a system of partial registration, where teachers in non-government schools must be registered, but those in government schools need not be registered.

The 1997 discussion paper, The Establishment of a Teacher Registration Authority in New South Wales (Government of New South Wales, 1997), suggested a system in
which, effectively, registration was to be mandatory for teachers in New South Wales
government schools but optional for teachers in independent schools. Eltis (1997d)
questioned the sense of the ministerial proposal which promoted a registration
authority that would not have jurisdiction in all sectors of school education. The New
South Wales Director-General for Education and Training, Dr. K. Boston (1997),
expressed his view that no unregistered teacher should ever be employed as a teacher.
Following extensive consultation, the New South Wales government eventually
drafted its Teaching Standards Bill 1998. That Bill, if it had been passed in
parliament, would have extended the jurisdiction of registration to teachers in all
government and non-government schools (as defined under the Education Act 1990).

The Tasmanian School Teachers Registration Bill 1997, which lapsed when an
election was called before it could be voted upon in parliament, required that all people
employed as teachers in a pre-school or kindergarten, a primary school, secondary
school, special school, or a senior secondary college in Tasmania must be registered. It
also proposed that teacher educators who must enter schools to supervise student
teachers should be registered as teachers.

Given the preceding summary of the differing ways that education systems of the
comparison groups define who should be registered, it is difficult to form conclusions
about what would be desirable across Australia. However, in view of the argument
that has been presented earlier—that it should be a major aim of a state government to
ensure that all school students in its state have access to highly qualified, competent
teachers—a case can be made for requiring that all teachers in all government and non-
government schools and pre-schools in all Australian states and territories must be
registered. Otherwise, they should not be employed as teachers.

Two other groups of people who need to take charge of classrooms for extended
periods are teacher education students and teacher educators. A pre-professional level
of registration for student teachers that would involve character and criminality checks
before enrolment in a teacher education program is proposed as desirable. Screening
of potential teacher education students by a registration authority would limit the
possibility that unsuitable people, who could in the future pose a risk to the physical
and psychological well being of children, might commence teacher education. There is
also a case for special registration for the teacher educators who supervise teacher
education practica and who might have to work with children in schools.

Employers in independent schools make the claim that registration would prevent them
from employing people with highly developed skills to undertake special programs that
they consider necessary for their students if those people had no teacher education
qualifications. Accommodation for this could be made through a special classification
of “instructor” for people who do not have teacher education qualifications, but who
have been approved to work in schools for a limited time under stringent conditions set
by the national registration authority. Boston (1997) has made a case for employing
skilled, qualified people with industrial experience to teach in vocational and
employment oriented courses in schools. The same “instructor” category could be a means through which this could be allowed.

5. Qualifications for Admission to the Register

In British Columbia, Ontario, England and Wales the usual qualifications required to become a teacher are a combination of four years of university level academic and professional preparation. England and Wales also have “licensed teacher schemes” whereby non-graduates with work experience who wish to become teachers can commence teaching in schools while earning their teaching credentials. Most school systems in the USA require teachers to have four years of academic and professional education before they can be licensed, although difficulties in recruiting adequate numbers of teachers have resulted in many states having emergency and alternative certification schemes.

Over the last twenty years many Australian reports on teacher education, such as the National Inquiry into Teacher Education (Auchmuty, 1980), the Discipline Review of Teacher Education in Mathematics and Science (Speedy, 1989), Teacher Education in Australia (Ebbeck, 1990), Teacher Education: Action Plan (New South Wales Office of Education and Youth Affairs, 1992), Preparing a Profession (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998) and A Class Act: Inquiry into the Status of the Teaching Profession (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998), have recommended that teachers should have successfully completed at least four years of university study, including substantial teacher education. Standards that
have been established by the Queensland Board of Teacher Education as from the beginning of 1999 require prospective teachers to have at least four years of university education that includes a minimum of two years of professional teacher education. The teacher education program must be accredited by the Board of Teacher Registration as suitable for preparing its graduates for professional practice. It is recommended in this thesis that this be the minimum standard for registration as a teacher in Australia.

The Director-General for Education and Training in New South Wales, Dr. K. Boston, has suggested that registration as a teacher should not necessarily require the possession of teacher education qualifications (Boston, 1997). The context in which Boston suggested this was that suitable people with desirable industrial expertise should be able to teach in vocational courses in schools, under the supervision of a fully registered teacher (Boston, 1997). The education of some children may, indeed, be enhanced by the employment of such people in schools and consideration should be given to some form of provisional registration to allow those people with skills developed in other settings to teach. However, they should not be eligible for permanent employment as teachers unless they have undertaken approved teacher education. Some variation on the licensed teacher schemes of England and Wales and the alternative licensing schemes that some American states use to provide alternative pathways into teaching might be possible for Australia, provided that they are well designed and accredited by the registration authority. A specific classification (not
registration) of “Instructor,” might be an appropriate way of distinguishing such alternative entrants from professionally prepared entrants.

6. Alternative Pathways to Teacher Registration

Alternative certification and emergency certification schemes allow people who do not have the minimum qualifications to become teachers. Ideological debate about educational quality has been generated by the search for alternative routes to teacher certification.

Those who oppose alternative or emergency licensure argue that in order to improve the quality of education it is necessary for teachers to have professional knowledge and subject matter competency grounded in sound pedagogical training (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Otuya, 1992). Zumwalt (1991) contends that alternative certification schemes are context-specific experiments designed to meet policy goals, such as attracting talented career changers or to fill teacher shortages, and as such should not be viewed as substitutes for or competitors of traditional teacher preparation. Cynically, some see the promotion of alternative certification schemes as an attempt to undermine the credibility and the professionalism of teaching (Zumwalt, 1991).

On the other hand, supporters of alternative teacher preparation schemes maintain that candidates with sound subject matter competency can become good teachers and contribute to the improvement of a system’s educational quality by applying in-depth subject matter knowledge to teaching without having undertaken traditional
pedagogical preparation (Otuya, 1992). Talented and experienced people are undoubtedly brought into teaching by some alternative certification programs, especially in critical subject areas where shortages exist (Otuya, 1992).

Accreditation of some forms of alternative programs might be justifiable, for example, as programs for allowing people who have valuable industrial qualifications and experience to teach vocational education programs in schools. Alternative certification programs might also be useful devices for upgrading the formal qualifications of people who are already employed as teachers or instructors, but who do not possess qualifications that would be acceptable for professional registration. An example of a successful program of this nature is the “Teaching Qualification (Further Education)” program offered to instructors and lecturers in further education colleges by the General Teaching Council for Scotland. Such programs could provide instruction in pedagogy, and allow those who have gained adequate teaching experience and who have demonstrated an adequate degree of competence the opportunity to become registered. Any such alternative programs should be carefully perused by a registration body, to ensure that they are substantial enough to overcome the objections that have been put forward by such authorities as Kramer, Moore and Baker (1991), Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein (1995), and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996).
7. The Internship: Probation or Provisional Registration and Induction Practices

From the data collected from overseas systems, and locally, there is support for an internship, or induction period, for newly employed teachers. It is highly recommended that such an internship should be part any system of teacher registration that might be introduced into Australia.

The internship should involve performance-based assessment of candidates and evaluation of teacher knowledge by procedures that are similar to those used during the clinical internships of other professions (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). The acquisition of the final professional teaching license should be dependent upon successful performance during the internship. Candidates who are not successful at the end of the internship should be provided with further supportive programs, but if they then do not attain suitable levels of performance, they should leave the profession. This equates the induction year with a probation year.

The Australian Education Union (1991) supports a system of provisional registration that may result in full registration after one year of induction/probation. The length of probation in Scotland is two years. Under the performance management policies that have been introduced for teachers in England and Wales, as from May 1999 all newly employed teachers must be provided with a one-year induction/probation program that is tailored to their needs (Department for Education and Employment, 1998b, 1999b). In the USA, Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein (1995) have promoted a model for
initial licensing that requires all prospective teachers to undergo an intensive, one-year long, supervised internship.

There is no uniform view as to how long the internship/induction/probation period should be. Tisher (1979) limited his studies of induction to the first year of service. Odell (1986) considered that induction support should extend to the first three years of teaching. Griffin (1985) and Veenman (1984) considered that induction should continue for more than one year. It is suggested here that the adjustment to the teaching profession is too complex to be achieved by most neophytes in only one year, and so it is highly recommended that, in Australia, the internship period for new teachers should be of two years duration.

The internship should incorporate well-planned induction, and should be conducted under the mentorship of an experienced, fully registered teacher. The internship is completed when the teaching intern (cf. Chapter 7, Subsection 4.1.2) has satisfied school authorities of his or her competence. A reporting process, such as that used by the South Australian Board of Teacher Registration, where the school principal comments on the teaching intern’s teaching knowledge and practical skills using information provided by the intern’s supervisors (not the mentor), is recommended.

8. A Code of Ethics

A code of ethics—a “set of standards and ideals, related to [the profession’s] responsibility to society and to the profession’s purposes and characteristics” (Thompson, 1997, p. 21)—is usually a short set of ethical principles referring to broad
and general types of conduct. It differs from a code of conduct, which is usually more
detailed and provides more specific statements that apply ethical principles to
situations that may commonly arise in the practice of the profession. It is also distinct
from a code of practice, which often contains rules of an ethical kind but also contains
rules as to how professional duties should be carried out (Thompson, 1997). The
question of whether, or how, ethics should be included in the formulation of standards
for teachers needs to be addressed (New South Wales Department of Education and

Amongst the comparison systems there were those that had specified codes of ethics
(e.g. Minnesota) while others, such as the General Teaching Council for Scotland,
avoided specifying such codes of practice and behaviour. It could be argued that codes
of ethics are necessary to guide practitioners as to what behaviours are acceptable or
not. The GTC for Scotland determined not to institute such a code since they believed
that the existence of a code of ethics would have no practical value in guiding
professional behaviour.

Teachers in general know little about ethics and lack the conceptual basis for justifying
the ethical decisions that they frequently must make (Burke, 1997). A code of ethics is
one way of articulating expectations of teachers as professionals and would provide a
guide upon which teachers could base the decisions that they frequently make that
relate to professional dilemmas. Thompson (1997) suggests that, in addition, a code of
ethics which states fundamental values and broad ethical principles for the profession
could “help raise the profession’s morale, self-confidence, sense of purpose and commitment and adjust its expectations, thus improving professional standards” (p. 29). Beare (1992) includes the formulation of a code of conduct as one of the characteristics that he sees necessary for teaching as a profession.

In view of the value that such a code might have in raising the morale of teachers and ultimately enhancing standards for the profession, it is concluded that it is desirable to have a code of ethics that applies to the profession of teaching in Australia, and that this should be developed by members of the profession, through whatever professional regulatory body might eventuate.

9. Professional Discipline

Along with the power to determine who should practise the profession or not, the registration bodies in the comparison groups have the power to discipline registered practitioners who fail to maintain professionally acceptable behaviour, whether that is defined through a code of ethics or not. This is a responsibility that is usually defined within the legislation under which the board has been established. Disciplinary measures may include fines or other sanctions on members or on those misrepresenting themselves as registered teachers. Registration boards usually have powers that extend to suspending registration or in the most serious of cases removing the name of a member from the register, that is, deregistration. Such sanctions are so serious in their implications that there must be mechanisms that ensure that members cannot be denied natural justice when allegations are made, and there must be clearly defined legal
avenues by which a person subjected to suspension or deregistration may appeal the judgement.

It must be seen as necessary in any teacher registration system to establish procedures for professional discipline. These procedures should take into account the principle that serious criminal acts, including child assault, should be dealt with by appropriate statutory authorities before the registration body becomes involved. Industrial issues should be treated initially as issues between the employer, the employee and the teacher's union. Only if professional misconduct or incompetence is substantiated as a result of those investigations should the professional registration body become involved.

10. Period of Registration

In most of the comparison groups, registration was renewable periodically. The periodic renewal of the right to practise is seen as necessary in a model for Australia, since it would allow the registration authority to conduct periodic police records checks and to regularly update details of registered teachers' qualifications and other professional items. Two alternative ways for having teachers renew their rights to practise are considered below:

1. Registration could be granted, say, on a three-year basis, and be renewable only after the teacher has satisfactorily undertaken accredited continuing professional education.
2. Registration might be granted for life, as recognition that the person has satisfied initial requirements, but the right to practise and to continue to practise could be governed by a “Practising Certificate” that must be renewed periodically, say each three years.

The second of these is favoured, since it acknowledges the practitioner’s initial acceptance into the profession while also providing adequately for updating criminality records and overseeing that the practitioner has maintained required standards and conditions. For example, if continued professional development were to be a condition for renewal of the right to practise, then the regular review of the Practising Certificate would allow the registration board to ensure that teachers have complied with the conditions.

11. Continued Registration and Continuing Professional Development

It should be recognised that the skills and knowledge that are needed for teaching have expanded well beyond what was necessary in the past (Eltis, 1997a). Teachers are required to be increasingly skilled and to keep up-to-date with rapid changes in learning theories and technologies. In 1980, the National Inquiry into Teacher Education recommended that teachers should be expected to undergo five days of in-servicing each year (Auchmuty, 1980). More recently the Inquiry into the Status of Teaching, A Class Act, made a similar recommendation (Senate Employment, Education and Training Reference Committee, 1998). The new performance management system for England and Wales specifies that teachers must be appraised
annually against agreed continuing professional education objectives, and if they do not achieve their CPE objectives they can have their levels of pay reduced (Department for Education and Employment, 1998b, 1999b). Many states in the USA require specific levels of CPE to be completed before a teachers’ licensure is renewed.

It should be specified in any system of teacher registration for Australia that renewal of a teacher’s practising certificate should be contingent upon the teacher having completed a specified amount of accredited CPE before the practising certificate can be renewed. This mandatory CPE requirement would also need to apply to teachers who have left the system for some time and who wish to commence practice again after the absence. If such people who wish to return to practice cannot demonstrate that they have met the mandatory CPE requirements, but are otherwise qualified, then they should only be classified as conditionally registered until they have met their CPE obligations. The issue of a license to teach on a periodically renewable basis allows for the profession to have confidence that practitioners have refreshed their professional knowledge and practical skills.

12. Funding

It is not the purpose of this thesis to calculate precisely the costs of introducing a system of teacher registration. There are too many variables that are dependent upon determinations of an as yet unformed set of authorities. However, registration boards overseas, such as the GTC for Scotland and the New Zealand Teachers Registration Board, have managed to become self-funding within reasonable times since their
inception. In England and Wales, the government is prepared to pay all of the establishment costs for the proposed General Teaching Councils, but expects that these two bodies will become self-funding through tax-deductible annual registration fees of about £20 (Department for Education and Employment, 1998a, 1999a). The Queensland Board of Teacher Registration is self-funded from the $24 registration fee of each of the 74,000 members (Jansen, 1998). As is acknowledged in the New South Wales Ministerial Discussion Paper (Government of New South Wales, 1997), a significant initial amount of government funding would be required to establish a registration authority. Initial grants from state and Commonwealth governments would therefore be required to set up the infrastructure for national co-ordination of registration as proposed in this thesis. However, an aim for any model for teacher registration in Australia should be that within a short period of establishment, the registration authorities should be self-funding, without imposing upon teachers unduly large registration fees.

13. Transitional Arrangements

The registration bills that were put forward in the Tasmanian and New South Wales parliaments each had transition arrangements that took into account the fact that teachers already in service have entered the profession under employment contracts that predate registration requirements. Many practising teachers commenced teaching when it was acceptable to have only two years or three years of teacher education. Some have taught in unregulated, non-government schools for many years without having been required to possess formal professional qualifications. If a system of
registration is to be introduced, it will be necessary to formulate an interim policy for
handling registration for those already employed as teachers that takes the above facts
into account and which does not retrospectively penalise those who have given years of
acceptable, indeed valuable, service to teaching.

The registration of more than 200,000 practising teachers and recent teacher education
students would be an enormous task. The time required could be considerable, and so
transitional arrangements may have to be kept in place for several years.

Conclusion

In Part 1 of this chapter, registration as practised in a number of selected overseas
educational systems was examined. The overseas comparative groups were chosen
principally because they had introduced, or were considering introducing, systems for
registering teachers. Documentary materials were used as sources of data. Issues were
identified, and categorised. As the examination progressed, some of the categories
were combined, new categories emerged and some categories vanished. Eventually,
13 categories remained. These analytical categories have been listed as “critical
issues,” and have provided attributes that are considered necessary or desirable for a
system for registering teachers in Australia. These have been integrated with the data
that comes from the subsequent Chapters 5 and 6 into the model that is displayed in
Chapter 7.
Chapter 5

ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION OVERSEAS

The purpose of the first part of this chapter, “Accreditation in Overseas Systems,” is to examine how overseas authorities monitor and approve initial teacher education programs that prepare teachers for professional registration or monitor and approve the providers of such programs. Just as teacher registration, where it exists, guards the integrity of the profession by monitoring the quality of those entitled to practise the profession, accreditation should ensure that teacher education programs prepare prospective teachers adequately for professional practice.

Factors that are considered to be necessary or desirable inclusions in a system for accrediting programs of profession preparation of teachers in Australia are further discussed in the second part of the chapter, “Critical Issues: Attributes of Accreditation.”

Part 1: Accreditation in Overseas Systems

This section will describe accreditation practices in Scotland, England and Wales, The USA, New Zealand and Canada. Examples of documents and records from overseas sources that have been used in this chapter are listed in Appendix A.

Accreditation of Teacher Education in Scotland

In Scotland, all initial teacher education courses must be approved by the Secretary of State. They must be subjected to external validation under the auspices of the
university or other degree awarding institution before they can gain approval. The committee conducting the validation process must contain members from outside of the university, or else be supervised by a committee that contains members external to the university (Scottish Office Education Department, 1993). Furthermore, a course of initial teacher education cannot operate in Scotland unless it has accreditation from the GTC, that is all courses must be acceptable to the GTC as leading to registration as a primary or secondary teacher (General Teaching Council for Scotland, 1994; Scottish Office Education Department, 1993).

In its Policy Statement on “The Accreditation and Review of Courses of Initial Teacher Education” (1994), the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTC) defined accreditation as “the process of ascertaining the professional acceptability of a new course of initial teacher education.” Accreditation in Scotland applies to courses, not institutions. Each course is evaluated on an individual basis and from a point of view that the course should be a preparation for professional practice.

Registration as a teacher with the GTC cannot be obtained if the courses leading to the teaching qualification are not accredited. This relationship between teacher registration and course accreditation is ensconced in the Teaching Council (Scotland) Act of 1965, which requires the GTC to “keep itself informed of the nature of instruction given in colleges of education” (Whiteford, 1993, p. 29). The Act gives the GTC the power to make recommendations on the content of, and arrangements for, courses in teacher education and to bring to the attention of the Secretary of State any
concern about the quality of teacher preparation courses (Whiteford, 1993). The Council’s Accreditation and Review Committee has responsibility for the scrutiny and approval of courses of initial teacher education (Sutherland, 1993).

The Accreditation and Review Committee of the Council undertakes its responsibilities through two sub-committees. There are four stages in the accreditation of a new course: (a) preliminary discussion with the Scottish Office Education Department and the Council to determine whether further development of the course proposal should be encouraged, (b) approval by the Scottish Office Education Department if the course has complied with national guidelines, (c) validation as to whether or not the course has met university requirements for academic rigour or “degree-worthiness,” and (d) accreditation when the Council determines if the course is professionally acceptable. In the fourth stage the Council’s Accreditation Sub-committee must determine whether or not the course offers relevant professional preparation for teaching. In the review of an existing course, the Council’s Review Sub-committee will normally undertake only the last three of these stages. Full accreditation allows the course to run for a period of up to five years without review unless substantial changes are made to the course.

A summary of the major criteria used by the Council for the accreditation of courses is listed below:

- The course demonstrates coherence, balance and progression.
Professional studies are taught in an integrated way.

There are clear links between college and school elements in the course.

A variety of teaching methods is used.

A variety of assessment methods is used.

Schools and colleges are involved in a “partnership” in training and assessment.

Adequate student selection procedures that involve consideration of references and interviews as well as entry qualifications exist.

Serving teachers are involved in the selection process.

Teaching staffs possess recent, relevant and successful experience of teaching in schools.

Special education needs are adequately catered for.

Cross-curricular issues—gender equality, European awareness, and anti-racist education—are clearly addressed.

The college has a structured system of course evaluation.

A review of the policy for accreditation of courses in Scotland (Scottish Office Education Department, 1992) listed the following as the main strengths of the Scottish accreditation process:

The teaching profession itself oversees the training process for teachers.
Because a significant number of practising teachers are involved in the accreditation process, the credibility of the training institutions is enhanced in the eyes of the profession.

Professional relevance and appropriateness are more likely to be built into the course because professional teachers are on the approval committee.

The training institutions are aware that they are serving the profession and not in some way remote from the profession.

Partnerships between the schools and the training institutions are strengthened.

The review further determined that the system had the following demonstrable weaknesses:

At times, the team of Accreditation Sub-committee members is not always as strong as it might be, due to the difficulty in controlling the backgrounds and experience of the individual elected members.

Expertise by necessity is built up over time, yet when elections occur every four years the shape of the Council can change considerably.

Due to changes in the membership of the Accreditation Sub-committee and the nature of courses, consistency is difficult to achieve.

Institutions can perceive accreditation procedures as hurdles to be overcome by whatever means, rather than as opportunities for professional interaction and improvement.
The language used by teacher educators in the normal course of their work may not be familiar to serving teachers.

Many of the potential problems that were expected at the outset were resolved through discussion between the GTC and the institutions during visitations to the institutions. As a result there has been no need for the GTC to bring to the attention of the Secretary of State any unresolved problems (Whiteford, 1993). A great deal of the GTC’s time is expended on the accreditation of courses. Whiteford (1993) describes the involvement of the GTC with accreditation as occupying “a formidable large amount of time” (p. 29), and perceives this as reflective of “how increasingly valuable and welcome the Council’s contribution has become” (p. 29).

Accreditation of Teacher Education in England and Wales

The following is a brief historical description of the development of the regulation of teacher education in post World War II England and Wales. It provides a temporal perspective of the progression of teacher education from employer sponsored training colleges to faculties of autonomous universities. The subsequent evolution of accreditation, firstly through the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) and ultimately the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), is discussed.

The McNair Report of 1944 set the basic structure of post-war teacher education in England and Wales (Graves, 1995; Williams, 1993). At that time, Training Colleges provided teacher education for primary school teachers while secondary school teachers trained in departments of education within universities. Major aims of the
McNair Report were to raise the standards in teacher education and to encourage research into education. These aims were to be achieved by establishing Institutes of Education (known officially as Area Training Organisations or ATOs). The establishment of ATOs placed teacher education under the academic control of universities, whereas previously teacher education had been provided in non-university institutions (Graves, 1995). By 1971 there were 23 ATOs, usually integral parts of universities (Williams, 1993). The growth of the numbers of teachers who were university graduates, the growth in the availability of higher degree courses in education (MAs and PhDs) and the increase in research projects, particularly in curriculum research, attest to the success in achieving the aims of the McNair Report (Graves, 1995).

Downturns in pupil numbers in schools during the 1960s and 1970s brought about the need to rationalise the provision of teacher education (Graves, 1995). As a result, many colleges of education closed or amalgamated with local universities or polytechnics. This is somewhat analogous to what happened in the late 1980s in Australia. Since few independent colleges of education remained, the ATOs became redundant.

In 1984 the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) was established to advise the Secretary of State for Education and Science on the accreditation of initial teacher education courses (Howarth, 1990). The establishment of CATE occurred at a time when external criticism of teacher education was
“strident” (Graves, 1995, p. 3). Before CATE was constituted there were enormous variations in teacher training courses, especially in the balance of time spent by students on educational theory and practical teaching skills. The criteria originally authorised by CATE for accrediting teacher education included strengthening teachers’ academic backgrounds in their teaching subjects, requiring that all primary school teachers should receive training in mathematics and the English language, and that all teacher training should have a more practical focus and should involve experienced teachers from schools (Howarth, 1990).

CATE was reconstituted in 1990 with altered terms of reference. Much of the substance of the 1984 criteria was retained, but many provisions were revised to take account of changes in education, particularly the adoption of a national curriculum (Howarth, 1990). New criteria included the stipulation that tutors in pedagogy—that is, lecturers in teacher education courses, but not those concerned purely with academic subjects—should renew their experience of school teaching through spending at least 35 days of each five years in a school (Department of Education and Science, 1989; Graves, 1995; Howarth, 1990). CATE also required that for a course to be accredited, a thorough report of an inspection of the courses must be prepared by Her Majesty’s Inspectors. Although these reports were intended to be formative, the universities reacted angrily to what they saw as an attempt by the government to curb their autonomy. More antagonism was generated by members of what Graves (1995, p. 3) called the “radical right,” who felt that CATE was dominated by established
teacher educationalists who tended to be “soft on the institutions concerned” (p. 3). Such criticism of the efforts of CATE ultimately led to its replacement in 1994 by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA).

The TTA was established under the Education Act of 1994, and presently the profession of teaching in England and Wales is regulated by the TTA. The formation of the TTA brought together into one body the functions of accrediting all providers of initial teacher education and of funding them (Graves, 1995; Williams, 1995a). The TTA does not determine standards for the employment of teachers. That is the responsibility of the Secretary of State.

All primary and secondary teacher education courses in England are accredited through the TTA according to requirements set out in the official Circular 10/97 “Requirements for Courses of Initial Teacher Training,” which replaced Circular 14/93 “The Initial Training of Primary Teachers: New Criteria for Courses,” and Circular 9/92 “Initial Teacher Training (Secondary Phase)” in July 1997 (Department for Education, 1992, 1993; Department for Education and Employment, 1997). The Department for Education and Employment circulars describe the criteria required by the Secretary of State and are not changeable without the approval of the Secretary of State (Williams, 1995a). The accreditation requirements are extensive (Williams, 1995a). They cover areas such as the aims of initial teacher education, competencies expected of beginning teachers, quality assurance arrangements, and specific requirements for courses of initial teacher education. For example, for primary school
courses the TTA seeks data on the numbers of weeks to be spent in schools by enrolled
students, the directed time to be spent on core subjects such as English, Mathematics
and Science, and the minimum time to be devoted to the teaching of reading and
arithmetic. Matters such as required levels of staffing of the institution and
requirements for student entry to courses are also specified (Department for Education
and Employment, 1997; Teacher Training Agency, 1994b; Williams, 1995a).

On 1 March 1995, the Teacher Training Agency invited all providers of initial teacher
education to apply for institutional accreditation—a status that replaced course
accreditation, which was previously required by CATE (Teacher Training Agency,
1995; Williams, 1995a). Consequently, a provider is not able to offer courses that lead
to qualified teacher status without having gained institutional accreditation. Since
1995, the TTA has accredited 31 new providers of teacher education. Between them,
the new providers offer more than 1000 places each year (Morris, 1998).

In accrediting providers of initial teacher education, the Teacher Training Agency
makes use of reports from two sources, the Office of Standards in Education
(OFSTED) and the Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) (Meyenn et al., 1995;
Williams, 1995a). The OFSTED report is also accepted by the Higher Education
Funding Council for determination of continuance of funding for teacher education
programs (Meyenn et al., 1995).

Under Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Schools, OFSTED has conducted inspections
of all providers of secondary and primary teaching programs. Inspections are
thorough, and involve two visits to the institution. The first takes about a week and involves a review of material submitted by the institution and interviews with a range of members of the institution. On a subsequent week-long visit, students of the institution are watched while teaching. The institution is given a rating of 1 (very good), 2 (good), 3 (satisfactory), or 4 (unsatisfactory) with respect to each of the prescribed criteria (Meyenn et al., 1995).

The second report used by the Teacher Training Agency is that written by the Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC), an organisation funded by the universities and colleges of higher education themselves. Based on documentation provided by the institution and visits by a team of auditors, the HEQC report scrutinises the quality assurance mechanisms of the institution to ensure that the institution has effective accountability procedures for academic quality and standards in place (Meyenn et al., 1995).

The funding of initial teacher education is from the Department for Education and Employment, but is disbursed by the Teacher Training Agency. The TTA also has a responsibility for monitoring the demand and supply of teachers (Williams, 1995a).

A primary concept of institutional accreditation is that it is the responsibility of the institution to maintain the quality of all courses offered and the rigour of assessment of its students, thus ensuring that newly graduated teachers should have essential professional competencies (Teacher Training Agency, 1994a). In applying for institutional accreditation a provider, which may be an institution in the higher or
further education sector or a consortium of schools currently providing school-centred initial teacher training, must declare that all current, new or modified courses comply with the criteria set out in the prescriptive circulars of the Department for Education and Employment (Williams, 1995a). As from May 1998, all courses of initial teacher training have been expected to conform to the new criteria, which include requirements that all courses follow the new national curricula for initial teacher training in Mathematics, English, Information and Communications Technology, and Science (Bienkowska, 1999; Morris, 1998; Teacher Training Agency, 1997a).

Accreditation of Teacher Education in the USA

To understand the trends in accrediting teacher education in the USA, it is firstly necessary to consider how post-secondary institutions receive accreditation and focus on a set of major providers of teacher education. In a large number of American institutions offering teacher education, there are three levels of academic accreditation:

1. Accreditation of post-secondary institutions such as universities and colleges by regional accreditation commissions. This is a fundamental level of accreditation that is not specific to teacher education.

2. Voluntary accreditation of professional education units, that is schools of education, departments or other divisions that offer teacher education within institutions, by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
3. Accreditation of individual teacher education programs for teacher licensure (initial registration) purposes by state authorities under state legislation.

In the following discussion all three of the levels of accreditation listed above are discussed. As well, a fourth level of accreditation, by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), is discussed. TEAC is an accreditation organisation that was formed under the sponsorship of the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) in the 1990s as a possible alternative to NCATE.

The emphasis in this chapter is on the work of NCATE and its role in the accreditation of providers of American teacher education programs because of the extent of development work that has been conducted by it since its inception. NCATE has accreditation standards based around peer reviews. These are rigorous and demanding enough for nearly one in each five schools of education that subject themselves to scrutiny to be denied NCATE accreditation at their first application (Wise & Liebbrand, 1996).

1. The Regional Accreditation Commissions

Six non-government regional accreditation commissions have responsibility for accrediting institutions of post-secondary education in the USA. These bodies were established by non-profit associations of colleges and schools that were seeking to promote excellence in elementary, secondary and tertiary education through a range of services offered to member institutions, including evaluation and accreditation.
The commissions do not accredit individual schools, colleges, faculties or departments within tertiary institutions. Nor do they accredit individual courses or suites of courses that constitute coherent programs within the institution. The regional accreditation process focuses on the objectives of the institution, the financial viability of the institution, the effectiveness of the administration, the strength of the academic staff, the quality of the programs offered by the institution, the adequacy of the library and other facilities, and the appropriateness of student administrative policies and support services. Accreditation is usually granted for a specified period of five to ten years, but a commission may review the accreditation status of an institution at any time if there have been significant changes to its programs (Fry, 1994).

It should be noted that accreditation signifies that an institution has met the minimum requirements. Variations in quality of the academic programs within accredited institutions occur (Fry, 1994).

The regional commissions accredit the great majority of US higher education institutions. However, it is voluntary for institutions to comply with the regional accreditation commissions’ standards, so there are institutions that do not seek accreditation through the regional commissions. Failure to gain accreditation through a regional accreditation commission does not prevent an institution’s graduates from being employed as teachers.

The Commission on Recognition of Post-secondary Accreditation (CORPA) gives the six regional commissions official standing at the national level, accepting that their
accreditation procedures meet agreed standards of quality and performance. CORPA, a voluntary, non-government organisation that seeks to facilitate the role of the regional accrediting bodies, replaced the Council on Post-secondary Accreditation (COPA) from 1 January 1994.

2. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

As well as recognising the regional accrediting commissions, CORPA officially recognises national organisations that satisfy the minimum standards in accrediting programs that prepare students to take up a profession or occupation. The only organisation that is recognised by CORPA and the US Department of Education as meeting their criteria for accrediting teacher education programs is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992).

NCATE was formed in 1954 in Washington, D.C. Five groups were instrumental in its formation:

- The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).
- The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC).
- The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the National Education Association (NEA).
- The National Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).
The National Schools Board (NSB)

(National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992.)

The accreditation procedures of NCATE are designed to establish and uphold national standards of excellence, to strengthen the quality and integrity of professional education units, and to ensure that accreditation requirements are related to best professional practice (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992).

The goals of NCATE are to ensure that:

Institutions deliver a level of quality in professional education that fosters competent practice of its graduates.

Institutions meet rigorous academic standards of excellence in professional education.

(National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992, p. 1.)

NCATE provides a mechanism for voluntary accreditation of the professional education unit, that is a school, college, department, faculty, or other administrative unit within the institution, which is primarily responsible for the preparation of teachers and other professional education personnel. Accreditation of teacher education units is not yet mandatory (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1997; Williams, 1994; Wise & Liebbrand, 1993, 1996), so many universities do not subject themselves to the procedures. In the early 1990s only some 500 of the 1300 schools of teacher education, or departments or divisions that offer teacher education across the US were accredited with NCATE (Wise & Liebbrand,
1993; Williams, 1994). However, by the late 1990s support had increased significantly. By 1997, 41 states had established accreditation partnerships with NCATE. These partnerships involve a variety of ways in which the state’s authorities and NCATE interact in the processes by which teacher education programs are reviewed for state approval. As well, 15 states were using NCATE standards as the basis for approving all their teacher education institutions (Darling-Hammond, 1999).

In the 1980s NCATE accreditation was highly criticised on the grounds of cost of annual fees and site visits, the extensive requirements for documentation, and the time required to prepare for accreditation reviews. The review process itself was criticised on the basis of perceived inconsistencies between recommendations by visiting review teams and determinations by the accrediting board. State authorities tended to ignore NCATE accreditation, relying on their own determinations with local standards. The state authorities were wary of NCATE infringing upon their authority in program approval (Fry, 1994).

The position of NCATE strengthened after standards and accreditation processes were redesigned in 1987, with support from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Education Association (NEA) and other bodies. The 1987 revision centred on developing standards that reflected the knowledge base for teaching and learning (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Wise & Liebbrand, 1996). As a result, schools of education were expected to demonstrate that their programs were based on “established and current research and best practice, and
that staff and students can articulate the framework of knowledge” (Wise & Liebbrand, 1996, p. 203).

NCATE continually revises its standards to incorporate new knowledge and practice (Wise & Liebbrand, 1996). In 1992 the NEA adopted resolutions to urge its local affiliates to incorporate policies that encouraged the appointment of teachers who have graduated from NCATE accredited institutions (Fry, 1994). The 1994 revision incorporated the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards for what beginning teachers should know and be able to do (Darling-Hammond, 1999). The resultant refined standards had an emphasis on performance, that is, expectations by NCATE that an institution’s teacher education students and graduates should be able to demonstrate specific skills (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1994). The skills are quite explicit. Developed by INTASC, they are oriented towards outcomes (Wise & Liebbrand, 1996).

The governance of NCATE is shared between professional associations that represent the following four constituent groups:

- teacher education, through the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE);

- teachers, through the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT);
state and local policymakers, through the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National School Boards Association (NSBA); and,

- professional specialty areas through numerous organisations.

(Williams, 1994.)

These professional associations provide representatives to NCATE’s boards, funding for NCATE activities, and take part in the development of standards, policies, procedures, budgeting and the determination of NCATE’s constitution (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992).

There are four boards that are established under NCATE’s constitution. The following information with respect to the four boards is taken from the NCATE handbook, *Standards, Procedures, and Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Units* (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992). All representatives on the four boards are elected for a term of three years.

The **Executive Board** is comprised of no more than 21 representatives, including the chairs of the other three boards, and a member from the general public. Equal numbers from the constituent groups that have been listed above hold the remaining places. The Executive Board elects the President of NCATE and oversees the Constitution. This board monitors all NCATE standards, policies, and fiscal matters.

The **Unit Accreditation Board** is comprised of up to 32 members, one third being representatives from teacher education, one third being teachers, one sixth being state
and local policymakers, and the remaining sixth coming from professional specialty areas. This board is responsible for developing standards and procedures for the accreditation of the professional education units and oversees on-site visits to institutions.

The State Recognition Board recognises states that have program approval systems which meet national standards of quality. It has no more than 13 members. The majority of its members, that is seven of the 13, are state and local policymakers. The rest are teacher educators, teachers and professional specialty representatives.

Members of the Specialty Areas Board have responsibilities for developing rules and procedures for approving curriculum guidelines and for making recommendations regarding the process of reviewing folios of curriculum materials submitted by the professional unit. They approve professional education guidelines that institutions are required to address as part of the preconditions process. The Specialty Areas Board has nine members, six of whom are from professional specialty areas. The rest are teacher educators and teachers.

**NCATE Accreditation Procedures**

implementation in 1995. The following data are drawn principally from those two sources. The procedures are summarised below.

Preconditions for determining eligibility for NCATE accreditation. If an institution offers baccalaureate or graduate degrees that prepare teachers or other professional staff in schools it may seek NCATE accreditation. Ten preconditions must be met. Documentation attesting to this must be submitted at least 18 months prior to the on-site visit. The ten preconditions are listed below:

1. There is a written description of the professional education unit responsible for teacher preparatory courses.

2. A Dean, or Director, or Chair officially represents the unit and has authority and responsibility for the overall administration of the unit.

3. There are written policies and procedures upon which the operation of the unit is based.

4. There are internal and external systems for evaluating the operation, scope and quality of offerings of the unit, and the effectiveness of graduates of the unit.

5. The unit has criteria for admission of students to basic teacher education programs that include assessment of basic skills.

6. The unit uses multiple evaluation methods to assess the effectiveness of its students at exit from all programs at all levels.
7. In those states where there is a program approval process, the unit’s programs meet with approval of the appropriate state agencies.

8. The unit submits a curriculum portfolio for each of its programs for which there are NCATE guidelines.

9. The institution is fully accredited by the appropriate institutional accrediting agency that is recognised by CORPA.

10. The institution is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, colour, religion, age or handicap.

**Application for accreditation.** In its application for NCATE accreditation, an institution must submit an “Intent to Seek NCATE Accreditation” form upon which basic data relating to the institution and its programs must be provided. Documentation showing that all preconditions have been met and documentation providing data relating to the institution and its programs as requested in the NCATE Annual Report must also be provided.

**Curriculum folios.** Institutions must submit curriculum folios that respond to guidelines set by the Specialty Areas Board. In states where program approval systems have been recognised by NCATE’s State Recognition Board such folios need not be submitted. The state’s decision regarding the quality of the programs is accepted in those cases by NCATE.
Review of preconditions. When NCATE reviews the submitted documentation and establishes that the ten preconditions have been satisfied, NCATE notifies the unit of its eligibility for review of accreditation and sends to it the materials and instructions for continuing the process. Institutions notified that they have not satisfied preconditions may discontinue with the procedures or resubmit documentation showing that the deficiencies have been remedied.

Notations of compliance with guidelines. When an institution has been accepted as having met the guidelines, a notation to that effect is added to NCATE’s publication, *Annual Guide to Accredited Education Programs/Units*.

Institutional report. The NCATE Boards of Examiners (BOEs) are evaluation teams that visit units in order to assess them against NCATE criteria. The BOEs are composed of equal numbers of teacher educators, teachers, and state and local policymakers. The BOE members are selected on the basis of their expertise and experience in evaluation, especially through interpretation of quantified data, use of ratings scales and questionnaires, interviewing and observation techniques, reading and analysing written narrative material, writing observations and evaluations. Especially taken into account are their abilities in making professional judgements about professional education units. BOE members are appointed for a period of three years, and all undergo intensive training in NCATE expectations and in conducting accreditation reviews.
Prior to a visit by the NCATE Board of Examiners to the institution, an institutional report that responds to the expectations found in the NCATE standards and compliance criteria must be lodged. This report is an integral part of the accreditation process. It provides both qualitative and quantitative assessments of the institution’s professional unit.

This report and college catalogues must be submitted to the Board of Examiners team some two months prior to the scheduled on-site visit.

**On-site review of the institution.** After acceptance that all preconditions have been met, the on-site visit is scheduled. A five or six member Board of Examiners team visits the unit for about three days to assess whether or not NCATE standards have been satisfied.

During the visit, faculty members, administrators, students, co-operating teachers, alumni and other involved persons are interviewed. Written material, which must be organised for display in a convenient exhibition room, is reviewed and field sites are inspected.

For re-accreditation, the Board of Examiners team makes an on-site visit each fifth year (Fry, 1994).

**Team report and institutional response/rejoinder.** After the on-site visit by the Board of Examiners team, a report of the findings of the team is written by its Chair. The report indicates whether or not the unit has met NCATE standards. It outlines the
team’s rationale for the finding, and provides an appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the unit. The Chair must send this report to NCATE within 30 days of the on-site visit. It is then immediately sent to the head of the professional education unit of the institution, who must acknowledge receipt of the report.

After consultation with the Chief Executive Officer of the institution, the head of the professional unit has 30 days to lodge a “rejoinder.”

**Unit Accreditation Board action.** An audit committee of the Unit Accreditation Board considers the team report and the institutional rejoinder and makes a recommendation as to accreditation of the unit.

**Action letter and report from NCATE.** Within a month of the Accreditation Board’s making its decision, the institution is notified of its accreditation status. Notification is via a letter and an “action report” from the President of NCATE to the Chief Executive Officer of the institution. The action report indicates standards met or not met and weaknesses of the professional unit, as well as showing the Board’s actions regarding separate accreditation for basic and advanced levels. It may include stipulations to be met prior to award of accreditation.

If NCATE accreditation is granted, the professional education unit must submit annual reports that concentrate on whatever actions have been carried out to remedy any weaknesses that were identified in the accreditation process and which show changes
or initiatives introduced by the unit during the year. The Unit Accreditation Board reviews these in the third year.

**NCATE Standards for Accreditation**

NCATE standards for accreditation of teacher education units were the results of consensual agreement between teachers, policy makers, teacher educators and other interested parties. The 1987 standards included requirements for the following at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels:

- The integration into the curriculum of research-derived knowledge.

- The establishment of criteria for admission to, progress during, and exit from teacher education programs.

- The integration of liberal arts and professional education.

- The inclusion of carefully planned clinical and field-based experiences.

- The establishment of programs to assist beginning teachers.

- The formation of relationships with local schools.

(Adapted from Wise & Liebrand, 1993.)

In 1995, the standards were revised to cover the following five categories:

- Design of professional education: curriculum, delivery and community.

- Candidates in professional education (that is, the students): qualifications, composition, monitoring and assessing progress, ensuring competence.
Professional education faculty: qualifications, composition, professional assignments, professional development.

The unit for professional education: governance and accountability, resources and teaching scholarship, resources for operations.

(National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1994, p. 2.)

The institutions initially fared poorly following the 1987 revision of NCATE standards, with many previously accredited institutions being denied accreditation (Wise & Liebbrand, 1995). In the first three years of application of the 1987 standards, that is from 1988 to 1991, the denial rate was 30% (Wise & Liebbrand, 1995). However, as providers adjusted their programs to comply with the demands of the new standards, re-accreditation rates rose and denial rates declined, so that by October 1993, when NCATE had reviewed the accreditation status of 364 of the 500 previously accredited units under the new standards, only 17% were denied accreditation, while 73% were re-accredited and 10% were accredited with stipulations (Wise & Liebbrand, 1993). By 1995, the pass rate had reached, and was expected to remain at, approximately 85% (Wise & Liebbrand, 1995).

The standards for NCATE accreditation reflect the need for improved performance in the area of teacher education in the USA and the demand for accountability in this professional preparation area. All standards must be addressed by the institution seeking accreditation. Criteria, or compliance indicators, accompany each standard and are intended as guides as to what evidence is needed to show that the standard has
been met. All programs offered by the unit at both basic and advanced levels must be examined under the review process (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1992, 1994).

While NCATE could be said to have been “successful” in attracting some 500 teacher education units to subject themselves to NCATE accreditation procedures, the question “why has it not attracted the majority of institutions?” needs to be asked. New NCATE standards were developed to restore confidence in what had been a heavily criticised accreditation process (Edmundson, 1993), and yet in 1992, seven years after their implementation, fewer rather than more institutions were participating in national accreditation. From January to July of 1992, 49 institutions withdrew from NCATE (Andrew & Schwab, 1993). Reasons suggested by commentators for withdrawal or non-participation range from concern with the administrative complexity of the process to costs and even to deliberate attempts by some universities, notably in Iowa and Arizona, to undermine the claim by teaching to be a “profession.”

As well as the criticisms of the 1980s, noted earlier in this chapter, a review by Marilyn Guy (1962), once President of AACTE, pointed out that institutions which were members of AACTE had concerns about the following aspects of NCATE policies and procedures:

- The selection, training and evaluation of Board of Examiners members.
Inconsistencies of decisions between Board of Examiners and the Unit Accreditation Board.

The need for greater flexibility within the NCATE process to consider institutional context and provide for innovation.

Determining whether or not NCATE’s methods were the most appropriate for evaluating an institution’s commitment to faculty and staff diversity.

The purpose and value of continuing the accreditation process.

The need to rethink the folio process.

The need for higher education institutions’ voices to be heard more consistently within NCATE.

The desirability of a common national system of accreditation and the appropriate relationships between the states and NCATE.

Ambivalence within AACTE on whether NCATE’s purpose should be more stimulatory than regulatory.

Gideonse (1993) strongly defended NCATE accreditation, arguing that there is a strong relationship between accreditation of teacher education providers and the effectiveness of America’s schools. However, he was critical that the review of NCATE failed to consider important areas of concern, concentrating on what he calls “basic questions” such as those of governance, finance, standards, structure of the procedures, and length of validity of accreditation. He felt that some of the issues that
brought on earlier criticism remained unresolved, and that the restructuring itself created further problems. As well as these, and criticisms identified by Guy (listed above), Gideonse noted three major external challenges to NCATE as a national accredditor of teacher education courses.

The first of the external challenges identified by Gideonse was the withdrawal of teacher education institutions in universities of Iowa and Arizona from NCATE as from 10 March 1992. The reasons put forward by the universities included that the accreditation processes were superfluous, cumbersome, wasteful of faculty time, too costly, too prescriptive, and ineffective as stimuli to improvement. The universities in Iowa maintained that the withdrawals were in response to a national strategy to weed out questionable accreditation agencies. The second was the failure of NBPTS to insist that applicants for its advanced certification status should be graduates of NCATE-accredited schools. The third was the persistence of state agencies with alternative routes to teaching licensure that demonstrates a futility in maintaining profession-accredited standards.

Gideonse (1993) dismissed the implication that accreditation per se is flawed. Instead, he argued that the withdrawals of Iowa State University, Drake University, the University of Northern Iowa, the University of Iowa, and the nine public universities of Arizona from NCATE, and the reluctance of other institutions to subscribe to NCATE, were symptomatic of deeper problems of identity within universities and the teacher education profession itself. Sutton (1993) agreed with Gideonse on this point. He
attributed the withdrawals of these institutions from NCATE to the universities’ deliberately denying full professional status to teaching and thus to the teacher education faculties. The denial of full professional status to the education faculties would result in an unwelcome re-ordering of campus priorities and a redistribution of the universities’ funds across professional programs, with a resultant effect on the relative prestige of professional programs (Sutton, 1993).

More recently the Professor of Educational Leadership and Foundational Studies at the University of Arkansas-Fayetteville, Christopher J. Lucas, was quite scathing in his criticism of NCATE (Imig, 1997). In his book, Teacher Education in America: Reform Agendas for the Twenty First Century, Lucas (1997, in Imig, 1997) claimed that NCATE was more concerned with extending and elaborating the machinery of accreditation and licensure than in engaging in meaningful reform of the profession. He slated the promise by NCATE of authentic assessment of teacher education providers and rising standards as valueless. He severely criticised NBPTS and INTASC, as well as NCATE, for their faith in performance-based standards and principles. He saw the dependence of NCATE’s revised standards on such performance-based assessments as being innocuous and ineffectual. Lucas seemed convinced that teacher education should be removed from its undergraduate setting and placed in a postgraduate context, as a diploma or certificate course accessed by graduates and taken over 16 weeks. Lucas believed that a teacher can learn all he or she needs academically in a semester, and that meaningful teacher education occurs
once the person is in the classroom. Imig (1997), the Chief Executive of AACTE, dismissed Lucas’s book as “one of the most short-sighted and dispiriting books I have read in a long time” (p. 3).

The criticisms of NCATE by Lucas went considerably further than those of Guy (1992), Gideonse (1993), Andrew & Schwab (1993), Sutton (1993) and Edmundson (1993), all of whom conceded that NCATE had inherent problems but who were optimistic that a single national accreditation body of the form of NCATE was the greatest hope for establishing the professional status of teaching and ultimately for bringing improvements in teaching practice and in the quality of education in America. The attitude of these commentators is aptly summarised by Parker (1994):

... despite my criticisms, I am an avid supporter of national accreditation of teacher education. I would like to see the day when all 1300 schools, colleges, and departments of education are in the NCATE fold. (p. 705.)

Wise (1994, 1996) and Wise and Liebbrand (1993, 1996) have consistently supported the need for national accreditation of teacher education, specifically through NCATE. They see NCATE as playing a pivotal role in the adoption by teacher education units of performance-oriented standards for preparing teachers, and in facilitating for the states the development of performance-oriented licensing systems for beginning teachers. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) strongly supports accreditation through NCATE, coupled with performance-based
initial licensing through INTASC standards and the provision of advanced certification via the NBPTS as means by which the quality of American education can be improved.

3. State Approval of Teacher Education Programs

In the USA the states take it as their legal responsibility and obligation to involve themselves in the process of monitoring teacher education courses in order to protect the rights of their citizens. The states may adopt, or make reference to, accreditation standards of any of the regional or national accreditation agencies, but state standards take precedence. Accreditation of teacher education courses is undertaken usually by the state department of education, a state’s board of education, or a state standards board or commission appointed by the governor or the legislature of the state (Fry, 1994).

All teacher education programs that lead to state registration of teachers or provide specific teaching area endorsements must be accredited by the state agencies before their graduates are granted state licensure. Thus, individual accreditation is required for pre-service programs for each subject specialty in both junior and senior secondary areas, for disability areas in special education programs, for elementary (primary) teaching, and for specialist programs such as those that prepare school counsellors, school social workers or guidance teachers (Fry, 1994).

Most state agencies publish their standards and procedures for accreditation, and appoint review teams that include educational professionals as well as citizens who have interests in education to evaluate programs against the published standards. The
state accreditation agencies do exchange information related to program accreditation standards, licensing requirements, accredited programs and other matters through the initiative of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC). The collaboration of states through NASDTEC serves as a basis for interstate reciprocity in licensing.

Increasingly, states are forming partnerships with NCATE to conduct their reviews of teacher education programs. The number of states entering into partnerships with NCATE for accreditation reviews grew from 14 in 1989 to 40 in 1996 (Wise & Liebbrand, 1996). State/NCATE partnerships bring rigour to the review of colleges of education by integrating state and NCATE standards for teacher preparation. Some states turn the entire review process over to NCATE, saving resources while ensuring quality. Other states use their own representatives to review individual programs (Wise & Liebbrand, 1996).

The specifics of the program accreditation standards across the states are diverse. Depending on the state there may be requirements for supervising teachers to have certain minimum qualifications and for teacher educators to have licensure. Some states specify the standards by which student teachers are assessed for their practicum experiences. Almost all states have specified minimum times for practical experience of student teachers that range from eight weeks to 18 weeks (Fry, 1994).

In 1994 there were 1289 teacher education institutions that offered state-approved programs. Of these, 1278 had regional accreditation and 524 had NCATE
accreditation. Most of the institutions that were state-approved but which did not have regional accreditation were universities run by fundamentalist churches that could not accept certain of the criteria specified for regional accreditation.

There is a need for accreditation standards for institutions that prepare teachers to be made comparable in terms of program requirements among the states in order to promote reciprocity in the certification of teachers (Sanders, 1985). The adoption by the states of a multiplicity of accreditation standards constitutes an “absurd” degree of duplication (Andrew & Schwab, 1993, p. 181). Andrew and Schwab (1993) also consider that it is in the interests of the states to move in this direction and accept and promote national accreditation through NCATE alone. They propose modifications of the NCATE standards for program accreditation that they claim would reduce the much criticised complexity of NCATE procedures. States could focus their program accountability efforts at the point of issue of state licenses, since it would be at that stage that substandard teacher preparation would become most obvious. In the transition period during which NCATE would be examining institutional units that had not already adopted NCATE standards for accreditation, they concede that the states should maintain their present accreditation schemes.

There have, however, been cases where the apparent rigour of state specified accreditation requirements have not been scrupulously observed. When the four universities of Iowa (referred to earlier) abandoned national accreditation by withdrawing from NCATE, they asserted that Iowa’s own state procedures would keep
them accountable to high standards (Sutton, 1993). Sutton disputed that the procedures of Iowa state constituted a truly professional model for accreditation, since the examining teams were chaired by staff members of the Iowa Department of Education and the teachers that were utilised on the examining teams were prevented by law from serving on the state board of education. Moreover, he claimed that examining visits were conducted by state agencies only intermittently: for example, only staff visitations and no visits for review purpose were made by teams in the period from 1982 to 1984 and between 1984 and 1988 there were no staff visitations or review team visitations.

Sanders (1985) questioned whether state accreditation standards were precise enough to differentiate between effective teacher education programs and those that are ineffective. He felt that the state standards generally were limited to prescribing courses and credit hours.

One of the less propitious outcomes of states setting their own accreditation standards for teacher education courses is that in some US states the standards actually impose legal limits on the number of professional education credit points that can be included in programs (Roth, 1989). This occurred, for example, in California, Virginia and Texas. In California, the *Ryan Act* limited professional education to one year or less of coursework, including one semester of teaching practice. In Virginia, guidelines for teacher education courses specify that professional education must be limited to 18 hours of coursework, not including field studies. In 1989 in Texas, a prospective
teacher’s 128 hour program included only 24 hours of professional study (Denemark, 1985). However, from September 1991 in Texas, no more than 18 hours of professional education coursework, including six hours of credit for student teaching, could be required for a teaching certificate (Roth, 1989). Roth (1989) saw the limitation of the content of teacher education courses by the states as a way that states could use their regulatory powers over the profession to impress their view that teacher education was of little value.

4. The Teacher Education Accreditation Council: An Alternative to NCATE

In the later part of the 1990s an accreditation organisation that could become a viable alternative to NCATE was sponsored by the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) (Anderson, 1997). This body, known as the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), was formed for several reasons. Firstly, it was hoped that its existence would expand the diversity of choice in accreditation. Secondly, it was claimed that in comparison with NCATE, the new body would eliminate perceived inconsistencies in the application of accreditation standards, create a governing board with stronger representation from the institutions served, and resist moves to link state licensure standards with accreditation standards. The assertion is that these are weaknesses that persist in the NCATE system. Further, TEAC objectives and procedures would concentrate on student outcomes rather than on input variables as with the NCATE model.
In contrast to NCATE, which uses external evaluation of its member teacher education units, the new organisation aims to meld two types of accountability: *internal*, which focuses on academic concerns and is campus-centred, and *external* whereby outside quality assurance auditors periodically assess the institution to determine how well the internal auditing process was serving the public interest. Thus, the balance in TEAC evaluation would be heavily towards internal accountability. Anderson (1997) saw accreditation aimed at internal accountability in a specialist area as much like an extended form of regional accreditation, which was required anyway under the existing NCATE system.

Anderson (1997) questioned whether or not the internal evaluations under the TEAC paradigm would allow for judgements to be made by the profession. Members of the profession usually conduct professional accreditation evaluations, but the TEAC processes seem to hand that accountability task to the institutional leaders. Anderson expresses a fear that institutional leaders, that is, the presidents and provosts of the universities, may not be able to be completely self-critical, open and trustworthy in their roles in evaluations as proposed by TEAC (Anderson, 1997).

In 1997 the 403 member institutions of the CIC were surveyed to ascertain their attitudes to the new accreditation body. The response rate was 81% or 329 members, and of those, 319 had teacher education faculties. Only 69 of the 319 with teacher education programs were accredited through NCATE and the other 250 had no accreditation at all in that specialty. Of the 319 with teacher education programs, 146
indicated that they would be interested in accreditation through TEAC, 92 said “no” and 56 indicated that they would consider it. Of the 69 accredited with NCATE, 35 said they would remain with NCATE, 20 said they would change to TEAC and the remaining 14 indicated that they would consider changing over (Anderson, 1997).

Qualified support of the AACTE for TEAC was expressed by Anderson (1997), as President of AACTE. Anderson saw promise in TEAC’s aspiration to address the shortcomings of NCATE, but hoped that the proposed solutions would not create other unforeseen problems. He was impressed by the assertion by TEAC that it can attract many of the 250 CIC institutions that are not accredited at all in teacher education. Perhaps the greatest good that would come from the attempt to establish TEAC is that unaccredited higher education institutions might learn much more about accreditation through the campaign efforts by TEAC.

Accreditation of Teacher Education in New Zealand

In the late 1990s, New Zealand experienced a serious shortage of teachers (Julian & Meade, 1997; Preston, 1997). The perception of teaching as a career with poor wages, a reluctance for graduates to accept teaching positions in remote rural areas, and a decrease in teacher morale resulted in low rates of acceptance of places in teacher education programs at a time of increased rates of resignations and retirements from an ageing workforce (Julian & Meade, 1997). The New Zealand Government responded to the recruitment-attrition deficit with strategies that focused on recruitment, training, retention and filling of positions that were hard to staff (Preston, 1997). The number
of fully funded teacher education places was increased from 6612 in 1996 to 8348 (not all of which were taken up) in 1997, and private providers were encouraged to seek accreditation and compete for the privilege of having funded teacher education places (Julian & Meade, 1997). The reasoning behind the New Zealand Government policies of increasing the number of accredited teacher education providers was the belief that greater competition between providers should result in improvement in the quality of the teaching service (Julian & Meade, 1997).

An Expansion in the Numbers of Accredited Teacher Education Providers

Prior to 1989 there were only six providers of primary and secondary teacher education in New Zealand. However, by 1997, as a result of government policies, there were 16 directly funded providers of teacher education in New Zealand and 10 other institutions that provided teacher education on behalf of, or in conjoint arrangements with, the funded providers. The funded providers included four colleges of education, five polytechnics or institutes of technology, three private training establishments, one whare wananga (a Maori institution), and three universities. The unfunded stakeholders were four universities (each offering B.Ed degrees in conjunction with local colleges of education), three polytechnics, one university and a secondary school (each delivering programs on behalf of other polytechnics), and a Maori learning centre (which operates on behalf of the whare wananga) (Julian & Meade, 1997). There was a similar expansion in providers of early childhood programs, to more than
30 providers by early 1997, and a proliferation in the diversity of programs and institutional models (Julian & Meade, 1997).

**Quality Assurance for Teacher Education in New Zealand: Accreditation of Providers of Teacher Education and Approval of Courses of Teacher Education**

Two sets of quality assurance requirements exist for providers of teacher education in New Zealand. Firstly, in order to receive funding a tertiary institution is required to have charters, with goals, objectives and expected outcomes that are approved by the Ministry of Education. Secondly, all providers—funded or providing courses on behalf of funded institutions—must be accredited and the courses approved by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) under the standards of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). Accreditation and approval are delegated by the NZQA to authorised bodies under New Zealand’s *Education Act (1989)* (Julian & Meade, 1997).

The NZQA is the organisation that has the responsibility for developing and implementing the NQF in partnership with education and training providers (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 1997). The NZQA is required under Sections 253 and 260 of the *[NZ] Education Act (1989)* to promote and monitor inter-institutional course approvals and moderation procedures. The *Education Act* has provision for the NZQA to delegate authority for approving courses (under Section 258) and for accrediting institutions as providers of approved courses (under section 259) to appropriate bodies (Colleges of Education Accreditation Committee, 1997). Four
moderating bodies exercise such delegated authority with respect to teacher education under the policies and practices established by the NZQA. These are:

- The **Vice-Chancellors’ Committee**, through the Committee on University Academic Programmes (CUAP), which accredits university providers.

- The **Association of Polytechnics in New Zealand**, through the New Zealand Polytechnics Programme Committee (NZPPC), which accredits polytechnics.

- The **New Zealand Council for Teacher Education**, through the Colleges of Education Accreditation Committee (CEAC), which accredits colleges of education.

- The **NZQA**, itself, which accredits private providers.

(Adapted from Julian & Meade, 1997).

Each of the four bodies has three principal functions with respect to the institutions over which they respectively have jurisdiction. These are:

- to **accredit** the institutions to deliver programs based on unit standards registered on the NQF, or other programs or qualifications for which accreditation is required;

- to **approve** courses and programs delivered in the institutions that are not based on unit standards registered on the NQF; and,
to ensure that inter-institutional monitoring systems are in place.

(Colleges of Education Accreditation Committee, 1997.)

It should be understood that, under section 258 and section 259 of the legislation and in NZQA documents, accreditation of providers and course approval differ. Accreditation is a standing given to providers that allows them to deliver programs based on unit standards that have been developed and registered with the NQF, as well as national certificates and diplomas. The development of unit standards is in the hands of the Teacher Education Advisory Group, and an institution must have accreditation in order to offer programs based on these units. Course approval is a distinct process involving the evaluation of proposals for courses that are not based on unit standards to ensure that outcomes conform with NZQA criteria. Course approval was meant to apply until the end of 1993, but has remained in effect pending the development of enough unit standards and other national qualifications to warrant a concentration on accreditation of providers (Colleges of Education Accreditation Committee, 1997).

The Relationship between Teacher Registration and the Approval of Teacher Education Courses and Programs

A clear relationship between approval of teacher education programs and teacher registration is specified in the Education Act. Under section 124A(2)b of the Education Act, the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board determines whether teachers who wish to be registered have undertaken teacher education programs
recognised as suitable preparation for teachers (New Zealand Government, 1993, p. 70). The New Zealand Teacher Registration Board issues a document, *Broad Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programmes*, that specifies the quality of teacher education programs in terms of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority standards framework and outlines the approval requirements (New Zealand Teacher Registration Board, 1996b).

The approval process involves the provider giving adequate information about the program to the Teacher Registration Board. The Board appraises the information and consults with other groups that it believes should be involved. The program may be subject to an evaluation report after a specified time. There is provision that approval may be granted subject to specific objectives being met before graduates are given registration. With the burgeoning of new providers in 1997, the Registration Board has expressed its concern about the quality of preparation by some of the new providers by refusing to recognise for registration purposes the qualifications of graduates of some of the courses until they have spent two years teaching in schools (Julian & Meade, 1997).

The “Guidelines” specify that intake into a teacher education program must take into account prior knowledge or qualifications that “indicate the ability to complete a course of study at tertiary level” (New Zealand Teacher Registration Board, 1996, p. 1) and also take into account the applicant’s personal experiences and characteristics that should ensure that he or she is fit to teach. Teacher education programs should be
seen as part of a process that continues through internship and on-going professional
development. The purposes and outcomes of program units are specified, with an
emphasis that practising teachers should be involved in their development. Practical
experiences, the need for qualified and experienced teaching staff, a sound research
base for courses, adequate physical facilities (including library and learning resources),
assessment procedures, the existence of a representative controlling body (one that is
representative of providers, users and beneficiaries of the program) and the need for
continuous external and internal monitoring and moderating of the quality of courses
are specified in the “Guidelines.”

An approved course may be deemed by the Registration Board as no longer preparing
its students to be “satisfactorily trained to teach” under Section 124A of the Act. In
such a case the Board must give notice that it intends to cease accepting the program as
preparing graduates suitable for registration as teachers and give the provider the
chance to address the matters that led it to that decision.

Pressure from private providers has resulted in the government allowing them to offer
shortened courses, despite serious concerns about quality control. Most prospective
employers do not have much idea of the quality of the graduates of the new providers.
This, in part, is due to the providers not having established a reputation with regard to
their service, and partly due to there being no on-going monitoring by the NZQA of
their systems to date, even though all new providers are accredited and their programs
are approved by the NZQA (Julian & Meade, 1997).
Accreditation of Teacher Education in Canada

Under the *Teaching Profession Act (1987)*, the British Columbia College of Teachers has responsibilities for accrediting teacher education programs for certification purposes. Subsequent to its formation, the British Columbia College of Teachers and the General Teaching Council for Scotland were described as having “similar characteristics, including control of certification by the profession” (British Columbia College of Teachers, 1991, p. 5). The Council has responsibility for developing criteria for assessing such programs in Faculties of Education in the province’s universities for accreditation and for co-operating with those faculties in the design and evaluation of such programs.

Accreditation of existing teacher education programs may be granted on a continuing basis, but the British Columbia College of Teachers may require those programs to be reviewed periodically. Accreditation of new teacher education programs in universities in British Columbia may be granted on an interim basis for a period of five years (British Columbia College of Teachers, 1995).

Through Regulation 84 of the *College of Teachers Act*, the Ontario College of Teachers has responsibility for accrediting pre-service teacher education programs offered by universities in Ontario. It also has responsibility for accrediting in-service programs and additional qualifications courses for a broad range of roles such as principals, substitute teachers, superintendents and directors of education (Ontario College of Teachers, 1998).
Part 2. Critical Issues: Attributes of Accreditation

Systems for the accreditation of teacher education in England and Wales, Scotland, New Zealand, the USA and Canada have been examined. A number of analytical categories relating to the status of accreditation of teacher education have been identified from the documentary data of those overseas systems and they are discussed here as critical issues. They include:

1. Accreditation: External and internal.
2. Establishing standards for accreditation
3. Institution (provider) accreditation versus program (or course) accreditation.
4. The accrediting agency, and the relationships between accreditation and registration.
5. Accreditation and the autonomy of teacher education institutions.
6. Frequency and duration of accreditation.

From the discussions of each of these analytical categories (or critical issues), elements have been recognised that are considered to be necessary or desirable for inclusion in the model for regulating the profession of teaching through accreditation of teacher education.

1. Accreditation: External and Internal.

In England and Wales the Teacher Training Agency—a government instrumentality external to the universities—accredits teacher education. In New Zealand, teacher
education is subject to external accreditation that ensures that programs satisfy the requirements of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). The registration bodies of Scotland, Ontario and British Columbia have the power to accredit teacher education. In the USA, a growing number of institutions subject their programs voluntarily to NCATE accreditation.

Wise and Liebbrand (1993) saw external accreditation of professional education programs by a body “based in the profession itself” (p. 135) as the “cornerstone of any profession” (p. 135), and suggested that such a model must apply to teacher education if teaching is to attain the standing that other professions already enjoy. Teacher education in Australian universities is subjected to external accreditation by a body representative of the profession only in two states, South Australia and Queensland, where teacher registration boards have been given that responsibility.

In his major evaluation of universities in Australia, West (1998) supported the existing system of internal program accreditation, signifying that self-accreditation was one of the great strengths of universities in Australia. This notwithstanding, universities in Australia have generally accepted external accreditation of preparatory courses for professions other than teaching, provided that the accrediting agency does not interfere with the universities’ claims to academic autonomy.

In view of the above, it is concluded that if teachers in Australia are to be recognised as professionals whose practice is founded on knowledge and research, then it is necessary for practitioners to ensure that only people who are graduates of teacher
education programs that provide rigorous academic and professional preparation may enter practice. It is necessary for practitioners to make the determination as to whether or not the graduates of teacher education programs are well enough prepared to enter practice. It is recommended that the registration body should do this through an accrediting agency that represents the profession, but which also can draw on the expertise of teacher educators in universities. This form of external accreditation by the registration authority should be done in such a way as to maintain the universities’ tradition of self-accreditation (internal accreditation) of its academic programs.

Internal accreditation could be conducted by each university according to standards established by the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE). In order to obtain external accreditation, trained observers from the teaching profession’s accreditation body would participate in each university’s internal accreditation procedures, to provide advice and ensure that agreed standards have been followed. Once they are convinced that the university is maintaining the agreed standards, the accreditation advisors should be in a position to make recommendations as to the accreditation status of the universities programs to the registration authority.

2. Establishing Standards for Accreditation

In England and Wales, standards for accreditation are defined in terms of whether or not an institution’s programs prepare its graduates adequately for Qualified Teacher Status (Department for Education and Employment, 1997). The standards for QTS are determined by the Secretary of State (Thompson, 1997). Under the new performance
management program that is to be introduced in 1999, the same arrangements will hold (Department for Education and Employment, 1999b).

In New Zealand, the Ministry of Education and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) are responsible for standards for accreditation and approval of teacher education, although under New Zealand's *Education Act (1989)* the NZQA can delegate this task to authorised bodies (Julian & Meade, 1997).

In the USA, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), which is largely representative of the profession, has done extensive work on establishing standards for accreditation of teacher education. Accreditation through NCATE is voluntary. In general in the USA, however, it is each state that sets accreditation standards for teacher education.

In Australia, the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE), has set out what should constitute effective standards for teacher education. It has built upon the efforts and work of the Australian Teaching Council and the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration to define a set of guidelines for initial teacher education. The guidelines include standards for both institutional and program accreditation. It is recommended in this thesis that the ACDE guidelines be used as the basis for standards for accrediting teacher education. However, while the ACDE should have a pre-eminent role in establishing the standards for accreditation of teacher education programs, it should be the profession's registration authority, as the peak standards body for the
profession, that approves the standards and monitors the application of the standards on behalf of the profession.

3. Institutional (Provider) Accreditation versus Program (or Course) Accreditation
Scotland has accreditation of teacher education courses rather than of institutions or providers. A course is evaluated individually to determine if it is a suitable element in the professional preparation of a teacher.

England and Wales changed from course accreditation to having institutional accreditation from March of 1995. Unless the provider has institutional accreditation it cannot offer courses that lead to Qualified Teacher Status.

New Zealand also has provider accreditation, which replaces an older system of course approval that is being phased out with time. Under the 1989 Education Act, programs of teacher education must be registered through the National Qualifications Framework. The New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), or a body to which this responsibility has been delegated, must accredit providers of those registered courses.

In the USA tertiary institutions that might or might not offer teacher education usually are accredited through one of six regional accreditation commissions. Programs of teacher education that lead to state licensure of teachers are accredited by the state. Teacher education units (that is, faculties, schools of education, departments or other divisions) within institutions may be accredited by NCATE if they choose, but only if
the parent institution has been accredited by a regional accreditation commission. The accreditation of teacher education, like teacher licensure, is made complex through each state having its own legislation. Such state accreditation of programs may require conditions that are beyond those specified by NCATE.

The Australian Council of Deans of Education (1998) developed standards and guidelines for both institutional and program accreditation. Institutional accreditation is a way for ensuring that the institution has the educational infrastructure to facilitate student learning and highly qualified staff to deliver programs. Program accreditation would ensure that coherent programs that are suitable for professional preparation are presented by the institution. This approach of combining institutional and program accreditation is considered highly desirable, and should be embodied in the model for Australia.

4. The Accrediting Agency, and the Relationships between Accreditation and Registration

In Scotland a person cannot be employed as a teacher unless he or she is registered with the General Teaching Council for Scotland, and it is not possible to be registered unless the course leading to a teaching qualification is accredited by the GTC or, in the case of a course completed overseas, accepted by the GTC as being of the standard suitable for accreditation.

In England and Wales, except for those who enter the profession through “licensed teacher” schemes, a person must have Qualified Teacher Status in order to teach in a
grant-maintained school. Qualified Teacher Status can only be earned by people whose qualifications are awarded by teacher education providers who are accredited through the Teacher Training Agency (TTA). The Secretary of State manages teacher registration through setting standards for Qualified Teacher Status (Thompson, 1997).

All providers of teacher education in New Zealand must be accredited through the NZQA in order to offer courses that are registered or approved under the NQF. The New Zealand Teacher Registration Board does not have the principal role in accreditation but must, under the Education Act, ensure that teachers have completed approved training before they can be registered.

In Canada, both the British Columbia College of Teachers and the Ontario College of Teachers have powers to accredit teacher education programs.

In the USA the individual American states take very seriously their responsibilities with respect to licensure of teachers and the associated mechanism of accreditation of teacher preparation courses. A significant number of states give their support to NCATE and a significant number of teacher education schools have submitted to the revised NCATE accreditation procedures. However, the majority of teacher education schools have not joined NCATE, and the majority of states insist that NCATE standards must not supplant their own standards. The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) asserts that the states have pre-eminence in developing the standards required for initial teacher certification and entry into the profession and thus should control accreditation for teacher
education. It may be that the support of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), and the impetus given by the significant report of the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) will drive more universities to accept that they should seek NCATE accreditation for their teacher education programs, but the intensity with which states in America guard their primacy in the area of education will certainly retard progress to national accreditation through NCATE, or indeed through any single organisation that is controlled by members of the profession of teaching itself.

Universities in Australia accept that the registration bodies for many established professions have the right to accredit professional programs (Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998; West, 1998). It is proposed in this thesis that members of the teaching profession, through their registration authority, should have the ultimate responsibility for determining the accreditation status of teacher education providers and their programs. The appropriate body to monitor standards for teacher education in Australia, and thus to determine whether or not teacher education programs prepare graduates who are suitable to practice the profession, should be the national registration authority that represents the profession.

5. Accreditation and the Autonomy of Teacher Education Institutions

Universities in Australia and overseas value their autonomy. They guard strongly their rights to control the academic affairs of their institutions, and they widely hold the belief that accreditation by external agencies interferes with these rights (Cunningham,
1988). However, they do accept external accreditation of programs that prepare professionals, such as doctors and dentists, for practice (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998; Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee; 1998; West, 1997). External accreditation of teacher education is accepted in Ontario and British Columbia, England and Wales, New Zealand and Scotland. Universities in many states in the USA accept external accreditation of teacher education.

It has been argued by Cunningham (1988) that accreditation is desirable to ensure a certain level of course quality and to encourage improvement in this level. Accreditation conducted by an authority external to a university need not threaten the autonomy of a university if it is concerned with the outcomes of programs and does not impose specific requirements upon the academic affairs of the university. It is proposed in this thesis that universities should retain their traditional forms of internal accreditation of their programs, but that their programs of teacher education should also undergo accreditation by a body external to the institutions that deliver the programs. External accreditation would provide assurance for the profession and the public that graduates of teacher education programs are well prepared for the teaching profession.

A system of self-accreditation by each teacher education institution, coupled with moderation evaluations by an external authority, should encourage quality in teacher education programs while allowing the autonomy of each institution to be guarded.
6. Frequency or Duration of Accreditation

Unless substantial changes are made to the course, accreditation in Scotland allows a course to run for a period of up to five years. Accreditation of an institution with the TTA in England and Wales is required each five or six years. In New Zealand, the guidelines do not specify the duration of accreditation of a provider, although they do state that a course approved as suitable for preparing teachers for registration may be subject to an evaluation report after a period of time that is specified at the time of approval.

It is difficult to make generalisations with respect to the duration of accreditation in the USA because of the diversity of state expectations. For those universities whose professional education units are accredited with NCATE, the period for re-accreditation is five years.

For the model for regulating standards for the teaching profession in Australia, periodic review of programs of teacher education providers and their programs by the external accrediting agency must be seen as necessary. The registration authority must be in a position to assure the public that the providers have assimilated current research into their programs and that graduates of those programs are suitable for professional registration.
Conclusion

Part 1 of this chapter was an examination of how accreditation of teacher education is managed in some overseas systems. In most of the comparative systems examined, some form of regulation of teacher education, that is accreditation, has been legislated for. However, there is no uniformity as to how accreditation is managed. Some systems have accreditation of individual courses, suites of courses that constitute coherent teacher education programs, teacher education units such as faculties or departments within institutions, or of entire institutions that offer teacher education courses. In some countries teacher education is accredited by a single national body, for example, the General Teaching Council for Scotland or the Teacher Training Agency in England and Wales, while in others, such as the USA, several monitoring agencies may vie on a state-by-state basis for the right to regulate the quality of teacher education.

Part 2 of the chapter outlined the attributes that it is thought should be included in a model for accreditation in Australia. The model presented in Chapter 7 integrates accreditation within a framework for registration and advanced certification. The next chapter will consider how advanced certification of teachers is dealt with overseas, and how it might be included in the model for regulating the profession of teaching in Australia.
Chapter 6

ADVANCED CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS IN OVERSEAS SYSTEMS

Registration of teachers, the accreditation of teacher education and advanced certification are the three major elements necessary in a system for regulating the profession of teaching (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Ingvarson, 1997; Maling, 1995; Wise & Liebbrand, 1993). Part 1 of this chapter examines how advanced certification is managed outside of Australia. Part 2 is a discussion of the elements relating to advanced certification that should be included in the model for regulating the profession of teaching in Australia.

Advanced certification differs considerably from initial licensure or registration. It should complement, not replace, initial licensure (Buday & Kelly, 1996). The granting of an initial license to practice a profession signifies that a practitioner has acceptable qualifications and has met standards of minimal competence that have been established by the state in order to protect the public from harm (O’Rourke, 1993). Advanced certification goes further, and involves the acknowledgement of high levels of accomplishment of experienced, licensed teachers through standards-based assessment of their knowledge and performance by professional peers who are specially trained to make such assessments (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995).
Part 1: Advanced Certification in Overseas Systems

The provision of advanced certification for teachers has been described as “weak” worldwide (Wise & Liebbrand, 1993). Since systems for advanced certification as defined in this thesis have not been well developed in Scotland, Canada and New Zealand, this part of Chapter 6 concentrates mainly on developments in England and Wales and the USA. Recently, there have been new, and quite radical, proposals to link performance, pay and advanced certification for teachers in England and Wales. As well, a great deal of developmental work has been done over the last decade by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) with respect to voluntary national certification of teachers in the United States of America.

Advanced Certification of Teachers in Scotland

The Scottish Office Education Department has a set of core competencies for beginning teachers (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998) and the General Teaching Council for Scotland has been involved with the provision of in-service training for teachers and staff development activities that are designed to support class teachers in their day-to-day roles (Galt, 1989). However, there does not appear to be a strategy in Scotland for advanced certification, as defined in this thesis.

Advanced Certification of Teachers in England and Wales

Some education systems subject teachers to evaluation or appraisal procedures that fall far short of what is required in a system of advanced certification. For example, from 1993 in England and Wales every government agency that employed teachers has been
required to ensure that teachers were regularly appraised (Ingvarson & Chadbourne, 1994). The appraisal cycle adopted nationally in England and Wales involved formative assessment, but it did not conform to what is required of a system of advanced certification as defined in this thesis. It offered no tangible rewards for the development of exceptional skill for those who were successful under the appraisal procedures. The appraisal contained no concept of a career structure and no program for career development (Ingvarson & Chadbourne, 1994). Such appraisal systems have limited use, in that they do not provide incentives that might encourage teachers to enhance their professional skills and increase their professional knowledge.

However, late in 1998 the government in the United Kingdom released a Green Paper, *Teachers: Meeting the Challenge of Change* (Department for Education and Employment, 1998b), which announced a radical new plan to link teacher performance and continued professional education, including the attainment of advanced certification, to salaries. A supplementary technical paper, *Teachers: Pay and Performance Management* (Department for Education and Employment, 1999b) set out details of the implementation of the recommendations of the Green Paper. The government has promised that up to one billion pounds will be made available in the two-year period 2000-2001 to support the implementation of the proposals (Department for Education and Employment, 1999b).

The Green Paper takes a performance-based approach with respect to assessment of teachers from their induction year to levels of advanced certification and to leadership
positions in schools. Career progression, rewards and salaries will all be linked to performance appraisal (Department for Education and Employment, 1998b). The following details have been extracted from the technical document, Teachers: Pay and Performance Management (Department for Education and Employment, 1999b).

All who seek an initial appointment as a teacher must have Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). The Department for Education and Employment will still determine eligibility for QTS, using the criteria established by the Secretary for State. All new teachers appointed after 1 May 1999 will undergo a statutory, one-year induction program, during which they will have a reduced teaching load, equivalent to 90% of the normal load. Training and support targeted to each teacher’s needs will be provided. At the end of the induction year, the new teachers must be appraised. Successful teachers will progress to the next salary step, while those who are unsuccessful will leave the profession.

Every teacher who has been successful at the induction appraisal will undergo further performance appraisal each year. The head of the school will report on each teacher’s performance, against a set of at least three agreed objectives. The objectives will include improved teaching performance, target setting for pupil improvement and targets for the teacher’s own professional development. Failure in the appraisal will result in the teacher not progressing on the salary scale, or even having a reduction in salary. Exceptional performance will be rewarded by accelerated progression on the salary scale. The Green Paper claims that the strategy avoids crudely linking pay and
results because the appraisal is designed to recognise sustained high-level performance that will be judged against individually agreed objectives, which draw on targets for pupil attainment, and the relevant national teaching standards.

Evidence to be used at appraisal includes classroom records and observation, comparative performance data, scrutiny of pupils’ work, and a record of the teacher’s professional development with an analysis of its impact on students’ learning. As well, interviews with pupils and parents may be used.

Salary progression will stop at what is to be called the “threshold.” Progression beyond that threshold will be granted to teachers who (a) have attained a certain level of qualifications and experience, and (b) can demonstrate through a number of means, including a portfolio, that they have satisfied performance criteria of high standard.

The expectation is that achievement of the threshold should be demanding, and while a majority of teachers should aspire to it and be able to attain it a sizeable minority will fail to pass the threshold. The threshold assessment is to be conducted by the head of the school, subject to review by an external assessor drawn from a pool of nationally trained experts. Attainment of the threshold will be rewarded with progression to considerably higher salary ranges, but in order to retain those, the teacher will need to demonstrate an increased contribution to the teaching and learning goals of the school, and continued personal professional development. The first teachers to progress beyond the threshold are expected to do so at the beginning of the year 2000.
While attainment of the threshold could be seen as a form of advanced certification, that title probably should be accorded to the classification of Advanced Skills Teacher (AST). There is currently an AST classification in England and Wales that is assessed externally. The current arrangements for external assessment for AST will remain in force until the end of the 1999-2000 academic year, and then will be reviewed. It is envisaged that new arrangements for assessing ASTs, similar to those for teachers progressing beyond the threshold, will come into force. National standards for AST assessment will be developed. The AST classification is to be reserved for the top few percent of classroom teachers.

The performance assessments will extend to positions of responsibility. New criteria for assessing heads of schools will be introduced.

Central to the aims of the Green Paper is an attempt to “restore teaching to the status it deserves—a profession essential to our success in the new century” (Millett, 1999, p. 2). Millett (1999) believes that the implementation of the Green Paper recommendations will increase the status of teaching, help raise entry standards for initial teacher training (ITT), and attract capable people into postgraduate programs. She considers that the implementation of the Green Paper’s recommendations will improve standards for initial training of teachers, and improve the professional development of teachers after they enter service. She expects that the generous salaries attached to the AST classification will encourage the best teachers to stay in the classrooms rather than leave the classrooms to seek better pay. The plan is designed to
improve the leadership in schools, improve appraisal methods, and provide better rewards for good teachers.

**Advanced Certification of Teachers in the USA**

For many years there has been concern in the USA over the quality of teaching in schools and the effect of inefficient teaching on the national economy. The low status of teaching and the poor financial rewards of the more than 2.5 million elementary and secondary teachers in the USA have been seen as fundamental reasons behind the inability of teaching to attract more capable people to the profession (King, 1994). These concerns, relating the quality of outcomes of education systems with the quality of teachers, have led to the formation in some states of standards boards that promote evaluation, appraisal and certification schemes (Conley, 1994; King, 1994).

Moves to improve teachers and teaching through evaluation of their efficiency are not new in the USA (Conley, 1994; King, 1994). To exemplify this, King (1994) points out that as long ago as 1915 the Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education had a theme of assessing teachers’ efficiency. Some of the schemes proposed for measuring teacher efficiency were linked to forms of merit pay (Conley, 1994; King, 1994). More recently the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) endorsed the more positive approach of rewarding outstanding teachers with the status of advanced certification that might be linked with increased pay and career opportunities. Darling-Hammond, Wise and Klein (1995) favour a similar performance-based approach.
Most states in the USA have some form of advanced certification. The mode of certification varies from state to state, and this is reflective of the inability of the states to agree on a consistent approach. Most states issue a basic, initial form of license to teach with a second, third or even a fourth level of licensure available after the teacher has completed further study and gained some years of experience in the classroom. State-granted advanced certification usually involves the completion of a master’s degree or equivalent units of advanced university study and an extended period of satisfactory teaching service. In New York, for example, holders of Provisional Certificates are required to complete a master’s degree in a field related to their teaching area and to pass a content knowledge test and a teaching skills performance test within a period of five years in order to retain licensure. Success in these tasks converts the Provisional Certificate to a “Permanent Certificate” that is valid for life.

In Texas the initial license or “Provisional Certificate,” which is valid for life, is available to those with a bachelor’s degree from an approved teacher education institution. A teacher with three years of experience who has completed 30 additional semester hours of postgraduate study may upgrade this to the “Professional Certificate” (Fry, 1994).

Some states, such as Tennessee, have attempted to introduce merit-pay systems that link salaries paid to teachers to success in performance-based assessments that are conditions of tenure. The Tennessee state Governor, Lamar Alexander, attempted to introduce such a scheme in 1983. Under Alexander’s scheme, teachers were to be
classified into four categories, apprentice, professional, senior and master teachers, after performance-based peer evaluation (Stedman, 1983). Teachers of all classifications would renew their licenses every five years, and as a consequence the concept of tenure of employment was to be extinguished. In exchange for this concession, those who gained the status of senior or master teacher would be paid considerable premiums on their standard salaries. The particular premium in payment would be contingent upon the teachers signing contracts for specified periods of service. Senior teachers were to be paid 10% or 30% above their contract salaries according to whether they signed contracts for 10 months or for 11 months. Master teachers were to be paid a supplement of 15%, 35% or 60% if they signed contracts for 10, 11 or 12 months, respectively (Stedman, 1983).

Governor Alexander’s proposal was supported by the public, Tennessee’s School Boards Association, Principals Study Council, Superintendents Study Council, and the Children’s Services Commission. However, major concerns arose over how the scheme was to be financed, how quotas for the categories were to be filled, how teacher performance was to be evaluated, whether the scheme would be an incentive or disincentive, and the effect of the scheme—particularly the imposition of quotas—on the morale of teachers. Particular opposition to the scheme came from the Tennessee Teachers Association, which proposed its own scheme through a competing bill in the House and Senate.
The outcome of the disputation in Tennessee was the “career ladder program,” which is a compromise between the schemes of Governor Alexander and the Teachers Association (Stedman, 1983). Tennessee’s Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1983 created the “career ladder program,” which is a merit-pay system for teacher performance appraisal (Sanders & Hom, 1995). Under this system, a teacher is initially licensed as an “apprentice teacher.” Renewal of licensure through performance assessment is necessary after three years. After a total of four years of successful teaching the apprentice can seek assessment for a “professional license,” which must be renewed after 10 years (Fry, 1994).

Some American school districts such as Rochester in New York, and Cincinnati in Ohio have multi-stage systems of advanced certification based on performance assessment. These districts run similar “Careers-in-Teaching” programs, in which teachers are classified as interns, residents, career teachers and lead teachers. The districts link attainment of the various teaching grades with incentives such as salary increases and promotion opportunities. The aims are to attract and retain quality teachers and to improve teachers’ professional growth opportunities. Another aim is to rid the systems of incompetent teachers. Integral to the systems are mentoring and periodic reassessment. Tenure and salaries progression are linked to attainment of the levels of certification (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).
Systems of advanced certification, such as those of Tennessee, Cincinnati and Rochester usually do not have currency outside of the initiating school districts or states. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certification system, which is described in the next section, aims to reward very competent teachers with a form of advanced certification that is recognised nationally.

National Certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)

The need in the USA for a body such as the NBPTS grew from the 1983 federal report, *A Nation at Risk*, which alerted the American public to concerns about the American education system and led to the establishment of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. The Task Force’s subsequent 1986 report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, concluded that the key to improving school effectiveness was an improvement in teacher standards, and that the status of the teaching profession in America needed to be raised substantially in order to attract and retain excellent teachers (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). In *A Nation Prepared*, the task force recommended the establishment of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994c; O’Rourke, 1993). The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was founded a year later, in 1987, with the mission to improve the quality of teaching and public education in the USA. It was estimated that it would take ten to fifteen years to implement fully the operation of the NBPTS.

A 63 member Board of Directors representative of key stakeholders in education governs the NBPTS. The majority of members of the board are practising teachers (Baratz-Snowden, 1992), while the remainder are business leaders, elected government officials and others whose responsibilities and interests affect educational policy in America (O’Rourke, 1993).

Certification through the NBPTS is voluntary and is designed to complement, not replace, initial state licensure. Whereas state licensure merely indicates that the license holder satisfies a minimum level of requirements upon entry to the profession, National Board certification signifies highly accomplished teaching based on a specific set of professional criteria. Secondly, state licensure requirements vary from state-to-
state, while NBPTS certification is uniform across the country. Thirdly, standards for
NBPTS certification have been developed through teacher input rather than by the
requirements of legislatures (Baratz-Snowden, 1992).

In order to make certification available to as many teachers as possible in as many
states as possible, the NBPTS set quite liberal prerequisites. A candidate needs only to
have a baccalaureate degree and to have taught successfully for three years as a
licensed teacher. In those states where teachers in private schools are not required to
be licensed, the three years of teaching experience are to have been gained in a school
recognised and approved by the state (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). A teacher
who has the prerequisites can then be assessed under the NBPTS scheme.

Establishment of the assessment standards of the NBPTS certification system involves:

♦ **Standards setting**, through which the NBPTS defines what an accomplished
teacher should know and be able to do.

♦ **Assessment**, where a number of instruments based on a variety of performance
measures are used to test whether or not a candidate meets the standards
expected of an accomplished teacher.

♦ **Professional development**, to make teachers cognisant of what constitutes
excellent teaching and how they can incorporate elements of this into their

teaching.

(Adapted from Baratz-Snowden, 1992.)
Standards Setting

The NBPTS vision of certification is spelled out in its policy statement, *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do* (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1990). The NBPTS lists the following as fundamental requirements for proficient teaching:

- A broad grounding in the liberal arts and sciences.
- Knowledge of the subjects to be taught, of the skills to be developed, and of the curricular arrangements and materials that organise and embody that content.
- Knowledge of general and subject-specific methods for teaching and for evaluating student learning.
- Knowledge of students and human development.
- Skills in effectively teaching students from racially, ethnically, and socio-economically diverse backgrounds.
- Skills, capacities and dispositions to employ the above wisely in the interests of the students.

(National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994c, p. 4.)

The NBPTS exemplifies the standards-based approach to assessing teachers for “certification” (which corresponds to “advanced certification” in this thesis). It bases its standards around the following five propositions:

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to their students.
3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.

4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.

5. Teachers are members of learning communities.

(National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994c, pp. 6-26.)

The National Board does not issue a single certificate that might signify that a teacher is highly proficient in all areas. Instead, specialist certification is awarded to teachers who can demonstrate expertise in one or more of the 30 defined fields for which standards have been developed. Teachers who work across the curriculum can choose to seek either subject-specific certification or a generalist certificate (O’Rourke, 1993). Standards for the certification fields are determined by specialist committees (Baratz-Snowden, 1992).

Assessment

The criteria that the NBPTS espouses in the development of its assessment system are encapsulated in the acronym “APPLE.” TheAPPLE standard demands that the system must be:

- Administratively feasible, so that large numbers of qualified teachers can gain certification without undue delay.

- Professionally acceptable and credible, so that teachers know that they accurately reflect their professional knowledge and skills.
Publicly acceptable, so that parents and taxpayers see Board certification as a legitimate acknowledgement of advanced standing and not just a piece of paper.

Legally defensible, and fair and equitable.

Economically affordable, so that certification is realistically within the reach of any teacher who wishes to seek this standing.

(Baratz-Snowden, 1992; O’Rourke, 1993.)

Data for assessing the teacher include portfolio documentation and performance observations, collected at both the teacher’s school and an assessment centre (Baratz-Snowden, 1992). The following is a description of the preparation required of a teacher seeking NBPTS certification in the area of “Early Adolescence/English Language Arts.”

Fourteen standards are defined as facets of teaching English language arts to young adolescents. These are listed in the NBPTS preparatory material as: knowledge of the students; curricular choices; engagement; learning environment; instructional resources; reading; writing; discourse; language study; integrated instruction; assessment; self-reflection; professional community involvement; and, family outreach (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994a). Analyses of data gathered at the school site and at an assessment centre are designed to assess the teacher’s attainment with respect to these standards.
School-site data are collected through a teacher's portfolio documentation and through on-site observation. The teacher prepares the school site portfolio using formats that are defined by the NBPTS. Such items as curriculum guides, a reflective essay, copies of student projects, and attestations from colleagues can be included in the portfolio (Baratz-Snowden, 1992). Four booklets guide the preparation of the required tasks. These are:

- The Teacher's Professional Background Information booklet, in which the applicants document information about themselves as teaching professionals.

- The Student Learning Exercise booklet, in which the applicants are required to demonstrate how they monitor students as they learn.

- The Post-reading Discussion Exercise booklet. This exercise is described more fully in the next few paragraphs.

- The Planning and Teaching Exercise booklet, in which the applicants collect over a period of three weeks documentation as to how they plan continuous episodes of course instruction.

Two kinds of documentation are required: commentaries, which are written explanations of the applicant's thinking about particular aspects of the teaching assignment; and, instructional artefacts, which are concrete materials produced or used by the teacher or pupils in the course of teaching. Instructional artefacts include copies of literary work used in the lesson, student assignments, and videotapes of
lessons or parts of lessons (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994b).

The following description of the Post-reading Discussion Exercise is provided to exemplify the degree to which tasks are designed to assess the teacher’s development with respect to the five basic propositions, and the fundamental requirements for being a good teacher. For the Post-reading Discussion Exercise the teachers must demonstrate, on video, a teaching task in the form of an interpretation-discussion lesson. In the commentaries that accompany the analysis of the task, teachers are asked to supply information about their students’ prior experience with tasks similar to that set for the teaching assignment, students’ abilities related to the task, the instructional goals for the exercise, other activities that preceded or followed the task, and the role that the activities played in helping students build interpretations. In their analyses the teachers must disclose their own roles in the discussion, and explain why they approached the roles as they did. They must outline several routines that they had previously established with the class to make the task run smoothly, and point out sections of the video that provide evidence for this. They must point out on the video when one or more students demonstrated the type of discussion that helps to build interpretations. Then the teachers must evaluate the task in terms of quality of interaction and how well it helped achieve their goals, and indicate what they might do in subsequent lessons to increase their students’ discussion and interpretative skills. The task is sufficiently standardised to ensure that common criteria that are task
sensitive and grounded in subject-specific pedagogy can be applied in evaluating performance (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995).

The assessment centre tasks focus on structured interviews, simulations and knowledge of subject matter and content pedagogy (Baratz-Snowden, 1992). The tasks attempted at the assessment centres include analysis of the instruction of other teachers through videotapes and artefacts, the assessment and response to items of student work, analyses of texts, and instructional planning exercises (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). The majority of tasks set to evaluate knowledge and skills are open-ended paper and pen tests. These are common in certification examinations in other professions, such as architecture, and have the advantages of allowing complex responses while preserving the anonymity of candidates and avoiding assessor bias. Open-ended tasks allow complex questions to be asked that require the applicant to demonstrate synthesis and understanding as well as knowledge. The candidate must identify issues and produce, as opposed to recognise, answers to problems (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995).

It is estimated that more than $US50 million will eventually be required to complete the development of the assessment standards. Half of this money is to come from federal funds and half from public corporations and foundations (O’Rourke, 1993).
The designated assessment tasks are the outcomes of the NBPTS research and development strategy, which has three main components:

1. Assessment Development Laboratories (ADLs), which work closely with teachers and other selected personnel to develop both instruments and procedures (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). The ADLs develop prototype assessment packages, conduct initial pilot tests, revise the packages and then provide support materials (Baratz-Snowden, 1992).

2. A Field Test Network (FTN) that develops professional development support for teachers (Baratz-Snowden, 1992; Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995).

3. A Technical Analysis Group (TAG), which can be described as the research arm of the Board (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). The TAG co-ordinates the FTNs to ensure that the assessments are valid, reliable and bias-free (Baratz-Snowden, 1992).

**Professional Development**

Professional development is seen by the NBPTS as integral to its certification process. The Board has devised professional development models that provide teachers with opportunities for growth and change. Schools and districts within the Field Test Network co-operate with the NBPTS to provide professional development programs. Professional associations and discipline-specific organisations are involved with the NBPTS in co-ordinating professional development activities. Board certified teachers also are used as professional development resources for those preparing for Board
certification. The NBPTS works with universities and colleges of education to make teacher education more compatible with NBPTS certification standards (Baratz-Snowden, 1992).

**General Comments on the NBPTS Certification System**

That this chapter dwells on the NBPTS of the USA is a result of the dearth of advanced certification schemes internationally, as was stated in the introduction of the chapter. However, the concentration on this American organisation is also justifiable in that the NBPTS certification scheme is most comprehensive and in itself provides a model that could, with modification, be followed by Australia.

Darling-Hammond, Wise & Klein (1995) believe that the approach taken by the NBPTS has the following advantages over previous attempts to assess on-the-job teaching. The assessment process is extended over a number of weeks, taking a longitudinal view of how teaching and learning are managed. The use of video evidence relates what happens at a certain moment of time to what has happened prior to and subsequent to the taped task. The assessment involves a variety of ways of examining teaching and how effectively teachers make teaching judgements. It assesses the rationale of teachers in making curricular and pedagogical decisions. The use of the portfolio, which should contain examples of the work of several students over time, allows some assessment of how teaching has influenced the students’ learning and progress.
In a critique funded by the US Department of Education, Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) expressed support for the highly systematic and participatory approach of the NBPTS to standards setting and the Board’s aim to raise the status of accomplished teachers. They reserved judgement, however, as to the effectiveness of the NBPTS in raising standards of teachers throughout the USA, especially in schools in economically disadvantaged areas, since it was “too early [in 1995]” to make such judgements (p. 37). More recent analysis of the characteristics of successful NBPTS certification candidates has found that, more typically than not, they are teaching in “white” schools located in higher socio-economic communities (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998). Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) identified the following potential strengths and weaknesses of the NBPTS system.

Potential Strengths of the NBPTS System

♦ The Board communicated and collaborated with a wide range of people and organisations that are vital to the success of the venture.

♦ The Board has set out to define the core elements of what teachers should know and be able to do.

♦ The further definition of teaching levels, generic teaching qualities and subject areas has been well developed.

♦ The recognition of standards “undergirding the credibility” (p. 331) of areas to be assessed has commenced, with much involvement of expert teachers and other relevant persons.
♦ The research and development work has been well planned.

♦ The basic aims of the Board, to improve teaching and learning nationally and as a result to influence the quality of the provision of education more widely, are most worthwhile objectives.

Potential Weaknesses of the NBPTS System

♦ NBPTS has a major potential weakness in relation to the credibility of the assessment system with respect to its methods for assessing who is a “successful” teacher. The lack of controlled observations in field trials of teachers in classroom situations potentially weakens the validity of the assessment procedures. Attempts to draw effective and credible conclusions from videotaped lessons, simulation exercises and written examinations as to what was good teaching constitute only “quasi-evaluation.” However, the TAGs are aware of this weakness and are conducting much research that holds promise to overcome the dilemma.

♦ There are weaknesses also in how the Board attempts to identify and assess “students’ learning.” If teachers are to be effective then they must “aid student learning.” A major validity and reliability problem of the methodology that must be overcome is that the assessment procedures do not address actual, perceived and recorded student learning.

♦ The Board’s insistence on the experienced teacher having “collegial co-operation” as part of his or her professional development might be desirable, but
would require the Board to prove the long-term validity and efficacy of collaborative approaches to teaching and student learning and to develop methods of discerning the relative inputs into each teaching assignment by each of the teachers involved.

✦ There is the risk of the Board’s standards lacking sufficient uniformity to give comparative equity and credibility across the different assessment fields. That is, it might be that a certificate given in one field is perceived to be different/better/more difficult to obtain than that given in another area. This is a problem that TAGs are aware of and should address.

✦ Confidence in the processes is highly dependent on the scoring of the assessments.

(Adapted from Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995.)

Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) were also concerned about the balance between benefits as to costs and risks. They saw teachers benefiting from the following:

✦ The potential increase in the status of the profession.

✦ Having their individual professional ambitions, such as satisfaction of professional achievement, or promotion, realised.

✦ The institution of state and district policies that would enhance teacher mobility.

✦ Individual schools and some school districts having their prestige enhanced if a considerable number of their teachers have Board certification.
The implementation of evaluation programs that utilise the Board’s certificate as a measure.

The offsetting risk/cost factors that concerned Shinkfield & Stufflebeam included the following:

♦ There is considerable risk that Board certificated teachers would be attracted away from poorly resourced schools to work in wealthier schools.

♦ School districts might give disproportionate weighting to Board certification by comparison with other measures of a teacher’s merit.

♦ Poorer schools might suffer serious financial burdens if they considered that they should support many of their teachers in seeking Board certification.

♦ Animosity may arise between staff members if they felt that too much benefit was being given to those who succeeded in gaining Board certification.

♦ Teaching in a school might suffer if schools gave teachers much release time to prepare for Board certification.

(Adapted from Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995.)

While they expressed their concern about the weaknesses listed above, Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995) considered the identification of those weaknesses some years before the Board planned to issue certification as positive. Research projects were in place to address those real or potential weaknesses.
Acceptance of NBPTS Certification: Incentives for Teachers to Participate

Certification through the NBPTS has gained widespread acceptance in school systems across the USA. Career advancement and salary progression are often linked to NBPTS certification. Those who are successful in NBPTS assessment are generally rewarded with substantial annual salary increments (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998). Nearly 100 school districts have put incentives into place for teachers who earn NBPTS certification (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998). Examples of incentives include the following:

♦ In North Carolina, teachers are given up to five days release time to prepare their portfolios and to prepare for assessment (Fry, 1994). If successful in gaining NBPTS certification, a teacher is given a 12% salary bonus for each year of the ten years of currency of certification. As well, the state will pay the $US2000 certification fee (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998).

♦ The Los Angeles Unified School District and the United Teachers of Los Angeles agreed to a 15% increase in salary for teachers with NBPTS certification (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998).

♦ The Jericho (New York) school district reimburses the certification fee to teachers who undergo the procedures and pays those who achieve certification a stipend of $US4000 per annum. Those who do not gain certification are paid a $US2000 annual stipend (Fry, 1994).
♦ The Governor of Georgia in 1994 determined to pay NBPTS certification fees and a 5% increase in salary to those who were successful in their NBPTS assessment (Fry, 1994).

♦ The state of Ohio pledged to pay certification fees for 250 teachers in 1996 and for 400 teachers in 1997, and to reward those successfully certificated with an annual payment of $US2500 for the life of the certificate (Fry, 1994; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998).


♦ The annual bonus for NBPTS certified teachers in Mississippi was raised to $US6000 in November 1998 (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998).

As well as providing significant remuneration incentives, some states and school districts use Board certification as a requisite qualification for teachers to become mentors, principals or co-operating teacher educators. Some states and districts acknowledge Board certification as sufficient for the award of the authority’s advanced license (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996). Teacher associations are beginning to organise their professional development infrastructures to accommodate and support teachers who are seeking NBPTS certification (Ingvarson, 1997). The American Federation of Teachers, one of the two major industrial unions
for teachers in the USA, has given support to the NBPTS since its inception (King, 1994) and resolved to support salary differentials to NBPTS certified teachers ("Incentives for National Board Certification . . .," 1995).

The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) has argued for a career continuum that includes much higher pay levels for teachers who have attained very high levels of professional standards. The US President, Bill Clinton, has endorsed the National Commission’s recommendation, and has made a specific commitment to support the work of the NBPTS as a means to this end by making funding available to enable 100,000 more American teachers to seek board certification (Ingvarson, 1997).

It has been suggested by Wise and Liebbrand (1993) that the adoption of the NBPTS system of advanced certification would allow employers to abandon the usual course counting regimen for determining salaries and career rewards for teachers and replace it with a more objective, performance-linked system. This system could even be used as a basis for providing different levels of responsibilities for teachers who have demonstrated different levels of proficiency and have gained advanced certification. They envisage that, according to acquisition of initial and subsequent qualifications, teachers could be classified at three levels:

1. **Instructors**, who would be college graduates, but not graduates in teacher education of nationally accredited institutions. Instructors would be closely supervised. If they wished to become professional teachers they would have to
undertake a post-graduate program at an accredited institution and meet licensing standards.

2. **Professional teachers.** These would be graduates of teacher education programs undertaken at nationally accredited institutions. They would be designated as “interns” during their first year in a school and be supervised by specially trained board certified or professional teachers. By the end of their internship they must pass examinations and evaluations of their teaching performance.

3. **Board certified teachers.** Professional teachers who wish to be so designated would have to seek recognition through NBPTS certification.

Wise and Liebbrand (1993) suggest that while school districts could maintain their systems of paying teachers according to length of experience, the three categories of teachers could be compensated on different career tracks. Demonstration of skill and knowledge through the NBPTS system could be used as the basis for movement across the tracks, instead of the requirement for further college or university course credits. The Wise and Liebbrand model would require teachers, administrators and policy-makers to acknowledge a professionalism based around licensure (registration), accreditation and board certification (advanced certification).

One of the problems of the Wise and Liebbrand model is that, at their “instructor” level, there is no requirement for initial teacher education. It would be probable that objections by teachers’ industrial and professional associations would prevent this
practice of putting inadequately prepared persons into the classroom from eventuating. If it did eventuate, their instructional activities would need to be limited in scope and supervision would need to be constant. The National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) proposed a similar model that overcomes this serious deficiency. In this model there is the presumption that teachers will only be hired after completing high quality teacher education and then receiving an initial teaching license by passing tests of subject matter knowledge and teaching knowledge. Then it is recommended that tenure only be granted after the teacher has successfully completed performance assessments according to Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) requirements in the first years of teaching and earned a continuing license. Salary compensation would be linked to the completion of further levels of certification, for example gaining licensure in more than one subject area and going further to complete advanced certification through NBPTS standards. Thus, a teacher would pass through the following stages:

1. Upon employment the teacher, who must have undergone teacher education, would be designated as the holder of an initial license.

2. Upon earning INTASC certification the teacher would become a resident teacher and would work under the supervision of a mentor.

3. When tests of teaching skills are passed, the resident teacher would be recognised by the title professional teacher.
4. Progression to lead teacher would only occur when the teacher earned advanced certification through the NBPTS. A variety of professional responsibilities rewarded with further stipends would be available only for those who attained the level of lead teacher.

Schemes similar to that which the Commission has recommended, where tenure and salary rewards are linked with the stages of professional progression, already operate in some states and school districts such as Cincinnati and Rochester (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996)).

**Advanced Certification of Teachers in New Zealand**

In New Zealand, there are criteria for the characteristics, skills and qualifications that teachers need for registration, but until recently no established standards for advanced certification have been defined. The New Zealand Ministry has, however, commenced developing sets of professional standards for primary school principals, deputy principals, assistant principals and teachers, and for secondary school and area school principals. They have, in April 1998, released an interim set of standards for primary school deputy principals, assistant principals and primary school teachers (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998).

The interim standards are based around teachers being able to demonstrate the following “dimensions of being a teacher in New Zealand” (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998, p. 26): professional knowledge, professional practice, professional relationships, and professional leadership. The
Interim Professional Standards document makes clear that these standards will become part of the performance management systems for schools and performance appraisal system for teachers. Progression along the salary scale will also be linked to these standards (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998; New Zealand Ministry of Education, 1998). There are gradations in expectations for “Beginning Teachers,” “Fully Registered Teachers” and “Experienced Teachers” that are expressed in the interim standards. A Fully Registered Teacher would be expected to have three successful assessments against the “Professional Standards for Fully Registered Teachers” before being graded as an Experienced Teacher. Experienced Teachers as defined fit the definition used in this thesis of an advanced certified teacher. They are:

- highly skilled practitioners and classroom managers. Their teaching methods are well developed and they employ an advanced range of strategies for motivating students and engaging them in learning. They support and provide assistance to colleagues (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 7).

**Advanced Certification of Teachers in Canada**

In Canada, the Ontario College of Teachers has been examining models for developing teaching standards. As at the end of 1998, the College has distilled seven themes in describing standards for the profession. These themes are: a commitment to learning; required professional knowledge; facilitating effective learning; assessing and reporting for improvement; professional learning; creating a learning community; and, leadership (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998). These
themes have not yet been applied to either initial teacher registration or advanced certification. The Ontario College of Teachers expects that the process of drafting and consulting for developing professional teaching standards will take at least another two years.

Part 2: Critical Issues: Attributes of a System for Advanced Certification of Teachers

The following categories, or critical issues, have been derived from examination of the implementation of systems for classifying advanced certified teachers in the comparative groups, namely Scotland, Ontario in Canada, New Zealand, the USA, England and Wales in Part 1 of this chapter, and from the examination of the status of advanced certification in Australia conducted in Chapter 3.

1. Voluntary versus compulsory advanced certification.

2. Incentives and disincentives.

3. The regulatory/assessment body. Who should oversee the system, and assess the candidates?

4. Associated professional development.

5. Standards that should apply to advanced certification. Eligibility and assessment.

6. Financing the advanced certification system.

7. Articulation of advanced certification with registration and accreditation.
The identified categories are discussed here, with a view to determining what attributes should be included in the model for regulating the teaching profession in Australia that is presented in Chapter 7.

1. Voluntary versus Compulsory Advanced Certification

In the USA, the NBPTS provides voluntary, nationally recognised certification that rewards teachers who have developed exceptional skills and knowledge. England and Wales have an Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) classification that is voluntary. The new performance management system that England and Wales adopted in 1999 retains the AST classification, which is designed to reward exceptional teachers who opt to stay in classrooms rather than seek promotion, but links it more purposively with responsibilities for helping other teachers develop pedagogical skills (Department for Education and Employment, 1999b).

It is proposed that any system of advanced certification for teachers in Australia should be voluntary. Furthermore, advanced certification should a credential that is recognised nationally, across all school sectors in Australia. Fully registered teachers should be regarded as very competent professionals. They should not need to prove that they have acquired higher levels of competence unless they wish to be graded as advanced certified teachers. Failure to seek or gain advanced certification should not result in sanctions being applied by the employer.
Voluntary assessment for advanced certification is also consistent with the concept of Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) that held much promise when it was introduce in Australia in the 1970s, but which failed, for reasons that have already been given.

2. Incentives and Disincentives

The cost for a teacher who seeks NBPTS certification and the amount of time involved in seeking it are disincentives. Many states and school districts in the USA counter these disincentives by paying the $US2000 in fees for NBPTS assessment and by providing release time for the candidates to prepare their portfolios and attend the assessment centres (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998). Bonuses, premiums paid on salaries and access to a variety of career opportunities are further incentives available in some US school systems to encourage capable teachers to seek NBPTS certification (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998). In England and Wales, the new performance management scheme provides very high salary levels for teachers who attain AST classification (Department for Education and Employment, 1999b).

It has been argued earlier in this chapter that, while costs are disincentives for teachers to become involved in CPE, teachers are likely to participate voluntarily in programs if they lead to career rewards. In view of this, it is suggested that incentives should also be provided by Australian school systems if they wish to have teachers qualify for advanced certification. Incentives could include school systems paying the costs for assessment, providing release time for teachers to be involved, and rewarding those
who gain advanced certification with salary increases. As well as an increase in the salary of a teacher who attains advanced certification, it is suggested that it is desirable to reserve a range of career opportunities that are oriented to classroom practice for those who are successful in assessment for advanced certification.

3. The Regulatory/Assessment Body. Who Should Oversee the System and Assess the Candidates?

In England and Wales, the Advanced Skills Teacher classification is assessed by a specialist body external to the Department for Education and Employment. In the United States, a specialised organisation called the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) is gaining governmental and professional support for its system of awarding certification to knowledgeable, skilful teachers. The NBPTS is a non-profit, non-partisan and non-governmental agency whose directors are mostly classroom teachers (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998). It would be highly desirable in Australia to have a similar organisation, perhaps called the Australian Council for Assessment of Professional Teaching Standards (ACAPTS), that can be given the responsibility for overseeing advanced certification. In view of the recommendations made earlier in this chapter that Australia have a graded form of registration, it would be highly desirable for ACAPTS to be responsible to whatever registration body might be established for teachers in Australia. ACAPTS could, on behalf of the registration authority, subcontract the tasks of developing assessment protocols to specialised external organisations and take responsibility for ensuring the maintenance of high standards for advanced certification.
4. Associated Professional Development

The new performance management system that is to be introduced into England and Wales, links professional development to assessment of teachers’ performance at all stages of their careers, including assessment for Advanced Skills Teacher classification. A strength of the NBPTS in the USA is that it provides avenues for professional development for teachers seeking certification.

By defining a clear set of criteria against which teachers can have their competencies measured, a system of advanced certification could provide coherence for the direction that CPE should take. By focusing on pedagogical knowledge and skills, and providing clear articulation of what it is to be a good teacher, the advanced certification agent would provide a philosophy of CPE that would work to improve the quality of teachers and teaching.

For this reason, it is important that whatever body becomes the regulating agent for advanced certification in Australia, it should also provide avenues for teachers to learn about advances in teaching. The administering board should provide or promote a variety of continuing professional development activities that foster the acquisition of the knowledge, skills and dispositions that are required for the award of advanced certification.

The agency that oversees standards for advanced certification need not be the sole provider of CPE, but should be a source of advice and guidance for whatever other providers might be willing to offer CPE for those seeking advanced certification.
Other providers could be, for example, universities, employers or unions. If they are providing CPE to prepare teachers for advanced certification, they would be bound to work within a framework set by the profession itself through the advanced certification agency.

Teacher educators in universities could be significant contributors to the design and delivery of CPE as well as taking a role in validating assessment procedures. Experienced university staff could be valuable resource people in the development, delivery and evaluation of CPE for advanced certification. Wise and Liebbrand (1996) have suggested that, in the USA, the NBPTS standards could be used as the basis for designing advanced teacher education programs that may lead to the award of postgraduate qualifications such as master’s degrees. This is an avenue for universities in Australia to explore. Indeed, some universities such as the University of Western Sydney and Macquarie University already offer postgraduate practitioner degrees at master’s or doctoral level that are designed to bring about improvements in educational practice. It might be possible for such postgraduate awards to be articulated with advanced certification.

5. Standards for Advanced Certification: Eligibility and Assessment

Any system for assessing teachers for advanced certification must take into account that there is a multiplicity of ways in which advanced skills and professional knowledge can be assimilated into the professional performance of practitioners. The NBPTS system for assessing teachers for certification does just that, and the protocols
used by the NBPTS represent a most comprehensive system for evaluating a teacher’s acquired knowledge and developed skills. The mode of assessment for advanced certification in Australia should incorporate this comprehensive assessment style as a basic principle.

Standards for the award of advanced certification fall into two categories: (a) eligibility of teachers to seek the credential, and (b) standards for assessment.

(a) Eligibility of Teachers to Seek the Credential

In England and Wales, the Advanced Skills Teacher classification is usually attainable after nine years of teaching (Department of Education and Employment, 1999). To seek NBPTS certification, a teacher needs to have been teaching for only three years (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). There is an advantage in setting liberal eligibility requirements so that exceptional people who develop great skill early in their careers can be rewarded through certification. On the other hand, requirements that are too liberal would only serve to trivialise the credential. It would be a major initial task of the body that would administer advanced certification in Australia to determine eligibility requirements, but five years is suggested as the minimum period of teaching that should be required before a teacher should be eligible to seek classification as an advanced certified teacher. The requirements should not be so daunting as to discourage candidates, nor so liberal that the value of the credential is undermined.
(b) Standards for Assessment

The criteria that are used by the NBPTS in assessing teachers for board certification have been shown in some detail in Part 1 of this chapter. They depend upon the NBPTS having established standards for what an accomplished teacher might be expected to know and be able to do. NBPTS certification involves assessment of teaching performance via a number of instruments such as portfolios and videotaped lessons, and assessment of a teacher’s involvement in professional development. A major aim of NBPTS assessment is to ascertain whether or not a teacher’s practice has made a difference to student learning, so the assessment process is conducted over a significant time, one full year.

The new performance management system in England and Wales requires teachers to establish objectives at the commencement of a year and makes judgements at the end of the year as to how well those objectives have been met. The objectives must include aims for personal professional development and student learning outcomes. The school’s head must assess the teacher’s classroom performance.

A system for assessing Australian teachers for advanced certification should have similar components to those for the USA and England and Wales. While the award of advanced certification status should require examination of a teacher’s knowledge of subject content and associated modern pedagogical methods, it should concentrate on assessing advanced practical teaching skills that contribute significantly to increased
learning outcomes for students. It is recommended that it would be necessary to assess teachers seeking advanced certification for the following:

(a) **Performance at advanced teaching level.** Advanced Certified Teachers should be able to demonstrate the ability to apply advanced pedagogical skills and knowledge in the areas in which they teach.

(b) **Application of skills and knowledge to improve learning outcomes in the educational institution.** Advanced Certified Teachers should be able to demonstrate that, over a sustained period, they have been able to bring about gains in learning outcomes for their students.

(c) **Professional development.** Advanced Certified Teachers must have completed advanced CPE or approved academic work such as a Masters degree that relates to improvement in their teaching practice.

While the registration body should oversee and administer the award of advanced certification, it is considered highly desirable that assessment methods should be developed by expert bodies that would be specially commissioned for this task. The assessment protocols might include open-ended paper and pen tests, portfolios that contain samples of the teacher’s work, videotaped evidence of classroom performance, and analysis by the teacher and trained assessors of the teacher’s abilities to plan, conduct and analyse teaching episodes. The assessment should take into account not just what the teacher can do in a short period but should seek evidence of how the
teacher's performance over a period of time affects the learning of students in the teacher's classes. The assessment should be conducted over a significant period of time, not just a mere one or two week period.

6. Financing the Advanced Certification System

The cost of setting up the infrastructure for NBPTS certification in the USA is estimated to be more than $US50 million. Fees paid by each candidate for certification offset only part of the costs. Most of the development funding comes from the USA federal government and part from public corporations.

The cost for implementing the new performance management scheme in England and Wales is estimated to be in the order of a billion pounds. No costs have yet been made available for the implementation of the Advanced Skills Teacher classification.

The development of reliable assessment instruments is a costly exercise, and any school system that contemplates establishing a system of advanced certification that awards a well-valued credential must accept this. If Australia were to have a system of advanced certification the financial costs would be considerable, and this could be expected to be a major cause of governmental resistance. Ingvarson and Chadbourne (1995) contend that Australia needs a body similar in function to the NBPTS, and must be prepared to invest both time and money to make it work. A system of advanced certification that encourages the development of high levels of proficiency by teachers in classrooms has potential to contribute to the national economy. It is recommended, then, that it should be financed principally by the state and federal governments and by
industries that would benefit from the enhanced educational standards that should eventuate.

7. Articulation of Advanced Certification with Registration and Accreditation

In the United States of America, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) has been developing means for testing and assessing the performance of beginning teachers for initial licensure, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has spent many years, and millions of dollars, developing protocols by which experienced, talented teachers might be acknowledged for what they know about teaching and what they can do in classrooms. Many states have adopted the performance-based protocols of INTASC and the NBPTS, while others have adapted them to suit their own licensing standards (Buday & Kelly, 1996). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has developed standards for accreditation of teacher education at universities that take account of INTASC protocols. The US federal government has given great support to the INTASC and NBPTS schemes and to NCATE. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) has vigorously promoted initial licensing via INTASC standards, certification via NBPTS standards, and accreditation via NCATE standards as inseparable mechanisms for improving the quality of teachers and teaching in America's schools. The relationship between accreditation, registration, and advanced certification has been described as like the
legs of a three legged stool supporting teacher quality (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

If teaching is to be strengthened in Australia and its professional status improved, then there must be a strong articulation between registration, accreditation and advanced certification in the model for regulating teaching in Australia. Accreditation must ensure that teacher education programs are well designed and prepare their graduates suitably for professional practice. Registration must ensure that only people who have undertaken well designed, accredited teacher education programs can be registered. Advanced certification must be considered an extension of initial registration, and must involve the candidate in having successfully completed accredited CPE at an advanced level. Furthermore, the significance of the relationship between registration, accreditation and advanced certification must be clearly shown by the relationships that would exist between the respective administrative bodies for those policy mechanisms. For example, each organisation could have a presence on the boards that administer the other mechanisms.

Conclusion

Advanced certification of one sort or another is part of the profession of teaching in America. England and Wales have moved to introduce in September 1999 a performance-based, quality management system that includes a form of advanced certification. The premise of this chapter is that a national system of advanced certification should be introduced into Australia. Such a system could contribute to an
improvement in the quality of teachers and teaching by encouraging, acknowledging and rewarding the development of the knowledge and skills required of exceptional teachers. From the examination in this chapter of the way advanced certification is managed in school systems overseas, particularly in the USA with the NBPTS scheme and in England and Wales with their proposed new performance management system, proposals have been made as to what elements of advanced certification should be included in the model for Australia.

A system of advanced certification is one third of the trinity of policy mechanisms that is the essence of quality control for a teaching profession. Teacher registration and accreditation of teacher education are the other two essential policy mechanisms. The issues that have been explored in this chapter, and in Chapters 4 and 5, have contributed to the development of the unified model for regulating the profession of teaching in Australia. This model is presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 7

A MODEL FOR A UNIFIED SYSTEM OF TEACHER REGISTRATION, ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND ADVANCED CERTIFICATION FOR TEACHERS IN AUSTRALIA

Preface

In this chapter, the model for a system for teachers to regulate their own profession through registration, accreditation and advanced certification is presented. These three mechanisms, collectively, constitute a powerful quality assurance net for teaching (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996; Wise & Liebbrand, 1993).

It is believed that the model, as now presented, is workable for Australia and its states and that it could be introduced effectively with co-operation between state and federal policy-makers, stakeholders in all school sectors, and legislators. The roles that governments and government instrumentalities such as the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) might have in implementing this scheme are discussed in Chapter 9.

Whether or not this is the best model for Australia has been tested through interviews that involved representatives of the key stakeholder groups. That evaluation is discussed in Chapter 8.
Introduction to and Overview of the Model

Stage A of this study was an examination of how teaching has been regulated as a profession in Australia over the last decade. It was postulated that if teaching were to be viewed as a significant profession that could attract capable new recruits and retain experienced teachers, then it had to have a system of regulation through which the profession itself could take responsibility for standards of entry and practice.

Stage B of the study examined how the profession of teaching is managed overseas. As a result, 26 categories of elements that might be considered for inclusion in a system for regulating teaching in Australia emerged. There were 13 categories of critical issues for registration, six for accreditation, and seven for advanced certification. The 26 categories were refined inductively, and those elements that were considered necessary or desirable were integrated into Part 1 of the model, an overview of which follows.

Part 1 of the Model

1. Basic Principles. Section 1 of the model is comprised of the three basic principles, which were proposed in the conclusion of Chapter 3 and which have become the foundational elements for the model.
2. Regulatory Bodies to be Established. Section 2 describes the four major groups of regulatory bodies that were deemed to be necessary for the model to function.

3. The Jurisdiction of the Registration Board and the Scope of its Responsibilities. Section 3 establishes the groups of people who must be registered. The model proposes a registration board with the power to require that all registered teachers must have undertaken substantial programs of teacher education. It also deals with staff who are not registered teachers but whose roles place them in positions where they have significant power over children.

4. Registration of Teachers and the Right to Practise. In Section 4, the graded structure for registration is defined. Also in Section 4, a distinction is made between registration of teachers and the right to practise as a teacher. Registration should be viewed as acknowledgement that a person has earned the appropriate qualifications to apply to teach. The issue of a “Registration Certificate” signifies this. However, before a person might take control of a class, he or she must possess a renewable “Practising Certificate.” The currency of a Practising Certificate would indicate, for example, that police records clearances have been updated and that a teacher has fulfilled all continuing professional education obligations.
5. Advanced Certification for Teachers. Section 5 provides details of the classification of “Advanced Certification” for teachers.

6. Professional Discipline. In Section 6, the roles of the registration boards with respect to professional discipline are detailed. The principle here is that professional discipline may be contingent on decisions by other statutory bodies, such as the courts, and the model outlines how and when in such cases the registration body should become involved.

7. Accreditation of Teacher Education Providers and Programs. The accreditation of teacher education is dealt with in Section 7. The underlying principle is that universities should retain their rights and responsibilities for internal accreditation and approval of courses, but that the teacher registration bodies should have the right to accept or reject university courses according to whether or not they can be judged to prepare their graduates adequately to enter practice as teachers.

8. Interim Provisions. Section 8 outlines “Interim provisions” that would be necessary if such a model as this were to be implemented.

Part 2 of the Model

Suggestions as to how the statutory boards might be constituted are made, separately, in Part 2 of the model, “Recommendations for the Composition and Membership of the Regulatory Authorities.” The basic principles behind the proposal for the compositions of the boards are to ensure that (a) practising teachers hold the majority
of places on their profession's peak regulatory authority, and (b) the key stakeholders are represented in the appropriate numbers.

The Model

Part 1 of the Model: Principal Elements for Regulating the Profession of Teaching

The following are the principal elements of this model for a system of registration, accreditation and advanced certification of teachers. Developed from the critical issues identified in the earlier chapters, these are to be considered as the basic dicta of a policy for regulating the profession of teaching. More detail as to the functions and compositions of the regulatory authorities is presented in Part 2.

1. Basic Principles.

1.1. The profession of teaching should be regulated on a national basis by a statutory authority that is empowered to set and maintain high standards for registering teachers, accrediting teacher education programs and assessing experienced, skilled practitioners for advanced certification.

1.2. The peak regulatory authority and its major state subsidiaries that are to have responsibilities for registering teachers should be constituted in such ways as to ensure that teachers hold the majority of representative places in these bodies, and thus have significant rights and responsibilities for establishing and maintaining standards for the profession.
1.3. No person should be employed as a teacher, or undertake a teacher education practicum, or supervise any student teacher who is undertaking a teacher education practicum in a school or pre-school or early childhood centre within the jurisdiction of the regulatory authority unless he or she has been granted an appropriate level of registration by the national registration authority and thus has been certified to be of sound character and to be suitably qualified, as required in Section 4, for that task.

2. Regulatory authorities to be established.

2.1. Under the model, the National Teachers Registration Board (NTRB) would be established as the peak national standards body. The NTRB would be responsible for ensuring that there are high standards for initial and continuing professional education, registration of teachers and advanced certification for teachers across the nation.

2.2. The NTRB should delegate specific powers and responsibilities with respect to registering teachers in the states and territories, overseeing the accreditation of teacher education nationally, and setting national standards for advanced certification of teachers to the subsidiary bodies described in 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 below:

2.2.1. A State Teachers Registration Board (STRB) would be legislated for in each state and territory to be responsible to the NTRB for
assessing the professional standards of those who might enter the profession and those who should remain in the profession.

2.2.2. A national body, the **Australian Council for Assessment of Professional Teaching Standards (ACAPTS)** would be established to have a particular responsibility for establishing national standards for assessing experienced skilled teachers for advanced certification. ACAPTS would be a committee of the NTRB.

2.2.3. A national body, the **Australian Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (ACATE)**, would be established as an adjunct to the NTRB with responsibility for developing on behalf of the NTRB national standards for the accreditation of programs of initial teacher education. As an adjunct to the NTRB rather than a subcommittee, ACATE would not be restricted in its composition to members of the NTRB. However, the ultimate authority for gazetted of the standards for accreditation and for granting accreditation of teacher education providers and programs of teacher education would rest with the NTRB.

2.3. The regulatory authorities defined above should not be considered independent. They must be seen as part of a unified, federated system that would regulate the profession of teaching across the nation. However, the
NTRB is predominant, delegating responsibilities to ACATE and ACAPTS at the national level and to the STRBs at the state level.

3. The Jurisdiction of the National Teachers’ Registration Board and the scope of its responsibilities.

3.1. The NTRB will have jurisdiction throughout the states and territories of Australia over the following groups of educators.

3.1.1. Teachers who practise in schools (as defined in each state’s Education Act), including:

(a) Directors and teachers in pre-schools (defined as government or private establishments that offer educational development programs, child care or other services for children under school age, prior to their enrolling in primary school [New South Wales Independent Education Union, 1997]).

(b) Directors and teachers in early childhood services centres, (defined as establishments that provide child care, educational development programs or other services for children under school age, including programs for developmentally delayed or disabled children, or children at risk of being developmentally delayed or disabled, aged 0-6 years [New South Wales Independent Education
Union, 1997]. These include early intervention centres, long day care centres and multi-purpose centres).

c) Teachers in government and non-government primary schools, secondary schools, special schools and senior secondary colleges.

3.1.2. Non school-based educators, including the following:

(a) University-based teacher educators who must interact with school children in the course of their duties.

(b) Students who are undertaking pre-service education programs that are designed to prepare them for entry to the teaching profession under the categories defined in Section 3.1.1. (a), (b) and (c).

3.2. The NTRB will maintain a National Register of those who have been granted registration at the levels defined in Section 4 (provisions 4.1.1, 4.1.2 through 4.1.5) by their respective STRBs and a separate Register of those who have been given temporary rights to practise as instructors as defined in provision 4.1.6.

3.2.1. The following details will be recorded for each teacher (or instructor) admitted to the Registers:

(a) Name.
(b) Address.
(c) Date of birth.
(d) Professional qualifications.
(e) Date of admission to the Register.
(f) Date and outcome of the most recent police records checks.

(g) Current level of registration and date obtained.

(h) Currency of any Practising Certificate issued.

(i) Details of any sanctions or limitations imposed by the registration boards at any time since initial registration.

(j) Any other details that the NTRB considers relevant.

3.2.2. The details recorded under provision 3.2.1 above will be available only under privilege to the representative members of the NTRB and STRBs and to members of any board of inquiry, except that a member of the public or an educational institution may, through their local STRB, have access to a published abstract of the National Registers that displays for each person admitted to the various Registers information only as to the current level of registration of the named person (that is, item 3.2.1.[g] above), confirmation that the person possesses a current Practising Certificate (item 3.2.1.[h] above), and any limitations placed upon the employment of the person as a teacher by the STRBs (item 3.2.1.[i] above).

3.3. The NTRB, advised by ACATE, ACAPTS and the STRBs, should be responsible for the following:

3.3.1. Ensuring that only programs of teacher education that satisfy ACATE-established national standards for accreditation are accepted as qualifications for the registration of practising teachers.
3.3.2. Setting standards and criteria for all levels of registration of teachers at various stages of their professional growth, from entry to initial teacher education programs to the classification of experienced, skilled and knowledgeable teachers for advanced certification.

3.3.3. Establishing procedures for assessing for registration applicants who have gained qualifications overseas or through alternative teacher education programs.

3.3.4. Establishing policies that facilitate the interstate mobility of registered teachers.

3.3.5. Determining criteria for the STRBs to use in ascertaining if an applicant should be disqualified from becoming a teacher or if a registered teacher should be deregistered, and the associated procedures for sanctioning practitioners who fail to maintain acceptable professional standards of behaviour or practice.

3.3.6. Composing a comprehensive code of ethics that should guide teachers in their professional behaviour and relationships.

3.4. The NTRB will consult with ACATE, ACAPTS, the STRBs, departments of education, non-government employers of teachers, schools, universities, parent bodies, teachers’ unions and professional and subject organisations and other appropriate bodies in order to promote good practice with respect
to initial preparation of teachers, induction of neophytes, and professional
development for experienced practising teachers.

3.5. The NTRB will initiate and encourage research that promotes its ideals of
good practice and disseminate reports, reviews, research papers and other
publications to inform members of advances in those areas.

3.6. The NTRB will liaise with the governments, education departments,
independent schools’ employers, teachers’ unions, teacher education
providers and other stakeholders on matters such as teacher supply,
recruitment, and intake into teacher education programs.

4. Registration of teachers and the right to practise.

4.1. There should be a graduated registration structure that reflects the levels of
professional education, experience and skill of teachers. The following
levels of registration should be established:

4.1.1. Registration as a Teacher Education Student. This involves
federal and state police records checks and would be required for
acceptance into any accredited teacher education program.

4.1.2. Registration as a Teaching Intern. This level of registration
requires graduation from a university-based program of at least four
years duration that includes at least two years of ACATE-accredited
teacher education, or possession of overseas or other professional
teaching qualifications that the NTRB accepts as being the equivalent, and current police records clearances. This allows the person to undertake a two-year internship under the supervision of experienced mentors. (N.B. Some universities have advocated an "internship" that puts students who are near the end of their programs into schools for what, basically, are extended practicum sessions. The internship advocated in this model requires that the intern has completed initial professional qualifications before commencing work in a school.)

4.1.3. Board Registration as a **Professional Teacher.** Full Board Registration as a teacher should only be granted to a person who has successfully completed two years as a Teaching Intern and who has satisfied the registration authority of his or her good character and fitness to teach, including updated police records clearances.

4.1.4. Registration as an **Advanced Certificated Teacher.** Advanced Certification requires a minimum of five years experience as a Board Registered Teacher and successful assessment through ACAPTS-developed protocols.

4.1.5. Special certification as an **Approved Teacher Educator.** This would be a requirement for teacher educators who need to supervise student teachers on school sites. Approval would need to be sought
each three years. Teacher educators who are Board Registered Teachers with current Practising Certificates would automatically qualify for approval if they provide supporting documentation from the university faculty in which they work. The following teacher educators would be granted Approved Teacher Educator certification only after successfully undergoing character checks, including criminal records checks, to establish that they are of suitable character to be involved with school pupils. (a) Teacher educators who are Board Registered Teachers but whose Practising Certificates have lapsed, (b) teacher educators who do not have NTRB-approved or ACATE-accredited teacher education qualifications or who do possess such qualifications but who have not progressed through the stages of being a Registered Teaching Intern to Board Registered Teacher level.

4.1.6. A classification of Instructor. This classification designates the standing of a person who might not possess teacher education qualifications adequate for registration but is allowed by the registration body to teach as a paraprofessional under supervision in a specified school on a temporary basis for up to three years, for special reasons. The employer would need to prove to the satisfaction of the NTRB that the instructor is uniquely qualified for the position, that is that no registered teacher qualified for the position could be found in
Australia. Police records clearances would be required. An instructor could only extend his or her authorisation to practise beyond three years by undertaking a NTRB-approved, ACATE-accredited teacher education program, successful completion of which would allow him or her to seek registration at a level to be determined by the NTRB (for example as a Registered Intern Teacher or as a Board Registered Teacher).

4.2. Initial registration at any of the above levels should be sought by applying through the applicant’s local STRB.

4.2.1. An applicant may apply for initial registration at the level of Teacher Education Student, Teaching Intern, Board Registered Teacher, Advanced Certified Teacher, Instructor or Approved Teacher Educator according to experience and qualifications.

4.2.2. An applicant for initial registration as a Teaching Intern, Board Registered Teacher, Advanced Certified Teacher, Instructor or Approved Teacher Educator will pay a once only application fee that is determined by the NTRB to cover the costs incurred in confirming that the applicant satisfies the conditions laid down by the NTRB for registration at the appropriate level as defined in section 4.1, including checking that the applicant has suitable teacher education qualifications (where required), and to conduct character checks,
including police records searches, and to determine the applicant’s level of registration.

4.2.3. An applicant for classification as a Registered Teacher Education Student would pay a reduced application fee that would cover costs for necessary character and probity checks.

4.2.4. If the application is successful, and upon payment of a fee for initial registration, the applicant’s name and other details as prescribed in provision 3.2.1 will be entered into the National Register at the appropriate level and a National Teacher Registration Certificate will be issued. A separate Register would be kept for Instructors.

4.3. Persons may be employed as full-time or part-time teachers in government or non-government pre-schools, primary schools or secondary schools in Australia only if they are classified by the NTRB as Instructors, Registered Teaching Interns, Board Registered Teachers or are Advanced Certified Teachers and have current Practising Certificates. The following exclusions to the need to have a Practising Certificate would apply:

4.3.1. Teacher education students must be registered as such to undertake a practicum but do not require a Practising Certificate.

4.3.2. Teacher education lecturers who supervise teacher education students during their practicum experiences when they work in classrooms
with school pupils must have certification as Approved Teacher Educators. They need not have current Practising Certificates.

4.4. A Practising Certificate will be issued by the local STRB at the time of initial registration as an Instructor, Teaching Intern, Board Registered Teacher or Advanced Certified Teacher and must be renewed whenever a teacher’s registration status changes or each three years, whichever comes first, upon payment of a fee determined by the NTRB.

4.4.1. Current police records clearances are necessary for the initial issue of or renewal of a Practising Certificate.

4.4.2. A Practising Certificate will show the teacher’s name, qualifications, current registration status, date of expiry of the Practising Certificate and any limitations upon his or her employment.

4.5. To be eligible for renewal of their Practising Certificates all Registered Teaching Interns, Board Registered Teachers and Advanced Certified Teachers must satisfy the following conditions:

4.5.1. Successfully have undertaken a minimum number of hours of continuing professional education (CPE) as determined and approved for this purpose by the local STRB, or other STRB-approved study (for example, a university course), within the three years currency of
their Practising Certificates. Such programs must be accessible to all registered teachers, whether they are practising or not.

4.5.2. Produce evidence that they have taught for the equivalent of one entire term (a total of 50 teaching days) in the three-year period preceding their application for renewal of their Practising Certificate. At least ten of those days of teaching experience must have occurred in the 12 months immediately preceding the application for renewal.

4.6. Persons whose names are entered in the Registers but who do not hold a current Practising Certificate (for example Registered Teacher Education Students, Approved Teacher Educators, teachers who have been on extended leave or those whose Practising Certificates have lapsed) must obtain a current Practising Certificate before they can be employed or resume employment as teachers in schools or in early childhood settings.

4.6.1. A Registered Teacher Education Student will qualify for a Practising Certificate upon graduation and re-registration by the STRB as a Teaching Intern.

4.6.2. An Approved Teacher Educator who has Board Registration as a Professional Teacher may, at the discretion of the STRB and with confirmation by the NTRB, be given credit for professional development undertaken in the previous three years and credit for teaching at university level and thus be eligible for a Practising
Certificate. It will be up to the judgement of the STRB as to which level of registration it will grant.

4.6.3. At the discretion of the STRB, registered teachers returning from extended leave or who have otherwise been absent from the profession for some time and whose Practising Certificates have lapsed may be issued with conditional Practising Certificates that allow them to practise as Teaching Interns for a limited period that will be determined by the STRB until the CPE and experience requirements as specified in Section 4.5 (provisions 4.5.1 and 4.5.2) are fulfilled. At the end of the specified term it will be up to the discretion of the STRB as to whether the teachers will have their Practising Certificates confirmed. Also, it will be up to the judgement of the STRB as to which levels of registration it will grant to those teachers.

4.7. The Practising Certificate of an Instructor may be renewed by the STRB only if the applicant can produce evidence of having current enrolment in an NTRB-approved, ACATE-accredited teacher education program and proof that satisfactory progress has been made towards completing the program.
5. Advanced certification for teachers.

5.1. After completing a minimum period of successful teaching (to be
determined by the TRBs, but in the order of five years) as a Board
Registered Teacher, a teacher may seek Advanced Certification.

5.1.1. To gain Advanced Certification, board registered practitioners must:

(a) demonstrate to the satisfaction of ACAPTS, through submission
of evidence such as portfolios, reports from supervisors or peers or
both, and through demonstration over an extended period of time,
capacity to apply advanced pedagogical knowledge in the areas in
which they teach;

(b) have the officer who has designated overall responsibility for the
performance of teaching staff in the institution attest that the teachers
have contributed positively to the learning environments of the
institutions in which they practise through the application over a
significant period of advanced practical teaching skills and
knowledge; and,

(c) complete advanced CPE or other academic work such as a
Masters degree that has been approved for this purpose by ACAPTS.

5.1.2. The protocols for assessing how the applicant applies advanced
knowledge and practical skills would be developed and administered
by ACAPTS, on behalf of the NTRB.

5.1.3. Advanced certification would be a permanent status, so long as the
teacher’s registration is maintained and a Practising Certificate is
kept current. If a teacher’s registration is cancelled (for example, by
suspension or deregistration) or the Practising Certificate is
withdrawn for any period of time (for example, as a disciplinary
measure) or allowed to lapse, upon the resumption of practice the
NTRB will make a determination as to whether and under what
conditions the teacher will regain advanced certification status.

5.2. The NTRB should negotiate with employers and teachers’ unions so that
industrial awards might be modified to include the following incentives for
teachers to seek advanced certification:

5.2.1. A teacher who gains Advanced Certification should be rewarded by a
salary allowance equivalent to 3% of his or her current teaching
salary.

5.2.2. A range of positions of responsibility, both paid and unpaid, should
be reserved for Advanced Certified teachers.

6. Professional discipline.

6.1. The NTRB and STRBs should have responsibility for disciplining
registered teachers who fail to uphold professional standards of behaviour.

6.2. Allegations of incompetence or professional misconduct made against a
teacher should be investigated in the first instance by the employer of the
teacher. Matters of a serious criminal nature should be referred to the
police. Matters that involve child abuse (in New South Wales such forms
of child abuse are defined under the Commission for Children and Young
People Act 1998 [No.2] and the Ombudsman Amendment [Child Protection
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and Community Services] Act 1998 [No. 3]) should be referred to the appropriate authority as required under the laws of the state (for example, in New South Wales this would be the Department of Community Services, or eventually a Children’s Commission and the Ombudsman). The teacher’s legal and industrial rights should be respected and the teacher may be represented by legal counsel or by the appropriate teachers’ union during investigations. The teacher should have the right to challenge any outcome of the investigation by appeal through the state’s Industrial Relations Commission or Government and Related Employees Appeals Tribunal, whichever is appropriate.

6.2.1. If, after investigation, the employer concludes that the allegation is well founded and that the offence is serious enough to warrant the dismissal of the teacher, the employer must notify the local STRB of the nature of the misbehaviour and the outcome of the investigation.

6.2.2. If the employer concludes that an allegation is well founded and of a serious nature but the teacher resigns before the employer takes conclusive action, the employer must notify the STRB of the nature of the alleged misbehaviour and the findings of the investigation at that time.

6.2.3. Allegations of improper behaviour of a sexual nature or of physical assault upon a child must be reported to the appropriate authority (in
New South Wales, under the *Ombudsman Amendment [Child Protection and Community Services] Act 1998 [No.3]*, this will be the Ombudsman) for investigation. If after investigation that authority concludes that the allegation is well founded, the authority must notify the local STRB of the circumstances of the case.

6.2.4. If the police in a state know or believe that a person convicted of an offence of a sexual nature or of any indictable offence is a teacher, then the police must notify the local STRB of the conviction.

6.2.5. Teachers must notify the STRB of any conviction they have had for an indictable offence that occurred before or after they became registered at any level. Failure to do so should incur a fine, irrespective of how the STRB subsequently chooses to deal with the offence per se.

6.3. Upon notification under provisions 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4 or 6.2.5 above, the STRB should have the powers to properly investigate the substance of the complaint against the teacher.

6.3.1. The teacher must be informed in writing by the STRB that an investigation will be held and of the substance of the investigation.
6.3.2. If, after investigation, the STRB establishes that the complaints against a teacher are well founded and serious then it may require the teacher to attend an inquiry before a committee of the STRB.

6.3.3. The teacher may choose to attend the inquiry with or without legal representation, or to have a determination made in his or her absence.

6.3.4. If a committee of inquiry determines that a teacher is guilty of unprofessional behaviour or serious misconduct, or is incompetent, then the STRB may caution the teacher, levy fines or recommend to the NTRB that the teacher’s Practising Certificate should be suspended for a fixed period of time, or that the teacher should be deregistered.

6.3.5. If the NTRB deregisters a teacher following a recommendation by the STRB, the NTRB must specify whether deregistration is permanent and irrevocable or whether the teacher may at some future time apply for registration to be restored. In the latter case, the NTRB should specify a time after which the teacher may apply for registration to be restored and may specify conditions that must be met.

6.3.6. A teacher who is aggrieved by any decision of a board of inquiry should be entitled to file a notice of appeal with the STRB, and if the
matter cannot be resolved through arbitration then the teacher may be entitled to have the matter dealt with through the courts.

6.4. Schools and pre-schools under the jurisdiction of the NTRB (cf. Section 3) that employ as a teacher any person who does not have a current Practising Certificate should incur penalties that could include fines, suspension of their registration as a school and withholding of state or federal funding.

6.4.1. It is the responsibility of the employer to confirm through the local STRB or the NTRB the status of the teacher’s registration and currency of the teacher’s Practising Certificate.

6.5. A person who knowingly gives false or misleading information to any STRB or to the NTRB in an application for registration or who knowingly misleads the STRB or NTRB through omission of information should be liable to a fine and refusal of registration.

6.6. A person who falsely represents himself or herself as a registered teacher should be liable to penalties, including fines.

6.7. The NTRB and STRBs, as statutory authorities, should be empowered to have access to current police records of any applicant for registration or change of level of registration, or of any teacher who becomes subject of an inquiry.
6.8. The NTRB will advise all STRBs of the names of disqualified and
deregistered persons, who should not be considered for employment as
teachers and these names should be available under qualified privilege to
employers of teachers.

7. Accreditation of teacher education providers and programs.

7.1. The NTRB should gazette standards for the accreditation of teacher
education at (a) the provider or institutional level and (b) at program level.
These standards should be developed through ACATE, using as a basis the
National Standards and Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education that have
been established by the Australian Council of Deans of Education

7.1.1. Provider or institutional accreditation should be a guarantee that an
institution is capable of providing on-going teacher education of high
academic and professional standard by having sound educational and
financial management, adequate numbers of highly qualified staff, a
diverse provision of teacher education programs that are suitable for
preparing people for practice as teachers in a variety of schools, and
adequate facilities including libraries, resources and student support
services of standards appropriate to a higher education institution.
The institutions should meet or exceed standards required by the
NTRB (developed by ACATE) which should be based on those

7.1.2. Program accreditation should be a guarantee that any teacher education program offered by an accredited institution is of a standard suitable for preparing a graduate for initial registration as a practising teacher. The institutions should meet or exceed standards required by the NTRB (developed by ACATE) which should be based on those outlined in Section 2 of the *National Standards and Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education* (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998).

7.2. Institutions providing teacher education must undergo institutional accreditation review each five years.

7.2.1. Institutional accreditation should be through a self-reporting basis, with confirmatory follow-up visitations by NTRB assessment facilitators.

7.2.2. On the basis of recommendations of the NTRB assessment facilitators, the NTRB may:

(a) grant **unconditional institutional accreditation** for a period of five years,
(b) grant **provisional institutional accreditation** for a set period on
the condition that matters of concern discovered during the
accreditation review are to be addressed within that time, or

(c) refuse institutional accreditation.

7.3. Teacher education programs must undergo assessment for accreditation
each five years.

7.3.1. ACATE, in consultation with university authorities, especially the
Australian Council of Deans of Education, will develop protocols
and national standards for accreditation of teacher education
programs.

7.3.2. The providers (usually universities) must conduct accreditation
reviews of their own programs. Standards used by the universities in
self-accreditation of programs must meet or surpass those that are
prescribed by ACATE.

7.3.3. Accreditation assessment facilitators trained by ACATE will observe
each university’s self-accreditation procedures and provide advice to
guide the universities in developing and using protocols that should
meet or exceed the standards prescribed by ACATE.
7.3.4. Following an accreditation review, and taking into account the recommendations of the ACATE accreditation assessment facilitators, the NTRB may:

(a) grant **full accreditation** for a period of five years to a program that has been judged to meet ACATE standards by the assessment facilitators who participate in the university’s review procedures, or

(b) grant **conditional accreditation** for a limited period to a program if the ACATE assessment facilitators recommend that only minor amendments need be made for the program to meet ACATE standards and if the facilitators validate the university’s review procedures, or

(c) refuse accreditation standing for any program that the facilitators consider has not been correctly reviewed by the university or that fails to comply with ACATE guidelines.

7.4. An appeal process should be developed by the NTRB to handle disputes that might arise with respect to decisions made under provisions 7.2 and 7.3.

8. **Interim provisions.**

8.1. For the first year of operation of a policy based on this model interim STRBs should be established in each state and territory. In those states that
currently have registration boards the existing boards should continue for
one year as interim STRBs. In each of those states and territories where no
registration boards currently exist the Minister responsible for education,
after consultation with the stakeholder groups, should appoint an interim
board that has a composition similar to that proposed in Part 2 of this
model.

8.2. As soon as practicable after their formation, the interim STRBs should meet
to elect an interim NTRB that will function for one year or until a
permanent NTRB can be established.

8.3. After one year, or sooner if practicable, the interim STRBs and the interim
NTRB will be decommissioned and then formally be established according
to the procedures and with the compositions shown in Part 2 of this chapter.

8.4. Any person who, at the date of introduction of registration as outlined in
this model, is enrolled as a student in an initial teacher education program at
an Australian university or who currently is employed as a full-time teacher
in any educational setting that comes under the jurisdiction of this policy
should automatically be registered upon application, provided that the
criteria with respect to police records clearances are satisfied. This interim
right will lapse after the policy has been in force for one year, and any
person who has not taken advantage of it will then have to seek registration under the normal provisions of the policy.

8.4.1. A person whose application under provision 8.4 is successful will be granted registration as a Board Registered Teacher if he or she has taught successfully for the equivalent of two or more complete years, or as a Registered Teaching Intern if he or she has taught for fewer than two years, or as a Registered Teacher Education Student if still completing a teacher education program.

8.4.2. A person who at the time of introduction of this model as a policy is not employed as a full-time teacher but who has been employed as a casual or part-time teacher for periods whose total is the equivalent of one full term (50 teaching days) over the previous two years may make an application for automatic registration under provision 8.4, provided he or she has completed recognised teacher education qualifications.

8.4.3. A person who at the time of introduction of this as a policy is employed as a teacher educator in a university may upon application automatically be given certification as an Approved Teacher Educator, provided that the criteria with respect to police records clearances are satisfied.
8.5. A person who is eligible to make an application under interim provision
8.4, and does so, will not be required to pay initial registration application
fees or a fee for initial Registration and Practising Certificates that might be
issued, but will be liable for fees for future renewals of a Practising
Certificate.

8.6. At the date of introduction of this model all teacher education providers in
institutions that are listed in the Higher Education Funding Act should be
considered to be accredited and teacher education programs taught in those
institutions should be considered to be accredited as providing graduates
suitable for registration as teachers, for an initial period of five years. Other
institutions that offer teacher education programs should apply for interim
accreditation through the interim NTRB, which will consider each
application on its merits.

8.6.1. During the first five years following the introduction of the model, on
a progressive basis, all institutions and programs granted
accreditation under provision 8.6 will be subject to accreditation
reviews as defined in this model. The date of initial review will then
become the date from which the five years currency of accreditation
will be taken.
Part 2 of the Model: Recommendations for the Composition and Membership of the Regulatory Authorities

Data from examination of the critical issues in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 were used to compose the model that has been presented in Part 1. Below, the compositions of the authorities that were defined in Section 2 of Part 1 and the extent to which particular interest groups should be represented on the governing councils of the profession (that is, the TRBs) are presented and discussed in more detail than was appropriate for that previous section.

The State and National Teachers Registration Boards (the TRBs)

(a) Compositions of the STRBs and the NTRB

Each registration board of this federated model, whether State (the STRBs) or National (the NTRB), should have an appointed executive officer (or registrar) and a secretariat to manage day-to-day administrative functions. As a guide, in 1997 the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration had a professional and clerical staff that consisted of 21 full-time or part-time employees (Board of Teacher Registration [Queensland], 1998). As well, each of the STRBs would need on occasions to employ highly trained people who are qualified to investigate serious complaints, and have access to legal counsel who could competently deal with charges that might arise following serious breaches of professional behaviour. The loci of control of the NTRB and each of the STRBs, however, should be in the hands of the profession and other major stakeholders through their representatives on the TRBs. Following are discussions of the composition and membership of the TRBs. The compositions of the STRBs are
discussed first, since in the model the manner by which the NTRB is formed is dependent upon the nature of membership of the STRBs.

The STRBs would include members who would be representative of groups that have significant interests in the quality of education in Australia, but there should be a majority of registered, practising teachers on each of those boards (cf. Part 1, Section 2.3). Arguments for the predominance of teachers on the registration boards have been presented in Chapter 4. The successful existing registration boards in South Australia and Queensland have compositions that meet this criterion, and the Teaching Standards Board proposed for New South Wales and the registration board proposed for Tasmania fall short of this ideal. In neither the Tasmanian board nor the New South Wales board would teacher representatives be elected by registered teachers.

The range of stakeholders that should have nominees representing them on a state’s STRB in this model have been drawn from an examination of the existing boards of Queensland and South Australia and the proposed board of Tasmania. Registered teachers should elect the teachers representing them on their respective State Registration Boards. In the larger states, a Teachers Registration Board composed in a manner consistent with the above, would need 18 members in order to be representative of the major stakeholders and still give teachers a majority representation of 10 (two elected representatives of the teachers’ unions and eight elected teachers). The membership of the STRB proposed in the model for a larger state would be:
♦ The Minister, or a nominee of the Minister, as its chair.

♦ One nominee of the Director-General of School Education who, effectively, is the employer of teachers in government schools.

♦ A nominee of the Director of the state’s early childhood services.

♦ Two nominees of non-government school employers. (One should represent the major systemic Catholic sector, and the other should represent the non-systemic independent schools.)

♦ An elected representative of the members of each of the two major teachers’ unions (for teachers in the government and non-government sectors).

♦ Two nominees of parents. (One from the peak body representing parents of children in government schools, the Federation of Parents and Citizens of the state, and one from the peak body representing parents of children in non-government schools, the Parents Council.)

♦ A nominee of the body representing the teacher education sector, the Australian Council of Deans of Education (the ACDE).

♦ Eight practising registered teachers elected by and from the three constituencies of government schools (four members), non-government schools (two members) and early childhood centres (two members).

The sizes of the states’ education systems, as reflected in the numbers of teachers employed in each state of Australia, vary greatly. This is illustrated below, in Table 3.
Table 3: Total numbers of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers in all schools in Australia in 1995, state-by-state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE Teachers, State by State</td>
<td>69,094</td>
<td>51,340</td>
<td>35,774</td>
<td>19,610</td>
<td>16,110</td>
<td>5,595</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>2,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ministerial Council on Education, Employment and Youth Affairs, 1996, p. 28.)

Some states and territories have such small teaching forces that a STRB of the size suggested above would be uneconomical, if not impractical. In Tasmania (with 5,595 teachers in 1995), the ACT (3,863) and NT (2,587) the sizes of the STRBs could be reduced by having the nominee of the Director-General represent early childhood services as well as schools, reducing the representations from non-government employers to one and from parent organisations to one, and having only five elected practising teachers. This would result in a minimalist board of 12 that has 7 elected teachers (five current practitioners and two representing unions), as shown below.

- The Minister, or a nominee of the Minister, as its chair.
- One nominee of the Director-General as employer.
- One nominee of non-government employers.
- An elected representative of each of the two major teachers' unions (for teachers in government and non-government schools, respectively).
♦ One nominee of parents.

♦ One nominee of the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE).

♦ Five practising registered teachers elected by and from the three constituencies of government schools (two members), non-government schools (two members) and early childhood centres (one member).

The compositions suggested above would allow for the principle that elected practising teachers should have majority representation on each of the STRBs. This principle could be satisfied with respect to the NTRB as well, by having members of the NTRB elected from within the membership of the STRBs and voted for by the members of the STRBs. It would not be necessary to initiate processes for holding a time consuming and expensive general election of registered teachers. Having the NTRB constituted in the following manner would result in a NTRB of 26 (of whom 13 are elected registered teachers) that would be representative of the stakeholder groups.

♦ A representative of the Commonwealth Minister responsible for education would be appointed by the Minister.

♦ The eight nominees who represent the Ministers of Education of each state and territory on the respective STRBs.

♦ Four non-teacher representatives to be elected. One place on the NTRB to be filled with a single representative of each of the following stakeholder groups:
● The government employers, that is, from the nominees on the STRBs of the Directors-Generals of Education, and Directors of early childhood services.

● The non-government employers.

● The parent bodies.

● The tertiary sector, representing universities that offer teacher education.

♦ Four teachers, representing the unions, to be elected. Two places on the NTRB would be filled by elected representatives of the teachers’ unions of each sector (two each for government and non-government teachers’ unions).

♦ Nine teacher representatives to be elected. Nine practising teacher members would be elected from the representatives on the STRBs:

   ● Four from government schools.

   ● Three from non-government schools.

   ● Two from the early childhood sector.

For the STRBs the term of office should be four years, with half the representatives remaining in office when elections are held each second year. This would limit the problem of loss of developed expertise that could arise following elections.
Appointments of representatives on the NTRB should be for two years, with the changeover corresponding to the biennial half-elections of the STRBs.

(b) Functions of the Teacher Registration Boards

The functions of the TRBs have been described explicitly in the model that has been presented earlier, in Part 1 of this chapter. The fundamental tasks of the NTRB are to act on behalf of the practitioners in establishing policies and practices that foster high standards for the profession of teaching nationally through registration, accreditation and advanced certification. The STRBs would ensure that NTRB standards are enacted at state level.

(c) Advantages in this Model for Universal Mandatory Registration of Teachers

A properly empowered system of teacher registration, such as is proposed in this model, would bring benefits to all who are involved with schools. Those whom Jansen (1997) suggested would be beneficiaries of such as system would include:

♦ teachers, who would gain in status through registration affirming that teaching is a profession with unique knowledge, skills and aptitudes;

♦ parents, through the assurance that registration gives that teachers are well qualified, fit to teach and of good character.

♦ Teacher employers, who should have confidence that the registration system is supportive of high standards for teacher qualifications and that its centralised
systems for checking criminality and validity of qualifications will save them time and money by eliminating duplication of effort in these areas.

♦ The state and federal governments, by having authoritative bodies, representative of the profession, that can provide consistent advice on educational matters at little or no cost to the government.

♦ Teachers’ unions, which should welcome the protection that registration offers for the reputation of the profession and of teachers.

♦ The children in schools, whose safety would be enhanced by the registration body preventing people of known bad character being in contact with them as teachers.

♦ Teacher educators, who should appreciate representation on a single body that reflects the views of the profession and that works with universities consultatively to advise on suitability of pre-service programs.

As proposed, the registration bodies would be comprised of stakeholders who are representatives of the above groups of beneficiaries. Giving teachers majority membership of the profession’s governing councils would signify that teaching is a mature profession where the practitioners should have ultimate responsibility for their professional standards.
The Australian Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (ACATE)

(a) Composition of ACATE

In setting and protecting professional standards for teaching the views of two groups of stakeholders should predominate. These are the practitioners of the profession (the teachers), and those who prepare them for practice (the teacher educators). The model presented here allows for the practitioners to have the majority membership of the TRBs that must make judgements as to whether applicants for registration have undertaken adequate preparation through courses of teacher education. But by proposing the existence of a national accreditation body that is comprised mainly of representatives of the universities, and allowing the universities to maintain the essential element of self-accreditation, the model preserves the legitimate claims of universities to autonomy with respect to academic aspects of teacher education.

There already exists a nationally constituted body, the Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE), that is concerned with setting and maintaining high standards for teacher education programs in universities. The ACDE would form the nucleus of a statutory national body that would function under the auspices of the NTRB for these purposes. It has already been suggested that the accreditation body should be called the Australian Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (ACATE).

Constituting ACATE as an adjunct to the NTRB rather than as a subcommittee of the NTRB, would allow it to be comprised principally of representatives of the external body, ACDE, rather than being restricted in its membership to members of the NTRB.
There could still be cross-representation on ACATE from the NTRB so that teachers and other stakeholders could participate in the accreditation process.

One possible composition of ACATE that would give adequate representation of the NTRB would be as follows:

- Eight representatives drawn from the membership of the ACDE (one for each state or territory).
- A member of the NTRB representing teachers in government schools.
- A member of the NTRB representing teachers in non-government schools.
- A member of the NTRB representing teachers in early childhood settings.
- A member of the NTRB representing employers of teachers in government schools.
- A member of the NTRB representing employers of teachers in non-government schools.
- A parent representative from the NTRB.
(b) The Functions of ACATE and the Operation of Accreditation

ACATE would be responsible to the NTRB for setting standards for the accreditation of teacher education programs. ACATE would moderate the processes of institutional and program accreditation of teacher education through having a corps of trained assessment facilitators spread across all states and territories who would participate in the universities’ self-accreditation reviews. The ultimate determination of the accreditation status of providers and of their programs, however, would be made by the NTRB, acting on recommendations of ACATE assessment facilitators. Accreditation reviews would need to be conducted each five years (refer to Chapter 5 for a discussion of the duration of accreditation). During each university’s accreditation reviews, the ACATE accreditation assessment facilitators would:

- participate in faculty reviews and course assessments as they are conducted by the university,

- advise the review panel on technical requirements and procedures to be dealt with during the review,

- report to ACATE as to whether or not the national standards for accreditation have been met by the university, whether or not the university has used suitable protocols for its accreditation review, and whether or not the provider’s programs have been deemed to be of a standard suitable for preparing their graduates to enter professional practice as teachers.
The model for an accreditation body that is promoted in this thesis is consistent with the recommendations of the ACDE in *Preparing a Profession* (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998), which has been reported upon in Chapter 3, and the Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee (1998), also reported upon in Chapter 3. Although it places accreditation via ACATE within a framework that ultimately is governed by the teaching profession, it maintains the long established rights of universities to self-accreditation of academic programs.

The forty public tertiary institutions listed in the Higher Education Funding Act (HEFA) and private institutions such as Notre Dame University, Bond University and the Melbourne College of Divinity, are “self-accrediting bodies free to determine their own curriculum content, teaching methods and assessment arrangements” (West, 1998, p. 77). Public universities in Australia have a greater degree of autonomy in the management of resources and in academic matters than public universities in any part of the world (West, 1998). The freedom that Australian universities have from the direct influence of governments was acknowledged by West (1998) as a strength that places them in a position to respond to and to take advantage of developments in the higher education environment while maintaining their mission and aims. Universities rightly have claims to this degree of academic autonomy, but when they design courses they do have to accommodate the views of the professions to ensure that their graduates meet the needs of those professions and are suitable for professional practice (Williams et al., 1997). Various teacher education faculties already take into account
the needs of employers and registration boards where there are specific requirements that must be met for graduates to be employable (Williams et al., 1997). The *National Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education* (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998) represent consensus among the stakeholders concerned with teacher education and should be seen as the basis for standards of initial teacher education and for national teacher registration. If these guidelines were refined into accreditation standards acceptable to the representatives of the TRBs and of the ACDE on ACATE, then the work of ACATE could proceed to the satisfaction of the NTRB without the universities’ rights to autonomy being subsumed by a registration-accreditation bureaucracy.

(c) Advantages

This model for accrediting teacher education programs has significant advantages, as shown below:

- A model based around self-evaluation of programs by the universities themselves, overseen by the ACDE through its management of and majority representation on ACATE, would be more palatable to the university sector than any model where standards for accreditation are imposed by a bureaucracy external to the universities.

- The ACDE already takes a major role in standards setting. The model formalises the role of the ACDE at a national level with respect to accreditation of teacher education programs.
♦ The internal accreditation protocols already used by the universities would need little alteration.

♦ Costs should not be expected to be much greater than they are with current systems. Nevertheless, some financial help probably would need to be sought from the State and Commonwealth Governments.

♦ The NTRB is the body that has to be convinced that the standards of preparation of potential teachers are high enough for them to be registrable. The relationships between the NTRB and the ACDE representatives who manage ACATE are meant to be co-operative, and the stakeholders should make decisions collaboratively, utilising the considerable expertise of members of ACDE.

♦ The model acknowledges the expertise of the university sector by allowing senior executives of the peak body of teacher education faculties and departments, the ACDE, to lead in setting accreditation standards.
The Australian Council for the Assessment of Professional Teaching Standards (ACAPTS)

(a) The Composition of ACAPTS

Through the Teachers Registration Boards—State and National—the teaching profession itself would have jurisdiction over initial licensing of practitioners and responsibility for ensuring that each candidate for registration as a teacher has successfully completed teacher education that has ACATE accreditation. The profession should also have jurisdiction over the award of advanced certification for teachers. Advanced certification should properly be regarded as an extension of board registration that is accessible only to experienced, registered teachers who can satisfy stringent assessment of their skills and knowledge.

Under the model, the ultimate authority for gazetting and implementing standards for assessing teachers for advanced certification would be vested in the NTRB. A subcommittee of the NTRB, to be called the Australian Council for Assessment of Professional Teaching Standards (ACAPTS), would be responsible to the NTRB for commissioning specialist aspects of advanced certification to research and development experts who could establish and test standards for professional performance appraisal of highly skilled teachers. ACAPTS would also liaise with teachers’ professional associations in order to determine what should be included in protocols for assessing teachers for advanced certification. Since most of the technical aspects of the work of ACAPTS would be contracted out to specialist organisations under the model, ACAPTS would not need to be a large committee. In the model, it is
suggested that ACAPTS be comprised of the following members of the NTRB, selected on the basis of their experience and knowledge of teacher performance appraisal, and one representative of ACATE.

♦ One representative of the government school teachers’ union from the NTRB.

♦ One representative of the non-government school teachers’ union from the NTRB.

♦ One representative of the employers of teachers in government schools from the NTRB.

♦ One representative of the employers of teachers in non-government schools from the NTRB.

♦ One government schools teacher representative from the NTRB.

♦ One non-government schools teacher representative from the NTRB.

♦ One early childhood teacher representative from the NTRB.

♦ One teacher education representative from ACATE.

♦ One parent representative from the NTRB.
(b) The Functions and Operation of ACAPTS

Established as a committee of the NTRB, ACAPTS would have a charter to conduct the following functions:

- Subcontract the development of assessment instruments and procedures to organisations such as the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). (The ACER is a non-profit organisation that develops specialised educational testing materials and protocols and might be considered as suitable for this purpose.)

- Employ trained specialists to conduct assessments of teachers on behalf of the TRBs.

- Provide in-service guidance for those who opt for assessment for advanced certification, as does the NBPTS in the USA.

- Be a source of literature and up-to-date research on pedagogy that teachers wishing to earn advanced certification might use.

(c) Advantages of the Options for ACAPTS Proposed in the Model

Consideration was given to the possibility that ACAPTS might be established as an independent corporation modelled on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) that has gained credibility in the USA. However, the NBPTS is very costly to run, and it depends very much on financial support from government, educational organisations and industry. The fees charged for assessment by the NBPTS, although substantial to an individual, amount to a very small fraction of the
massive costs incurred in developing and maintaining the NBPTS. It could be
anticipated that if this model were adopted for Australia, it would be unlikely that
ACAPTS would be financially viable. It would need to be highly dependent on
external funding. Moreover, assessment fees would need to be substantial, to the point
of being disincentives to teachers who should seek advanced certification.

Incorporating ACAPTS as a special committee of the NTRB that subcontracts to
organisations such as ACER should be more cost effective than operating as an
independent corporation as does the NBPTS. The establishment costs of ACAPTS
should be negligible. The cost of maintaining staff and infrastructure for developing
assessment instruments and protocols would be avoided, as the specialist organisations
that would be contracted should already have specialist staff and equipment at hand.
However, the costs for administering a system of advanced certification nationally
have the potential to be great. Governments that wish to ensure that teachers continue
to develop their teaching skills must accept the inevitability of such costs.

Conclusion

What is presented in this chapter is a model for regulating the profession of teaching.
While it is predominantly a model for registering teachers, the two associated
mechanisms of accreditation of teacher education and the provision of advanced
certification have been integrated into the model. The three mechanisms are
inseparable in any comprehensive approach to setting and maintaining standards for
teaching. Table 4, below, summarises the major responsibilities, relationships and the
compositions of the authorities that are proposed under the model. The model is based on issues that arose from forms of inductive analysis of documentary material and which have been discussed in more detail in earlier chapters.

Table 4: Major responsibilities and functions of the regulatory bodies, and their compositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL LEVEL</th>
<th>AUTHORITY</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES AND FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>COMPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTRB</td>
<td>Peak policy-making body for the profession of teaching, with ultimate responsibility for setting standards for teacher registration, accreditation of teacher education and for advanced certification</td>
<td>Twenty six members, elected by STRB representatives from within the STRBs: one representative of the Commonwealth Minister for Education, one for each state or territory Minister, four teachers from the unions, nine teachers, and the balance from employers, parents and the tertiary area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACATE</td>
<td>Responsible for establishing standards for accrediting providers of teacher education and programs of teacher education, and for training accreditation assessment facilitators who participate in universities’ self-accreditation reviews.</td>
<td>Thirteen members: eight members of ACDE (one representing the universities in each state and territory), and a single NTRB representative of teachers in government schools, teachers in non-government schools, government employers, non-government employers, and parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACAPTS</td>
<td>Responsible for establishing standards and protocols for assessing teachers for advanced certification. Contracts development of standards to external expert performance appraisal bodies</td>
<td>Eight members: one from ACATE and seven from the NTRB (one each from non-government teachers’ unions, government teachers’ unions, non-government employers, government employers, a government teacher, a non-government teacher, parents and a representative from the teacher educators).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>STRBs</td>
<td>To be established in each state and territory. Each STRB deals with matters of registration and professional discipline at state level, guided by policies of the NTRB.</td>
<td>The Minister for Education, and 17 others (12 others in smaller states) representing the employers in both government and non-government sectors, the unions, parent bodies, teacher educators, and a majority of elected teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The model, as presented in the foregoing parts of this chapter, has been presented for evaluation to people who represent the stakeholder groups that would comprise the regulatory bodies. The outcomes of the evaluation interviews have been reported in Chapter 8.
Chapter 8

EVALUATION OF THE MODEL: VIEWS OF THE STAKEHOLDERS

Interviews with representatives of significant stakeholder groups were used to evaluate the model that has been presented in Chapter 7. A full description of the methodology for the evaluative interviews has been given in Chapter 2. Also included in Chapter 2 is the rationale for selecting the stakeholder groups.

All who accepted invitations to participate gave permission to use their names in the publication of their responses. With the exception of Senator Crowley, who has been cited individually, it was considered unnecessary for individual respondents to be named, since the responses have been taken as representative of the views of the respondents’ respective organisations. That is what the participants were asked to give.

The aim of the interviews was to ascertain the views of each of the respondents with respect to the regulation of teachers, particularly as presented in the model. Each participant was sent a copy of the model two weeks before the interview was held. Each interview took between one and two hours.

The interviews were semi-structured. Each respondent was firstly given a copy of the model, in the form that is shown in Chapter 7, so that they could prepare their responses. At the commencement of the interview, the respondents were given the opportunity to express, on behalf of their organisations, views about teacher
registration and the related matters of accreditation and advanced certification, and then asked questions that were chosen so that they related to the major sections of the model and to the compositions of the authorities proposed in the model. The precise wording of the questions was not predetermined. Nor was the order in which they were asked. Hence, no copy of specific interview questions is included, but samples of the types of questions asked are given in Appendix B. The responses were transcribed by hand, and summaries of each participant’s relevant comments are given below. A verbatim transcript of one of the interviews is provided in Appendix C. From each of the summaries, responses that point to desired modifications in the model were copied on to file cards, in categories, according to the sections of the model to which they related. From those, a set of possible amendments to the model was made. The recommended amendments are listed at the end of this chapter.

Summaries of Interview Responses

Each of the stakeholder groups was represented at the interviews by a single respondent, except for the New South Wales Joint Council for Professional Teachers’ Associations and the New South Wales Department of Education and Training, each of which provided two senior representatives. The respondents held senior positions in their respective organisations, and thus could represent the views of the organisations.
The Teachers’ Unions

The New South Wales Teachers Federation

The respondent for the New South Wales Teachers Federation favoured registration as a means for improving the status of teachers. He agreed with the federated structure of the model, but suggested that it would be more realistic to have registration on a state basis with common registration requirements from state-to-state.

He believed that registration should apply to teachers in all schools, as proposed in the model. However, he suggested some modifications to the jurisdiction of the model, namely (a) that student teachers should not be registered but be given some “associate” status, since registration should be reserved for fully-qualified professionals, and (b) all lecturers in universities should be registered, not just teacher education personnel who supervise student teachers during their practicum experiences. On this latter point, he was in agreement with the wide jurisdiction proposed by Crowley’s Senate Committee. His reasons were that this would ensure that lecturers had undertaken some form of professional education that would prepare them for their pedagogical duties. He also emphasised that people who visited schools to coach sport or teach music should not need to be registered, but there should be some form of accreditation available to them that differs from professional registration. This should entail character and criminal records checks.

He agreed with the concept of graded levels of registration, saying that this was consistent with the policies of the Federation, especially the inclusion of an internship
before full registration. He also supported the inclusion of an advanced certification, provided that the methodology for recognising such practitioners was not onerous. In view of the limited promotion opportunities for teachers in schools, he felt that advanced certification should be reasonably easily accessible for experienced teachers. He agreed with the provisions for instructors, but would have preferred to have them classified as having “provisional registration (3 years)” to overcome the potential problem of employers exploiting them because they see them as potentially “cheap labour.” He was also convinced that the provisions for the classification of instructor would need to be enforced very rigorously, and that the registration authorities and the profession would need to strongly resist any pressure that might be brought to bear by governments to change those provisions at times of teacher shortages.

He felt that linking registration and accreditation was logical and sound. If a registration authority said “these are the standards,” then teacher education faculties “would fall into line.” The view of the Federation was that there should be more co-operation between teacher education faculties and schools with respect to course requirements. He agreed with external and internal accreditation, so long as teachers are represented at each stage of accreditation. As per the model, academics should have the freedom to construct their courses while teachers, through their elected registration body, should have the final say as to whether or not a course adequately prepared its graduates for professional practice.
He agreed with the principle that the Register should be a public document, so long as private information was sufficiently protected. His feeling was that the public should know that their children’s teachers are qualified.

The provisions for professional discipline in the model were acceptable to the Federation, in that discipline matters and determination of incompetence should in the first instance be dealt with by the employer and employee, with the rights of the employee to involve the union and perhaps appeal to the courts maintained. Then, and only then, should the registration body become involved. The Federation was not in favour of the registration board becoming a major investigatory bureaucracy.

The Federation has a fundamental belief that the profession of teaching should be regulated by teachers. Thus, the idea that all sorts of people from the community should have representation on a registration or standards board—as proposed in both the model and in the New South Wales Teaching Standards Bill—“did not make sense” to them. In a spirit of compromise in negotiations with the state government over the New South Wales Teaching Standards Bill, the Federation settled for the proposed Teaching Standards Board to have on it “a majority of teachers.” The Federation felt that while the principle that “directors” on the STRBs should be elected was fine, it would be extremely costly and difficult to implement. They felt provisions where interest groups would appoint their directors were acceptable. In the case of the Federation, the appointments would come from elections.
The Federation representative accepted that the interim conditions of the model which gave registration to those already teaching, irrespective of whether they had prescribed qualifications or not, were necessary, but he would have preferred that those teaching without the prescribed qualifications should be given some form of “provisional” registration for a maximum period during which they would be expected to gain acceptable qualifications. The employers and the registration authority should cooperate to help them gain qualifications, perhaps through accredited alternative pathways.

He would have preferred not to have a renewable Practising Certificate because of the possibility of a large number of teachers not renewing it each three years. He felt that there could be other ways for managing the situations of people whose teaching knowledge might be out of date. For example, those who had been away from teaching for three or more years might have a right to return, but only after retraining.

In concluding, the Teachers Federation representative was asked to give his views as to the likelihood that the New South Wales government would consider presenting its Teaching Standards Bill or some other form of legislation that would result in the registration of teachers in New South Wales. The representative expressed doubts that the government would risk the embarrassment of defeat on this issue. He doubted that, if reintroduced, the New South Wales Teaching Standards Bill would succeed, even in a new parliament. He felt that the Teachers’ Federation (and also the Independent Education Union) would not accept the Bill without major modifications that gave to
teachers the responsibility to regulate teachers. The Teaching Standards Bill was seen by Federation as a means for dealing with incompetence and professional misbehaviour by hiring and firing teachers. Furthermore, the Bill was seen by the Federation as giving too much emphasis to dealing with paedophilia. In his opinion, the Teaching Standards Bill was seen by many teachers as an attack on their jobs rather than a means of improving the professional status of teachers.

The New South Wales Independent Education Union (IEU)

The representative of the New South Wales Independent Education Union (IEU) strongly supported registration of teachers, and stated that he and his union had actively done so for more than ten years. The IEU believed that registration would enhance the professional status of teachers. With respect to the model, he felt that the greatest impediment to its implementation was its national structure. It was highly unlikely that the Australian parliament could institute such a structure unless the states surrendered some of their powers to the Commonwealth Government, and he felt that state ministers would not do this. It would be possible for the Commonwealth Government to bring about some national co-ordination of registration by making it a condition of some federal funding, but this was unlikely since the Commonwealth’s Minister for Education opposed registration. He agreed that it might be possible to bring about some agreement on national co-ordination through the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), but not the
formation of a body that had significant policy-making powers that extended across state boundaries.

He volunteered objections to the stance of the interest groups from independent schools, that is the Parents Council, the Association of Heads of Independent Schools of Australia and the Association of Independent Schools, which favoured the registration of schools over the registration of teachers. He felt that this approach still allowed unqualified people to teach. The stance of the IEU was that only qualified people should be eligible for registration and only registered people should be able to teach.

He supported the nexus between accreditation and registration in the model. He believed that teachers, as professionals, should be involved with the review of the content of teacher education courses. However, while he thought that, structurally, the inclusion of a system of advanced certification for teachers was a “good idea,” he did not believe that such a system was achievable.

When asked his opinion on the prospects for a system of registering teachers in New South Wales, he said that he was not at all confident that the government would be able to resolve the differences between those who want universal mandatory registration that has a strict qualifications basis for entry to the profession and those who want entry to teaching to be unregulated.
Asked to comment on whether or not the interim conditions of the model should be put in place if registration were to be implemented, the representative said that his union, the IEU, was fundamentally opposed to them. What the IEU would prefer was for (i) people already teaching who have teaching qualifications and a degree to be given full registration, (ii) people currently teaching without qualifications but with five or more years of experience to be given full registration, and (iii) those currently teaching without teacher education qualifications and who had not completed five years of teaching to be given “provisional” registration, that is, “provisional” upon their gaining acceptable qualifications within a reasonable time. However, the IEU accepted that unqualified people who have established themselves in teaching have done so under the laws that existed at the time of their employment, and so should not be retrospectively penalised by having their careers ended.

The Employers

The New South Wales Department of Education and Training (DET)

The two representatives from the New South Wales Department of Education and Training (DET) were senior officers at “Director” level. Both had been involved with the Ministerial Advisory Council on the Quality of Teaching (MACQT) during its deliberations on teacher registration and both have an on-going involvement with developing professional teaching standards through their work with the DET. While they had administrative permission to participate in the evaluation, they considered that their responses could not be taken to represent the “official” views of DET.
The respondents agreed that there was a need for a system of registration for teachers and that this should encompass the associated areas of accreditation and advanced certification. They considered that teacher registration would bring about improvement in the quality of teachers in school systems and result in improvements in the quality of teaching. As well, they felt that some means for having national consistency with respect to registration was necessary, but that state and territory ministers would not hand any aspect of school education over to the Commonwealth. This would effectively prevent national registration as proposed in the model from eventuating.

They supported the graded registration system of the model, but they did not see the registration of student teachers as necessary since the recent introduction of new legislation in New South Wales. These new laws, the Commission for Children and Young People Act 1998 and the Child Protection (Prohibited Employment) Act 1998, respectively require careful screening\(^1\) of those who work with young people for criminality and prohibit the employment of anyone with a record of serious offences against young people from working with young people. These laws effectively make it unnecessary to have some additional form of registration to check the criminality of student teachers when they commenced a course of preparation. As well, when they undertook their practicum sessions they would be working under the supervision of a

\(^1\) As at 15 June 1999, the Department of Education and Training in New South Wales was negotiating with universities on the provision of probity checks for student teachers undertaking their practicum in government schools. As an interim measure, until probity checks are in place, schools are expected to accept university students for their practicum sessions (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1999).
qualified teacher. They accepted that teacher educators who needed to supervise the practicum should be registered teachers, since (a) they should have teaching qualifications if they are to advise student teachers on practical pedagogy, and (b) the teacher educators should have undergone probity checks if they are to work in schools with children. They did, however, agree that there were some difficulties with requiring all university lecturers to be registered, since many were discipline specialists rather than teachers.

They proposed that if registration were to be introduced, decisions would need to be made in the future as to whether teachers should be registered generically as “teachers” or registered for specific areas of competency or training, for example, as competent to teach in subject specialisations or in “school stages.”

They disagreed with registration being “lifelong,” as in the model. They would prefer it to be renewable after prescribed periods, mainly to encourage teachers to maintain their personal teaching standards.

They supported the provisions for continuing professional development and advanced certification in the model. The linkage of continuing professional development (CPE) to continuing registration and the provision of advanced certification would encourage the development of what they called “aspirational standards.” Linking continuing registration to the completion of specified levels of CPE was necessary as the means to
“drive” or encourage teachers to undertake continuing professional development. They believed that the involvement of teachers in CPE was not adequate at present.

They were particularly attracted by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) scheme and the ways various states in America provided incentives and rewarded teachers who earned board certification. Having said this, they expressed the view that if teachers wanted to be truly professional then they should take much responsibility for their own professional development, that is, they should bear much of the cost of their own CPE.

They agreed with the view expressed in the model that the Register must be a public document. However, they felt that care must be taken with respect to how information about people whose registration has lapsed or been withdrawn should be disclosed in the Register.

**The Association of Independent Schools Limited (AIS)**

The representative of the AIS agreed that teaching needed to have its status as a profession improved. He would like to see teaching become a profession, but he did not believe that it deserved that status yet. His view was that teachers are seen as subservient to politicians and education bureaucrats, that is, the public has an image of teachers as good technicians who follow policies that are determined for them and do what others tell them to do, instead of making professional decisions.
The AIS representative was opposed to compulsory registration, as he did not consider that it would improve teachers' professionalism. He would support registration only if (a) it genuinely could raise the quality of the profession and result in higher levels of expertise, and (b) it was voluntary.

The AIS was opposed to any form of teacher registration that would result in schools having to limit whom they employed to those who had a particular set of approved qualifications. From the point of view of independent schools, registration as proposed in the model, and also in the New South Wales Teaching Standards Bill, would have meant that a school which employed someone who was not approved by the Teaching Standards Board or the NTRB—that is, an outside body—could face sanctions that could even lead to its closure. The AIS would demand that independent schools should be allowed a degree of flexibility in employment so that they can deliver their educational programs.

It was the view of the AIS that if Preston's predicted teacher shortages eventuate (cf. Preston, 1997, 1998), then compulsory teacher registration would make it difficult for independent schools to employ teachers who could deliver the required curriculum. Independent schools must have freedom to solve this problem in a variety of ways. For example, some schools might be more adventurous in how they might deliver quality education, for example, by using combinations of large groups of students taught by expert teachers and small groups tutored by less experienced paraprofessionals. Some schools might modify the breadth of their curricula, for
example, by trimming some of the extra courses that they offer. Some schools might even raise extra funds that they could use to attract the best teachers away from other places. He saw that the need to combat teacher shortages might bring about pressure for increases in teachers’ salaries, in turn attracting more people to enter universities to eventually become teachers.

The stance of the AIS was that since parents choose schools and not teachers, it was the schools that should be registered. Registration of schools should be enough to ensure the quality of education in schools and protect children. The schools have a high level of accountability to parents, and to fulfil this, the schools would ensure that their teachers are capable of delivering the level of education demanded.

With respect to teachers’ professional development, he believed that teaching standards should be dealt with through a system where teachers would be made accountable for their professional development. Professional development must be accredited and have “tiers.” Teachers should receive salary increments in recognition of higher levels of professional development. He saw unions as the main hindrance to such a system as this.

It was his opinion that the Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) scheme failed because employers did not achieve a position where “limited numbers could get it.” In independent schools it was never called Advanced Skills Teacher. Teachers, prompted by the unions, did not want to be distinguished as “above the rest,” so it became known
as Senior Teacher. Because there was no quota on the Senior Teacher award, almost all who applied were given it. Instead of being seen as a status to seek, it became a commonplace. His contention was that if a “tough quota” had been imposed and the evaluation procedures required had been much “tougher,” then teachers would have valued it.

A significant weakness that he saw in the model was that it registered everyone as a “teacher.” He firmly believed that if registration were introduced, then it should be specific to the teaching area (primary or secondary, for example) or subjects for which a person was qualified.

Parent Groups

Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations of New South Wales (the P&C)

The representative of the Federation of Parents and Citizens’ Associations of New South Wales maintained that the P&C Associations saw it as necessary for teachers to be registered. She disagreed with the stance of representatives of the non-government school sector who argued that school registration should be enough to ensure the quality of education in their schools.

She saw teacher registration as a positive, affirming step towards giving teachers professional status, and that “no amount of money can do that.” However, she wanted the registration board to be constituted in such a way that it included a wide cross-section of community interest groups. She believed that the P&C should be
represented since they looked after the interests of all parents and all children in all
government schools.

She did not believe that New South Wales Teaching Standards Bill would have
provided a suitable form of registration. She expressed a view that through history in
New South Wales teachers have been seen as subservient to politicians and bureaucrats
and that the New South Wales Teaching Standards Bill would have maintained that
position. It did not create a structure that allowed teachers to control their own
professional standards.

With respect to the jurisdiction of registration, she stated that this would be a decision
of whatever registration body might be established. She would prefer to see a
registration board put in place, and then the board should determine who should be
eligible for registration. Her opinion was that there was no need for student teachers to
be registered, since (a) they are not yet qualified professionals, (b) they would always
be working under the supervision of registered teachers, and (c) they should be aware
when they commence their teacher education programs that if they have committed
any serious offence then they will not be eligible for registration at the end of their
preparation. She felt that Technical and Further Education (TAFE) teachers and all
university lecturers should be registered because they are, in fact teaching. However,
their form of registration should be different from that for school teachers.
The respondent disagreed with the interim provisions of the model. She suggested that the P&C would prefer to see all teachers in government schools immediately given registration, since they must be qualified. All teachers in non-government schools who have teacher education qualifications that were appropriate at the time of their appointment should automatically be registered, but unqualified teachers in non-government schools should be given a form of provisional registration, with a time limit of, say five years, to either provide proof that they meet the board’s registration requirements or to obtain accredited teaching qualifications and satisfy performance assessments before they should be registered. All people becoming teachers in non-government schools after the introduction of registration must have the required academic qualifications for registration. The provision of a generous time during which teachers in non-government schools need to become qualified for registration would overcome the problem that some non-government schools might face closure by having unregistrable teachers on staff.

The respondent stated that the P&C would support accreditation as proposed in the model. The registration board must be involved in setting standards for teacher preparation through the accreditation of teacher education.

She agreed that the public should have access to the Register in order to ascertain whether or not their children’s teachers are registered. As well, she believed that the public should be able to find out which teachers have been “struck off” the Register.
She agreed with the graded system of the model, but not that student teachers should be registered. She accepted the need for teachers to undergo prescribed continuing professional development in order to maintain registration, and that there should be a system of advanced certification similar to that suggested in the model. She saw no need for an Instructor classification, since such people must work under direct supervision of a teacher in a government school.

The P&C respondent thought that when registration was introduced, the ideal would be to register people to teach only in the areas for which they are qualified. Thus, registration would indicate types of schools and teaching areas, for example "primary school" or "secondary mathematics (junior school)."

New South Wales Parents Council Incorporated (NSWPC)

On the day of the interview, the New South Wales Parents Council Incorporated (NSWPC) representative provided the following documents as supplementary material for the interview: their monthly newsletter, *Choice in Schools*, Volume 18, Number 7, of November 1998, and letters to members of the New South Wales Legislative Council dated 25 November 1998 and 1 December 1998. These documents are of relevance in that they demonstrate the opposition of the NSWPC to registration of teachers, and in particular to the proposed *Teaching Standards Bill 1998*. They also demonstrate the preference of the NSWPC for registration of non-government schools as required under the *Education Act*. 
The spokesperson for the NSWPC said that his organisation would accept voluntary registration of teachers, but that it was not at all supportive of compulsory registration for teachers. The Parents Council believed that compulsory registration of teachers would be "more intrusive" for non-government schools than for government schools. The government school system already has control over qualifications and selection criteria for teachers through its system of "certification," which in many ways mirrors registration [Refer to Chapter 3 for the distinction between the two.] Thus, government schools are already adjusted to this form of regulation, while non-government schools would need time to adjust their staffing patterns.

The Parents Council would not want the strong nexus between registration of teachers and registration of schools that is proposed in Section 6.4 of the model. The Parents Council's approach is that since non-government schools already must be registered it is unnecessary to impose the requirement that they employ only registered teachers. Through the process of registering a non-government school, the head of the school or its governing body is held responsible for such things as the good environment, good philosophy and good teaching in those schools. The view that he expressed was the same as that of AHISA and AIS, which represent the employers in the non-government sector, that is that parents choose the school, not the teachers. It was the ethos and philosophy of the school that the parents sought. To enact legislation that requires that schools can only employ teachers who are registered, and therefore who have graduated from particular programs or institutions that have been accredited by an
external organisation, is seen by the Parent Council to put the philosophical basis of an independent school at risk.

The spokesperson conceded that in the past the administration of school registration had been somewhat weak, but he was satisfied that after the review of the requirements in 1998 (Office of the Board of Studies, New South Wales, 1998) the process is now adequate. The Guidelines require that if unqualified people are teaching in a school, then they must be under supervision and must be undertaking approved professional development.

He saw that the classification of “Instructor” in the model was intended to satisfy the needs of some independent schools, but thought that the requirements for employing someone as an Instructor were quite onerous. He felt that all teacher educators, not just those who supervise the practicum, should be registered teachers, since they were “teaching people to teach.”

He felt that if teacher registration were to be introduced, the predicted teacher shortages could force it to be abandoned. Schools—both non-government and government—would be forced to accept people who have subject, or discipline, qualifications, but who might not have teacher education qualifications as teachers, in order to fulfil their obligation to deliver the curriculum, and this might be the only way they could do so if qualified teachers were not available.
School Principals
New South Wales Secondary Schools Principals Council

The New South Wales Secondary Schools Principals Council is representative of principals in New South Wales government secondary schools. The representative of this group agreed “absolutely” with the three basic principles of the model. She was adamant that registration should be mandatory for all teachers in all government and non-government schools: “No school system should be exempted from it!” She strongly supported the principle that the registration boards should have a majority of elected registered teachers upon them. She insisted that these should be elected, not appointed, and that they must be registered teachers. She also strongly agreed that the registration bodies should determine standards for accreditation of teacher education programs for purposes of registration and that they should administer a system of advanced certification.

She also felt that university lecturers in teacher education should be registered and particularly approved of the provision for “Approved Teacher Educator.” She felt that all teacher educators should return to classroom teaching periodically—perhaps for a period of two school terms—to renew their “Practising Certificates.” She thought that it was important for teacher educators needed to renew their experiences of what it is like to teach in a school. She saw the provision of separate registration and a renewable Practising Certificate as a practical way to manage this.
She was strongly of the belief that Technical and Further Education (TAFE) teachers and instructors should also be registered, since, after all, they were teachers. The Secondary Schools Principals Council had taken this matter of qualifications of TAFE teachers up some years earlier with TAFE authorities. They were told that “a very high proportion” of TAFE teachers had “some sort of teaching qualification.” However, she believed that such qualifications would, on the whole, have not been generally recognised professional teacher education qualifications.

She supported the classification of “Instructor,” and particularly liked the terminological distinction between “instructor” and “teacher.” She gave an example from her own experience as a principal, of employing a person as a literacy instructor under a disadvantaged schools program. That person had strong academic qualifications, and while not teacher qualified, was excellent in the role she took. She considered that there was a need for such people to be used in school settings, but their tenure should be limited unless they undertook to complete teacher education qualifications as promoted in the model. She thought the three year limit on this classification was “very suitable.” This provision would need to be policed very rigorously if introduced.

As the representative of the Secondary Principals Council, she strongly supported the involvement of the registration boards with accreditation of teacher education in the model. She saw the system of internal accreditation by the universities combined with external accreditation by the registration boards as a way for universities to retain their
academic autonomy while giving teachers, through the TRBs, the right to certify programs that lead to teaching qualifications as suitable for preparing graduates for practice. She felt that the Department of Education should have taken a stronger role with respect to certifying standards of teacher education programs “years ago.” This was based on her perceptions as a principal that people graduating from some currently accepted teacher education programs are not well prepared for the reality of work in schools.

She indicated that she had supported the now defunct Advanced Skills Teacher scheme. It provided people with acknowledgement that they might not otherwise have received. She regretted that it was no longer in the teaching Award, and would support the advanced certification system proposed in the model. She emphasised that the status (a) should be associated with some extra responsibilities in the school, and (b) should not be for life, but be renewable upon evidence of continuing effort and competence in the role.

She believed that the Principals Council was in total agreement with the registration body having control of matters of professional discipline. She accepted as sound the principle that industrial action between the employer and employee should be treated separately from matters of professional discipline and that the registration body should, in general, only become involved after the industrial process had been dealt with. She
particularly supported the concept of applying penalties to schools that employed unregistered people.

She felt that the Principals Council would accept that the public should have access to the Register, but believed that item 3.2.1(i) “sanctions and limitations” should not be made public knowledge. As well, the names of those disqualified from registration should only be available to schools and employing bodies, on a “need to know” basis. She felt that the degree to which information should be disclosed should be guided by how other professions deal with it.

She disagreed with some of the interim conditions of Section 8. She did not like the provision for a “blanket” registration of all people currently teaching, irrespective of whether or not they had teacher education qualifications. She felt that those with qualifications should be entitled to automatic registration, but unqualified people who were teaching [usually in non-government schools] should be expected to gain qualifications within some reasonable time, say five years, or leave the profession. The qualification should be an approved pedagogical one, but there could be room for universities to design alternative forms of qualifications.

Association of Heads of Independent Schools of Australia (AHISA, NSW Branch)
The representative from the Association of Heads of Independent Schools of Australia (AHISA) provided documentary background material for the interview through a letter, dated 3 November 1998, written by the chair of the NSW branch of AHISA to the premier of New South Wales. The letter expresses the views of AHISA with
respect to teacher registration, and has been used to clarify issues that arose during the interview.

The AHISA spokesperson commented that he considered that the model was very sound in addressing the issues of status and professionalism of teachers and probity. He was concerned, though, that it did not adequately address teacher effectiveness. He was of the opinion that compulsory registration that prescribed qualifications would not, of itself, increase the effectiveness of teachers.

He expressed his concern that, in the model, registration of teachers was dependent upon their having completed approved programs of pre-service preparation. In his view, and that of AHISA, the completion of such programs does not guarantee that graduates will “automatically be competent or should be permitted to teach.”

Secondly, he was concerned that such a model would exclude some people who are very effective teachers, simply because they did not possess professional qualifications.

Thirdly, he feared that such a model could prevent an independent school from employing people who offer specialist expertise of a high order in such areas as sport, music, outdoor education, or even in academic areas.

He considered that, while the basic principles of the model “encapsulated a reasonable way of regulating teachers,” teachers in his sector (independent schools) were already subject to a de facto form of regulation through the registration of schools. School registration, in his view, made the institution responsible for competent practice by its
teachers. He did, however, accept that the regulations dealing with school registration were not thorough and were not thoroughly policed.

He saw some areas of strength in the model. He considered that the way it allowed disputes about competent practice and criminal behaviour to be handled in the industrial arena by the employer, the employee and the industrial unions before a registration board might become involved to deal with professional questions was very acceptable. He also saw the nexus between registration, accreditation and advanced certification as giving the model "a lot of strength." Registration by itself will not guarantee quality of teachers, but if the registration body has authority over the accreditation of teacher education programs then this could greatly improve the quality of people who would be eligible for registration. He, personally, had some concern as to the quality of some teacher education programs and would see accreditation through a registration board as proposed in the model as a way of addressing this. He had "mixed feelings" with the proposition that teachers should hold a majority on each of the registration boards. He felt that there needed to be a significant opportunity for other stakeholders to have an input to decisions relating to teachers and teaching standards, and would prefer a wide range of stakeholders to have representation.

He agreed with the concept of advanced certification as presented in the model. He did not, however, accept that it should be a permanent status, but should be renewable after some years, say five. Teachers undergoing renewal of their advanced certification
should not need full inspection, but still would need some evaluation of their work while holding that status.

He disagreed that teachers in independent schools should be registered. However, if such a model were to be adopted, he would extend the jurisdiction of registration to include all university lecturers, since they too are teachers, albeit not in schools.

He saw that the integration of the three regulatory mechanisms, while sound in theory, would create a large bureaucracy that would be cumbersome and costly. The imposition of a bureaucracy would be a disincentive to any government to implement the model. However, he personally would accept it if he could believe that it would increase teacher effectiveness. The integrated model would bring consistency to school systems as far as teacher regulation was concerned. It would also largely solve the problem of interstate mobility of teachers.

Other Respondents

The Joint Council of Professional Teachers’ Associations (JCPTA)

The Joint Council provided two documents to supplement the interview. These are: the JCPTA’s *Teacher Registration-Statement of Principles* and a media release *Teacher Registration: Joint Council is Ahead of the Rest*, dated 8 August 1998.

The JCPTA was included amongst the evaluation participants because it represents the views of a very wide cross-section of teachers who are members of the 47 professional associations that the JCPTA represents. The two representatives of the JCPTA agreed
with the model as presented, including the approaches to accreditation and advanced certification. They presented a strong argument that their organisation, being representative of so many teachers through member associations, should have been included amongst the groups proposed in the model as constituting the STRB for New South Wales. While agreeing in principle with the model, the representatives of the JCPTA made the following comments.

Since the aim of the process is to develop a professional registration authority, the JCPTA felt that it was inappropriate to include teacher education students. They considered that students are not yet “qualified” professionals.

Registration should not qualify teachers to teach outside their areas of expertise. Teachers should be registered to teach in the subject areas and school levels for which they are qualified.

While agreeing with the concept of internship, they preferred a probationary period of 12 months (instead of 2 years), with another 12 months allowed for those who fail to satisfy requirements for progressing to full registration after their first year of teaching.

They preferred that registration should be renewed each five years, contingent upon “accredited and relevant” professional development being completed. Renewal of registration should also be contingent upon successful performance appraisal. A process should be established to allow those persons who are found “to be not suited to teaching” to exit the profession “with dignity.”
The view of the JCPTA was that compulsory registration for all teachers in all sectors would enhance the quality of the teaching profession. It would promote the professional standing of teachers in the community and in time lift standards of teaching. Employers should support compulsory registration in order to raise the status of teaching as a profession. Registration would improve the occupational mobility of teachers between systems.

The Tertiary Sector

The respondent for the tertiary sector was the head of a school of teacher education at a New South Wales university, and had been involved in the development of *Preparing a Profession*, the report by the Australian Council of Deans of Education (1998) on the [*National Standards and Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education* Project. She agreed that national registration, as proposed in the basic principles of the model, was the ideal form of regulation for the teaching profession in Australia. However, she saw that there would be political impediments to this, namely the reluctance of the state governments to give up any of their control over education in their states to the Commonwealth. She saw that the most likely scenario for the introduction of registration was for Tasmania and New South Wales to move to some form of registration and then for the states to come to agreement on common standards for regulating the profession. This might eventually result in the formation of a federated system under a single national registration body.
The jurisdiction for registration should not include student teachers, since they would always be under the supervision of a registered teacher during their practicum experiences. She reinforced this view by commenting that medical students did not need to be registered.

As well, she accepted that teacher education personnel who were lecturing in teaching methods and those who were to supervise students during their practicum experiences should be registered. It seemed reasonable to her that these lecturers should, themselves, have accredited teacher education qualifications if they were going to teach aspects of pedagogy. However, some lecturers did not have to be qualified teachers and therefore should not need to be registered. This latter group might, for example, include specialist lecturers in educational psychology. Several universities have in their employment agreements for lecturers a condition that they attend some parts of a program, such as a Certificate in Higher Education, that involves aspects of teacher education and gives lecturers a qualification in teaching adults. The respondent thought such conditions would become a more common practice.

She was disappointed that nothing had occurred as a result of recommendations of the Australian Council of Deans of Education (1998) for national accreditation of teacher education. She felt that their report was excellent and offered a way to improve the quality of teacher education in Australia. Her prognosis was that funding would not be made available and that the recommendations would not go ahead. Establishment of national accreditation for teacher education would, in her view, bring about
improvements in teacher standards. It was her view that it was possible to start with accreditation and that registration would follow. She conceded that this approach would not prevent private schools from employing people irrespective of qualifications.

The respondent argued that teacher education was necessary for teachers in all schools. Despite a teacher having a good degree in a subject area, she considered that there are enough issues such as child development, learning theory, teaching strategies, testing and assessment theory, to require that persons undergo teacher education before being eligible for registration.

She accepted that there were a few people, perhaps in non-government schools, who were capable teachers but who had no teacher education. A registration system should have some interim provision for them. It should be possible for a registration board to develop procedures for testing their proficiency to enable them to prove that they might be registrable.

**Senator R. Crowley, Chair of the Commonwealth’s Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee**

Senator Crowley was interviewed because of the significant role she took through the Senate Committee and the publication of its report *A Class Act*, in 1998. She is not a representative of an interest group that could have claims for representation on a registration board at state or national level.
Senator Crowley responded that she very much believed that teachers should be registered. It is through a registration board that teachers can set their profession’s standards. She thought that this should be not be done by governments, but by the profession itself. Senator Crowley considered registration to be necessary to combat attacks on the professionalism of teachers and to improve the status of teachers. Profession-controlled registration would give teachers control over standards, and that will be to the benefit of teachers and children. The claim to be a registered teacher should carry with it recognition that the claimant is qualified and competent.

To the question “Dr. Kemp favoured national accreditation but clearly dismissed the idea of registration for teachers. Can accreditation alone have a significant effect on the status of teachers?” Senator Crowley responded: “Of course, accreditation will help, but it will not be a substitute for registration.” To be a professional implies that a person has passed through an accredited course. The possession of a credential does not necessarily entitle a person to practise. The qualification must be one that is approved by the profession.

With respect to professional development, Senator Crowley believed that if continuing professional development (CPE) is linked to on-going registration in other professions it should be so for teaching. But CPE need not be university-based. Other providers might be appropriate. The inclusion of a requirement for certain levels of CPE to be
linked to on-going registration must be done in a way that is sensitive to industrial issues as well as to professional needs.

Senator Crowley defended the Committee’s recommendation that registration should have a wide jurisdiction—covering teachers and instructors in Technical and Further Education (TAFE) and university lecturers as well as teachers in schools and preschools—by saying that if people are going to teach at any level, then the public, and the students, should be assured that they are qualified to do so.

When asked about whether or not registration should be national or based around some system of state registration authorities, she reinforced the Committee’s belief that it was a matter of equity that parents in one state should expect that teachers of their children should be as qualified as teachers in another state. She saw a need for national co-ordination in registration, just as she saw a need for national standardisation of curriculum. She expected that if this were ever to occur it would be through each state authority determining standards and for them to agree on some commonality. She did not see that a lot would need to be done to ensure common minimum standards. Some states might need to start developing their standards, but other states already had well established standards, for example, South Australia through its Teachers Registration Board.

Senator Crowley expressed her concern that the incumbent Liberal Commonwealth Government would not enact the recommendations of A Class Act. She predicted that
under a Labor government initiatives such as national registration would be encouraged.

The Evaluation Outcomes

It was clear from the interviews that opinion among the participating stakeholders was polarised, in that they either strongly favoured registration or strongly opposed it. The respondents who were in favour of registration as a means for improving the professional status of teachers were the Teachers Federation, the Independent Teachers Union, the respondents from the Department of Education and Training, the Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations, the Secondary Schools Principals Council, the Joint Council of Professional Teachers’ Associations, the representative of the tertiary teacher education sector, and Senator Crowley. Only three of the respondents, those representing the Association of Independent Schools, the New South Wales Parents Council, and the Association of Heads of Independent Schools, opposed registration.

Those who opposed registration did so for a number of reasons. In common, they felt that there were already adequate mechanisms in place—in the requirements of school registration by the Minister and accreditation by the Board of Studies—to assure their clientele of the quality of education in their schools. However, they conceded that the requirements were not always adequately policed. They also perceived that legislating for teacher registration in addition to the present system of school registration would put them under a form of double jeopardy, whereby some of their schools could even
be forced to close if they failed to meet the Minister’s requirements for school registration or if they inadvertently employed unregistered teachers. The representative of AHISA made the point that the registration of teachers based on completion of teacher education programs would not guarantee that those eligible for employment as teachers would be effective teachers. He did concede, though, that in combination with accreditation of teacher education the overall quality of teacher education graduates was likely to improve.

The respondents, on the whole, were pessimistic as to the likelihood of teacher registration being introduced into New South Wales. They based this on their perceptions that the non-government schools had significant influence with some members of the New South Wales parliament and that this might be enough to defeat a registration bill if one were to be introduced into parliament. If registration were to be introduced, they felt that it would be unlikely that it would ever come under the auspices of a single national registration authority as proposed in the model, since the states would never relinquish enough of their powers over education to the Commonwealth to make this possible.

Overall, the respondents supported accreditation as a means for assuring the quality of teacher education programs in universities, and were very much in support of teachers having representation on any accreditation committees. Most supported the concept of
advanced certification, as presented in the model, but with a limited tenure for the status.

The evaluation interviews have made a valuable contribution to what Millikan (1987) refers to as the “process of aggregating and clarifying the values preferences of [the] decision-making group and its constituency” (p. 26). In view of the interview responses, a number of amendments to the model are proposed.

**Proposed Amendments to the Model Arising from the Evaluation**

Responses to the interviews with major stakeholders have given rise to a number of amendments for the model. The model was built from analysis of the literature and of documents that relate to registration, accreditation and advanced certification in Australia and a number of overseas countries. It is considered, however, that the amended model would still not be acceptable to all stakeholder groups. For example, it was clear from the interviews that the AIS, AHISA and the New South Wales Parents Council are adamant in their opposition to the introduction of any form of mandatory registration that would have jurisdiction over their schools. The only amendment that would persuade these groups to support registration would be to make it voluntary, at least for teachers in non-government schools. For all intents and purposes, this would destroy whatever effect teacher registration would have with respect to guarding standards for entry to the profession. It would mean that employers in non-government schools would have no limitations on whom they could employ. The prerogative for setting standards would remain in the hands of the employers of a
significant number of teachers. It would do nothing towards improving the status of teachers. More likely, it would reinforce the notion that teachers are skilled technicians, good at what they do, but hardly deserving of the status of professionals. For this reason, it is still argued that registration must be mandatory for all teachers in all education sectors in Australia.

The amendments are listed under the same section headings as used in the model.

1. Basic Principles.

This section is fundamental to the model, and should remain essentially intact. The majority of respondents agreed with the concept of registration and the structure that linked accreditation and advanced certification in the model. Representatives of stakeholder groups from the independent education sector, however, have expressed their opposition to mandatory registration. All stakeholders have expressed their doubts that, in the prevailing political climate, a national statutory registration structure could eventuate.

The only amendment that should be made—on the grounds that most respondents did not see a need to include it—is that the requirement for teacher education students to be registered should be deleted from the model. The reasons that respondents gave for opposing the registration of student teachers were that (a) student teachers are not qualified professionals and therefore should not be eligible for what was perceived as registration for professionals, and (b) whenever student teachers were with students in
schools they were under the direct supervision of qualified, experienced teachers. The point in the model of registering student teachers was to ensure that criminality and personal background checks would be conducted before the commencement of a teacher education program so that no persons with a criminal background, mental illness or personality defect that could render them dangerous to children should be accepted into teacher education programs. In New South Wales, the Commission for Children and Young People Act 1998, the Child Protection (Prohibited Employment) Act 1998 and the Ombudsman Amendment (Child Protection and Community Services) Act 1998, all of which became operational during 1999, have made it necessary for such probity checks to be conducted before a student teacher commences a practicum. Subsequent to the construction of the model, negotiations have been conducted between universities and the Department of Education and Training in New South Wales so that appropriate arrangements for criminal record checks on student teachers can be put into place (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1999), and it is reasonable to expect that independent schools will institute similar safeguards. It is also reasonable to expect that such measures will be introduced into all states and territories. This lessens the need for a form of registration of student teachers and this—not the objections of the respondents—is the reason for deleting the need for student teacher registration from the model. The accepted amendment therefore is to omit the clause “or undertake a teacher education practicum” from Subsection 1.3 of the model.
2. Regulatory authorities to be established.

There should be no change to this section. It should remain in the model as an ideal. Most of those who agreed that there should be teacher registration felt that this was the structure that they would prefer, but that it would not eventuate because of the reluctance of state governments to forego any of their control over education to a national statutory body.

3. Jurisdiction of the NTRB and the scope of its responsibilities.

Since Section 1, “Basic principles,” has been amended to remove the need for registration of student teachers, the following amendment needs to be made in Section 3, to remove reference to student teachers: Omit section 3.1.2(b).

There was general agreement that no great benefit would come from allowing the public to have free access to details of limitations that the registration board might apply to a teacher. Hence, it is in order to amend Section 3.2.2 by omitting the clause: “...and any limitations placed upon the employment of the person as a teacher by the STRBs (item 3.2.1[i] above).”
4. Registration of teachers and the right to practise.

One of the points that was consistently made was that successful applicants for registration should be registered according to their teaching specialities, for example, as “secondary mathematics” or as “upper primary” or “special education teacher.” There is much sense in this, and it may be the direction that teacher registration should take in the future. However, extrapolating from the histories of establishment of registration systems in the comparison groups, it would seem expedient in getting a system established to start with simple “generic” registration of applicants as “teachers.” An established registration authority might very well in the future determine to endorse each registered teacher’s certificate with a specialisation based upon the nature of the program of initial teacher education completed.

Consistent with the amendments made in Section 1 and Section 3 to eliminate the need for registration of student teachers, the following amendments need to be made to Section 4 of the model. The effect of these amendments is simply to remove all mention of student teachers from Section 4:

♦ Omit section 4.1.1.

♦ In Section 4.2.1, omit “Teacher Education Student.”

♦ Omit section 4.2.3.

♦ Amend section 4.3.1 to read “Teacher education students do not require a Practising Certificate.”
• In Section 4.6, omit the words “Registered Teacher Education Students.”

• Amend section 4.6.1 to read “A teacher education student may apply for registration as a Teaching Intern upon graduation.”

5. Advanced certification for teachers.

A general view of the respondents was that advanced certification should not be lifelong. There was a need to ensure, through periodic review, that the teacher who had advanced certification status was still involved effectively with the development of other staff and was still contributing to the school’s learning environment effectively. To effect the respondents’ recommendations, which effectively strengthen the model, there is a need to amend Section 5.1.3 by replacing the sentence “Advanced certification would be a permanent status, so long as the teacher’s registration is maintained and a Practising Certificate is kept current” with the sentence “Advanced certification must be renewed each five years, according to the requirements of the NTRB.”

6. Professional discipline.

The respondents were, generally, quite satisfied with this section, especially since it allowed them to deal with potential allegations of misconduct and incompetent performance at the employer-employee level before a registration authority would become involved. Hence, Section 6 should be left intact.
7. Accreditation of teacher education providers and programs.

In general, the respondents from both the government and non-government sectors were positive about accreditation of teacher education as proposed in the model. Some of the respondents, for example the representative from the New South Wales Secondary Principals’ Council, were critical of standards of initial teacher education graduates from some tertiary institutes. They saw accreditation as a means for improving standards for initial teacher education, especially if teachers were involved directly with accrediting teacher education.

8. Interim provisions.

Amendments to this section are adjustments made necessary as the result of omitting student teachers from eligibility for registration. Thus, in Section 8.4 the words “is enrolled as a student in an initial teacher education program at an Australian university or” should be removed, and in Section 8.4.1 the words “. . . , or as a Registered Teacher Education Student if still completing a teacher education program” should be deleted.

The major criticism of respondents was that the structure of the statutory authorities was such that a person might become a representative on several of the bodies and that this would be most onerous. This is a reasonable criticism. However, for the sake of the model, no change is made. It might be necessary for the NTRB and the STRBs to consider the practicality of this if they are eventually formed.

An addition should be made to the suggested composition of each of the STRBs. There should be one representative of the Joint Council of Professional Teaching Associations. The respondents from the Joint Council pointed out that the Council represents the professional interests of some 47 member associations from all sectors of school education. As well, they were to be represented on the New South Wales Teaching Standards Board, if it were to have been formed.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the evaluation interviews have been considered. As a result, several amendments to the model have been made. Despite the amendments, the basic principles of the model remain intact and it remains a model for regulating the profession through mandatory registration, the accreditation of teacher education, and the provision of advanced certification for teachers. The model promotes autonomy for the profession by giving teachers the balance of power on the major regulatory bodies.
In the next chapter, the prospects for the profession of teaching in the new millennium are discussed. Unless governments, policymakers, and practitioners themselves institute changes that will attract more capable young people to enrol in undergraduate and postgraduate teacher education programs and that will encourage experienced teachers to remain teaching, then the prospects for the profession are bleak. Alternatives are discussed, but the conclusion is that a system of regulation that integrates registration, accreditation and advanced certification and that gives power to members of the profession to set their standards for practice is the best way that teaching can be made an attractive career. The implementation of the model is presented as a significant method by which the status of teaching in Australia can be enhanced.
Chapter 9

PROSPECTS FOR THE PROFESSION OF TEACHING IN AUSTRALIA IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM

At the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, there was concern that few young people were attracted to teaching as a career (Abbott-Chapman et al., 1991; Meade, 1990; Porter, 1990; Speedy, 1989; Taylor, 1991). This concern continues as the 1990s reach their end (Eltis, 1997b; Meyenn, 1997; Walker, 1996). Not only are fewer capable school leavers attracted to undergraduate teacher education programs, but there is evidence that the proportion of people with high academic ability entering postgraduate teacher education programs is lower than in the past (Dinham, 1995b; Eltis, 1997a; Ingvarson, 1997; Meyenn, 1997; Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998). Teaching has become “the occupation of last choice among those seeking to enter the professions” (Hill, 1998, p. 9).

Furthermore, while young people appear reluctant to become teachers, experienced teachers are leaving the profession at an unprecedented rate, for example, through early retirements (Preston, 1997). Foremost amongst the reasons for experienced teachers leaving the profession early is that, collectively, their morale is low. The Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee (1998) found evidence that while teachers know that their work is important, they believe that the public does not attach great value to what they do. They see their status as low when compared to other professionals who are required to have similar
qualifications and preparation. Teachers’ perceptions that the public does not value their work and accords them low professional status have contributed to the decline in the morale of teachers (Dinham & Scott, 1998; Eltis, 1997a, 1997b; Ingvarson, 1997; Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee, 1998).

Consequently, Preston (1997, 1998) has predicted that disparities between the rate at which practising teachers are leaving the profession and the rate at which qualified teacher education graduates are entering the profession will contribute to serious shortages of teachers in the new millennium. It is probably too late to prevent the impending crisis in teacher supply that Preston (1997, 1998) has predicted for Australia. However, one way to prevent reoccurrences of such shortages in the future is to act now to improve the professional status of teachers.

**Affirming Teaching as a Profession of Worth**

The remedy that has been used by governments and other employers when teacher shortages have occurred in the past—training people for entry to the profession through short duration, emergency programs—should not be contemplated. Reducing entry standards in this way is a pragmatic approach that can only lead to serious long-term reductions in the quality of teachers and teaching in Australia’s schools. There is evidence from studies in the USA that people who enter teaching through some shortened alternative preparation programs and those who are admitted via emergency licensing schemes frequently have poor pedagogical
skills and professional knowledge (Darling-Hammond, 1992; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1998). Complementary research shows that people who have undertaken teacher education programs that include substantial academic and practical preparation are more effective teachers than those who have had little or no teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 1992, 1996; Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1997; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1998). The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) have both recommended that American teachers should have an initial degree and should complete a substantial accredited teacher education qualification, preferably at the level of a masters degree.

One option that Australian governments could consider for enhancing the status of teaching is to increase teachers’ remuneration and improve working conditions for teachers in schools (Deer, 1994; Eltis, 1997a, 1997b). This option has the potential to make teaching more attractive as a career for capable young people and academic high-achievers, and would reduce the number of experienced teachers who leave the profession prematurely. In England and Wales, the government is taking this approach and promising very high rates of pay to capable teachers through its proposed performance management plan (Department for Education and Employment, 1998b, 1999b).

Another approach—the one advocated in this thesis—is to improve the status of teachers by giving them control over professional standards through a system of self-regulation. Self-regulation, through which practitioners take responsibility for
determining standards for entry to their profession and standards of practice, is one of the criteria normally associated with a profession (Ashenden, 1989; Beare, 1992; Brennan, 1989; Buday & Kelly, 1996; Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Deer, 1994; Dunkin, 1995; Ingvarson, 1995; Jansen, 1997, 1998; Kelly, 1996; Lee, 1989, 1997b; Maling, 1995; Williams, 1994, 1995b; Wise, 1994, 1996; Wise & Leibbrand, 1996). All too often, teachers are seen as mere implementers of policies and curricula that have been developed by others (Buday & Kelly, 1996; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1998). It is the perception that teachers lack control over their profession and their work that limits the degree to which teachers are regarded as professionals (Abdul-Haqq, 1992; Beare, 1992).

A finding that emerged early in this study—in Stage A—is that in Australia many employers of teachers, government bureaucrats, and members of the public do not accord teachers full professional status on the grounds that teachers do not control the standards of practice of their occupation. Except in the two states where teachers must be registered, employers set standards for employment of teachers and standards for professional practice. In Australia, governments and other teacher employing authorities exercise the kind of influence over teaching and teachers that would not be tolerated in other professions.

The need to affirm teaching as a profession of worth—and thus combat the crisis in morale of teachers so that good teachers remain in the profession, and make teaching a career that attracts able young people—is a compelling reason for considering teacher registration. There are, however, other reasons for
governments to consider introducing teacher registration, including the issue of child protection. The Wood Royal Commission has brought some pressure on the states, particularly New South Wales, to look at registration of teachers as a means for protecting children from paedophiles. There is no doubt that teacher registration can contribute to reducing the opportunities for people who have serious criminal records, particularly for sexual offences that involve children, to become teachers. In New South Wales, recent legislation that deals with this issue—namely the *Commission for Children and Young People Act 1998*, the *Child Protection (Prohibited Employment) Act 1998* and the *Ombudsman Amendment (Child Protection and Community Services) Act 1998*—has removed any need for a teachers registration authority to investigate complaints against teachers related to the sexual abuse and exploitation of children. However, the legislation still leaves the way open for a registration authority to conduct pre-employment screening, including checking criminal records, of potential teachers and to conduct interstate and intersystem checks on backgrounds of teachers.

Teaching could usefully take notice of how other professions regulate themselves. Established professions such as medicine, psychology, engineering and architecture typically have professional boards through which members of the profession exercise control over standards through registration, accreditation and advanced certification. Thus, they exercise a high degree of self-regulation even if their registration boards are established as statutory bodies by legislation and are not completely elected by members. Among other things, each board is the
custodian on behalf of society of the knowledge-base for the profession, the
regulation of entry to the profession, the induction of new members, the
establishment and implementation of ethical standards, and questions of discipline
(Williams et al., 1997). The model presented in Chapter 7 is recommended as a
way for teaching to have the form of professional regulation that has been
successful in many other professions. The introduction of such a model, whereby
teachers have responsibility for registration, accreditation and advanced
certification, would be a major step, and a necessary step, if teaching were to be
affirmed as an autonomous profession.

Basic Principles for the Model for Regulating the Teaching Profession in Australia

Teachers in Australia are professionals. The Senate Employment, Education and
Training References Committee (1998) has acknowledged this unreservedly. It
has been shown in Chapter 3 that teaching in Australia has become a complex
profession that now normally requires four years of university-based academic and
professional education. To allow people with inferior levels of academic
qualifications and inadequate professional preparation to become teachers is to put
the education of children at risk. To do so ignores the fact that teachers need to
know their subjects and teaching areas and know how to teach children (Darling-
Hammond & Berry, 1998). A fundamental aim in developing the model for
regulating the profession of teaching in Australia was that it had to ensure that
teachers were recognised as professionals by preserving the levels of academic and professional education that they required to enter practice.

In Stage A of this study, it was found that some school systems in Australia are unregulated, in that anyone can be employed as a teacher, irrespective of whether or not they are qualified. It is common in the non-government sector, for example the independent schools in New South Wales, for heads of schools to employ people as teachers using criteria other than the possession of academic and professional teaching qualifications.

It was also found in Stage A that in some other systems, for example the government schools of New South Wales, standards of qualifications required of teachers are given some protection through certification. However, since certification is specific to a school system, it does not prevent employers in other systems from varying requirements for employing teachers in their schools. Nor does certification necessarily protect standards for entry to teaching in the system in which it applies, since the employer, who in the case of the government schools in Australian states is the senior public servant in charge of the state’s education bureaucracy, has power to determine, and to unilaterally modify, standards for entry to the profession. This anti-professional practice reinforces an image of teachers as “public servants” rather than as professionals.

On the other hand, where a statutory registration authority regulates teaching, the employer is bound by law to employ only teachers who meet qualifications
standards that are determined by the registration authority, which usually is remote from the employer. Sometimes registration is practitioner-controlled and applies to most, if not all, teachers in a state (as in Queensland and South Australia). However, there are variations on this. For example, in Victoria only teachers in non-government schools are required to be registered.

Crowley's Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee (1998) emphasised that "relevant professional standards are the province of the teaching profession itself, and should be established and upheld by the profession" (p. 15). Ingvarson (1995) felt that it was necessary to distinguish between the areas for which the profession should be responsible and those that should be the responsibility of the governments and other employers. Governments and other stakeholders have legitimate interests in the operation of the teaching profession, but it is preferable for them not to control the profession in a direct manner. Freedom to operate as a professional person should be based on a degree of constraint imposed by the profession itself (Williams et al., 1997). The model presented in Chapter 7, and amended in Chapter 8, was developed after review of methods for regulating the profession of teaching in Australia and in the education systems of the USA, Scotland, Canada, New Zealand, England and Wales. The model is offered as a way forward. It gives to members of the profession in Australia the responsibility for defining, developing and guarding their own profession, albeit with an appropriate degree of regulation, through their representative professional registration boards.
The main premise behind the development of the model is embodied in the first of the three basic principles of Section 1. That is, that teaching should be seen as a national profession, in which standards are guarded by a statutory regulatory body which should have responsibility for the three areas that are considered to constitute the professional regulatory mechanisms for teaching: registration, accreditation, and advanced certification.

The second basic principle of the model is that teachers should have a majority representation on the peak regulatory authority and its major subsidiaries, and thus have significant rights and responsibilities for establishing and maintaining standards for the profession. However, the model also acknowledges the legitimate interests in education that other stakeholders have by including them as members of the regulatory authorities.

The third basic principle of the model is that no unregistered person should be employed to teach in a school or pre-school or early childhood centre anywhere in Australia or to supervise any student teacher who is undertaking a teacher education practicum in any of those settings.

To be registered, teachers must have academic and professional qualifications that are accredited by their national registration authority as suitable for preparing them for professional practice. As well, aspiring teachers must be of good character, and the registration authority should be empowered to check the criminal records of people who apply for registration as teachers. The registration body should also
have powers to sanction those registered teachers who do not maintain
professional standards of behaviour or competence.

Prospects for the Introduction of Autonomous Professional
Regulation for Teachers

As the 1990s come to a close, the Commonwealth and state governments have
become aware that teaching standards in Australian schools are at risk. In 1998,
the Commonwealth Government held a senate inquiry into the low professional
status and poor morale of teachers (Senate Employment, Education and Training
References Committee, 1998). The inquiry concluded that the solution would
come from establishing a national registration authority that was largely
profession-controlled and that would oversee accreditation and advanced
certification. The Commonwealth also commissioned the Australian Council of
Deans of Education to consult widely to develop a set of guidelines and standards
The Commonwealth has not acted on recommendations from either of those
inquiries. In the states, Tasmania and New South Wales both introduced teacher
registration bills into their respective parliaments, only to see them lapse when
their parliaments rose for new elections. Neither state has reintroduced these bills
into their new parliaments, although throughout 1999 the newly inducted
Tasmanian Minister for Education has been publicly announcing her commitment
to a fresh attempt to have a teacher registration bill enacted. As well, the Western
Australian government has called for an inquiry into teacher registration, but, as yet, the outcomes have not been available.

The prospects of New South Wales and Tasmania introducing teacher registration are poor, at least in the short term, but if they were to succeed, then five of the six states and two mainland territories would have some form of teacher registration. However, each state and territory could have a different form of registration, with differently constituted registration bodies, each with differing degrees of authority. To take this path solves only some of the problems that currently exist for teaching in Australia because teaching is a partially regulated occupation.

Among the major problems that exist are the anomalies in standards for entry to the profession in different states and school systems. Unless all states and territories legislate for mandatory registration for all teachers and governments cooperate to seek uniformity in the forms of registration that could be introduced, the confusion that currently exists in standards for entry to the profession between states is likely to persist. Even with interstate agreements for mutual recognition of qualifications, there may be difficulties for teachers qualified for registration in one state to obtain employment as teachers in another state.

A major question that must be asked is: how could teaching become a national profession, with common standards across state and territory borders? Adoption of the model that has been presented in this thesis would be one way. The model promotes a federated system that depends on the creation of a national regulatory
body (the NTRB) that is supported by subsidiary registration bodies (the STRBs) in each state. The NTRB would be the peak policy-making body, while the STRBs would ensure that the policies are administered consistently in each state or territory in accordance with national policy.

A subsequent major question would be: how could the implementation of a federated system, such as that promoted by the model, be achieved? The reality is that political opposition will make it very difficult to introduce teacher registration at a national level. In Australia, school education and teaching are state responsibilities. While some states might show interest in teacher registration, most would be reluctant to support any form of national registration that required them to give up any part of their constitutional powers over education. As well, the present Liberal Commonwealth Government could be expected to vigorously oppose national registration. It could be speculated that the Commonwealth’s opposition to registration—as expressed by the Minister for Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Dr. Kemp—was one of the reasons for the Commonwealth Government’s failure to support the Australian Teaching Council (ATC) which was modelled on the General Teaching Council for Scotland and which may have evolved into a national regulatory authority for Australia’s teachers.

In a political climate where the states are more likely to accept the introduction of some form of registration for teachers than the Commonwealth, it may be that the best avenue for introducing national registration as promoted in the model would be to work firstly on a state-by-state basis to establish teacher registration boards,
and then for the states to agree on some form of federated structure to co-ordinate the policies and functions of the state boards. It has been suggested in Chapter 1 that the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) would be the appropriate forum for the states to come to agreement on this issue.

Another scenario for establishing high standards for academic and professional qualifications for the profession of teaching in Australia is to start not with registration but with national accreditation of teacher education programs. If accredited teacher education were to become the benchmark by which standards of teacher preparation could be judged, then market forces might result in school systems preferring to employ teachers who have graduated from accredited programs. The Commonwealth, through Dr. Kemp (Maslen, 1998), has expressed support for national accreditation of teacher education as proposed by the Australian Council of Deans of Education (Australian Council of Deans of Education, 1998). In view of the Commonwealth’s opposition to registration but support for accreditation, this might have more chance of succeeding. An accreditation agency, similar to the Australian Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (ACATE) that has been proposed in the model, could be established through the Australian Council of Deans of Education. All key stakeholders—teacher educators, teachers, employers, unions, professional associations, and parent bodies—would need to have representation on this agency. The accrediting agency would establish standards for initial teacher
education that could be used as the basis for accrediting faculties and programs. The existing mechanisms that universities use for internal accreditation of courses would need little modification, and thus involve little extra expense, in order to satisfy protocols for external accreditation by the accrediting agency.

While there is relative uniformity in institutional structures in the higher education sector for the initial preparation of teachers, there is relative diversity in the school education sector, with the employers of teachers being the various state and territory departments of school education, the large systemic Catholic education systems, other smaller systems, and independent schools or agencies. Given this contrast, and in view of the non-government school sector’s opposition to registration, it should be easier to introduce a system of national accreditation of teacher education in the relatively unified higher education sector than it would be to achieve a national system of teacher registration in the diversified school sector (Williams et al., 1997).

Another way that teaching standards in school systems can be improved is to encourage experienced teachers to gain recognition on a national basis through advanced certification and to use their advanced skills for the educational benefit of their schools. The attempt to introduce an Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) classification into Australian schools through industrial award agreements in the 1990s failed, but at least it showed that employers, the governments and the unions
were interested in the concept and were prepared to recognise and reward skilled teachers who stayed in classrooms through a form of advanced certification.

The AST classification failed for many reasons, but perhaps the most significant for this thesis are that the modes of assessment were not well thought out or consistently administered and the rewards attached were insignificant. The classification ultimately held no status among teachers themselves. What is needed is an advanced certification award that is well regarded by teachers and the public and which carries with it worthwhile rewards. In the United States, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has spent many years, and millions of dollars, developing protocols by which experienced, talented teachers might be assessed and acknowledged for what they know about teaching and what they can do in classrooms. Board certified teachers are expected to be involved in the professional development of other teaching staff. School systems in the USA are rewarding board certified teachers with significant increases in pay, but expecting them to use their advanced skills to the benefit of their schools. In England and Wales, too, teachers who achieve the Advanced Skills Teacher classification will be rewarded with large increases in salaries, but will be expected to be involved with developing the teaching skills of other staff.

If the concept of advanced certification for teachers is to be revived in Australia, great thought must be given to how it is to be assessed and who should make the assessments. In this thesis, it is argued that the teaching profession itself should administer and oversee advanced certification. That could be done by having a
professional body that is wholly devoted to advanced certification or by having advanced certification organised through a body that is subsidiary to a professional standards or registration body, as promoted in the model of Chapter 7.

However, registration or accreditation or advanced certification, separately, will not ensure that only suitably qualified people become teachers. There should be some clear connection between accredited teacher education programs and entry to the profession if accreditation is to be effective. As well, advanced certification should be clearly seen as an extension of standards that would be expected of competent registered teachers. The only way to ensure that articulation between registration, accreditation and advanced certification occurs is to have a system of practitioner-based, professional self-regulation for teaching that encompasses these three professional regulatory mechanisms, as in the model.

The alternative to allowing the profession to regulate itself through registration, accreditation and advanced certification is to maintain the status quo. The status quo, however, is not good. The profession of teaching is not well regarded as a career by young people. Those presently teaching are suffering from poor morale. The difficulties of retaining experienced teachers and attracting capable neophytes appear to be leading to serious teacher shortages. As a result, there is a possibility that some employers in some systems will be tempted to reduce the professional qualifications that they require for people to be employed as teachers in their schools. The end result if this eventuates must be a reduction in the academic quality of teachers and a resultant reduction in the quality of education that schools
can provide. Unless the cycle is broken, there will be a continuation in the decline of public esteem for teachers.

What is required in Australia is a way to improve the status of teachers and to make teaching a career that will enjoy as high a public esteem as possible. The realisation of this vision can only come about if the stakeholders can come to a consensus on an appropriate model for regulation of the profession by the profession, and if governments and other employers of teachers can overcome the entrenched distrusts that seem to underlie their reluctance to give professional control and responsibility to teachers. The model developed in this thesis is offered as a way forward in the quest to give teaching in Australia the professional status that it should have.

Significance of the Study

This study has been concerned with significant policy issues that are central to teacher quality in Australia, now and in the future. It points to a way by which members of the Australian public can be assured that, no matter in which state they reside and no matter to which school system they elect to send their children, the quality of education that their children will receive will be of a very high standard. If the recommendations embodied in the model for regulating teaching were to be adopted, then Australia could have a teaching service comprised of competent, knowledgeable teachers who know their teaching areas and know how to teach children.
The structures in the model are meant to reinforce the fact that teachers are, indeed, professionals. As professionals, teachers should be responsible for their standards of practice. No longer should they be seen as technicians who are good at carrying out the wishes of others, but through the registration system of the model, teachers would have a very significant voice in most areas of school education.

Self-regulation, as promoted in the model, would enhance the profession of teaching by:

- serving a “gate keeping” function, to ensure that only people who have successfully completed accredited professional education and who are of demonstrably sound character enter the profession of teaching and stay in the profession;

- establishing and maintaining standards for accrediting teacher education programs as suitable for preparing graduates who are fit for professional practice; and,

- encouraging teachers to undertake career-long continuing professional development and encouraging skilled and knowledgeable practitioners to seek classification as advanced certified teachers.

The scope of this study has been limited to the development of the unified model for regulating the profession of teaching in Australia. The introduction of professional regulation for teachers will not be a simple task. It will entail a
considerable amount of development work and research. Some further lines of research are now suggested.

Recommendations for Further Research

There is great need for researchers to investigate means for assessing teaching standards, both for initial registration of teachers and for advanced certification. Brock and Mowbray have conducted a qualitative project for identifying professional teaching standards for New South Wales schools (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 1998). The report on their work has been timely. However, much more detailed work needs to be done. This could involve either more qualitative research or quantitative studies, for example, of the competence levels required for teachers to be effective in classrooms, and the effectiveness of teaching methodologies.

Studies into modes for delivery of continuing professional education (CPE) should be undertaken. CPE is fundamental to the success of the model. There should be an expansion of the range of modes by which practising teachers, who sometimes are located hundreds of kilometres from universities or cities, can receive useful in-service help. If the model is implemented, there will be an enormous need to provide CPE for all teachers, since this will be a condition for renewal of their Practising Certificates, and for those who wish to be assessed for advanced certification. Studies into effective induction would also be required, including
studies on forms of CPE for interns and of the effectiveness of various forms of supervision of new teachers during their induction phases.

Longitudinal studies of changes in the morale of teachers, their professional status, and their effectiveness in the classroom should be conducted, perhaps as means for evaluating the introduction of a professional regulatory system, especially if causal links between these variables could be established. The report by the Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee (1998), *A Class Act: Inquiry into the Status of the Teaching Profession*, has already established a benchmark for this field of research.

A particular area that was of concern to the Senate Committee was the degree of "casualisation" of the teaching profession in Australia. This has also been of concern in Scotland, where newly qualified teachers quite often can only obtain discontinuous episodes of casual employment. Consequently, many of them find it quite difficult to complete their mandatory two year probation period. Research directed to this problem would be most valuable, since a perception of teaching as dependent on casual employees has the potential to influence the status of teaching as a profession and ultimately to affect the morale of teachers.

While the great majority of teachers in Australia have undertaken university-based teacher education, a significant number, especially in independent schools, could be expected to have commenced teaching with little or no teacher education. There would be value in investigating effective modes of alternative teacher
education for such teachers to earn professionally recognised qualifications. Alternative modes for entry to teaching should not be dismissed out of hand. For some people, such as those who might have extensive experience in industry, these programs, if they are research-based and well developed, could provide acceptable pathways into teaching.

However, there has been concern that policymakers ignore research findings, or misuse them (Marginson, 1993). Historically, policymakers have been reluctant to act upon advice from educational policy research. This has been documented by Hocking (1993), who commented that research may only influence policy marginally in “the complex of pre-existing policies which already encompass educational issues” (p. 66). Hocking asserts that policymakers in education need to maximise the opportunities and benefits of research, as well as to be conscious of the limitations of research. Systematic inquiry into the nature of the poor relationship between research and policy has been rare (Hocking, 1993). Consequently, there is a need for investigation into the politics of change and innovation through policy research and a need to develop approaches to linking research and policy.

What are shown above are only a few of the areas associated with the crucial question of professional regulation for teachers that would require further research. Research into these areas would contribute to the knowledge-base for education and teaching in Australia. In addition, a national registration authority of the sort
promoted in the model would be a very effective body for disseminating research studies for practitioners.

In Conclusion

In concluding this study it must be said that, as the 1990s come to an end, there is ambiguity with respect to the occupational status of teaching in Australia. Is teaching a profession or not? The model developed in this thesis is based on the affirmative view that teaching is a profession and as such its practitioners should regulate their professional practice through registration, accreditation and advanced certification.

Teaching must be seen as a full profession if it is to be saved from becoming a second-rate occupation that will only attract second-rate practitioners. Regulation through the model would ensure that only people who are well prepared through substantial, accredited programs of academic and professional studies become teachers. As well, through the national system of advanced certification of the model, the most capable, experienced practitioners would be encouraged to stay in classrooms and be rewarded for contributing to the professional development of other teachers.

Most of the stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation supported the model, at least in principle. Notable among those who were opposed to autonomous professional regulation for teachers, though, were the employers in non-government schools, who seemed to fear that their rights as employers would be
affected by such a system. These employers must be convinced that it is in their interests and the interests of their schools' students for the status of teachers to be enhanced through the introduction of such professional regulation. It will be possible to introduce registration for all teachers in all school sectors only if the employers in those sectors are convinced that registration, accreditation and advanced certification will improve teaching standards and hence the quality of education for their students.
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APPENDIX A

SAMPLES OF DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS THAT RELATE TO
REGISTRATION, ACCREDITATION AND ADVANCED CERTIFICATION
IN THE COMPARISON GROUPS EXAMINED IN THE THESIS

Following is a list of documents relating to the regulation of teachers that were
perused for this thesis. The list is provided to give some idea of the range of
documentary material that was considered during the progress of this work. The
list is not exhaustive. Many documents were read only for the purpose of gaining
background information or for orienting the direction of certain aspects of the
study. Other documents have been used to provide specific data that has been
integrated into the text of the thesis. Where documents have been used for the
latter purpose, they and their authors have been appropriately cited in the body of
the thesis and listed in the References section.

SCOTLAND

GENERAL TEACHING COUNCIL FOR SCOTLAND (GTC)

Booklet
Booklet
Booklet
Booklet
Folder
Folder
Folder

Primary Post-Graduate Review
Primary Post-Graduate Review Final Report
Teaching Council for Scotland 1992/93
The Management of Probation
The Assessment of Probationer Teachers
Training Units for First Year Probationer Teachers: Primary,
Nursery
Welcome to Teaching for First Year Probationer Teachers:
Secondary
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Leaflet  Applications for Exceptional Admission to the Register from Teachers Trained in England, Wales and Northern Ireland
Leaflet  Applications for Exceptional Admission to the Register from Teachers Trained in European Community Countries and Overseas
Leaflet  Gender in Education
Leaflet  Multi-Cultural/Anti-Racist Education Handbook
Leaflet  Policy on Parent Help in Schools
Leaflet  Applications for Exceptional Admission to the Register from Teachers Trained in England,
Leaflet  Medical Standards
Leaflet  Probationer Teachers: What about Probation?
Leaflet  Probationer Teachers: What about registration?
Leaflet  What is the General Teaching Council for Scotland?
Newsletters  Several editions of Link
Pages  Guidelines for Teacher Training Courses
Pages  Historical Background
Pages  Policy Statement: Accreditation and Review of Courses of initial Teacher Education Accreditation and Teacher Education in Scotland
Pages  Secretary of State Guidelines for Initial Teacher Guidelines for Teacher Training Courses Training Courses
Video  Enhancing the Standards

ENGLAND AND WALES

GENERAL TEACHING COUNCIL: ENGLAND AND WALES

Booklet  Proposals for a Statutory General Teaching Council for England and Wales
Booklet  The Continuing Professional Development of Teachers
Leaflet  The Continuing Professional Development of Teachers
Leaflet  The Induction of Newly Appointed Teachers

THE TEACHER TRAINING AGENCY (TTA)

Circular  Standards for the award of Qualified Teacher Status. London: TTA.
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THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS (NBPTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booklet</th>
<th>Adolescence and Young Adulthood/English Language Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Adolescence and Young Adulthood/Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Adolescence and Young Adulthood/Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Early Adolescence/Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Early Childhood/Generalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Preparing Teachers for the Demands of the 21st Century: Professional Development and the NBPTS Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Social Studies-History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>The School As A Workplace for Teaching and Learning - Position Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Early Adolescence Through Young Adulthood/Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Early Adolescence/English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>How We Plan to Achieve Our Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Why America Needs the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>An Invitation to Apply for National Board Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>Incentives, Supports and Professional Acknowledgments for National Board Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>National Board Certification: 5 Principles of Successful Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION (NCATE)

Booklet A Vision of the Future
Booklet Accreditation,...Quality,...Professionalism,...Performance
Booklet An Introduction to The New Professional Teacher Project
Booklet NCATE Standards—19 May, 1994
Booklet Quality Teaching—Winter 1995
Booklet Teacher Preparation: A Continuum
Papers The Coming Revolution in Teacher Licensure: Redefining Teacher Preparation

CANADA

Booklet 1998 Registration Guide for Teacher Trained Outside the Province of Ontario and Outside Canada. The Ontario College of Teachers
Booklet Report to the College of Teachers on Teacher Education in British Columbia, July 1991
Internet Article Presentation by the Executive of the Ontario College of Teachers to the Standing Committee on the Administration of Justice on Bill 160: Education Improvement Act, by Donna Marie Kennedy (Chair), John Cruickshank (Vice-chair), Margaret Wilson (Registrar). October 1997. http://www.oct.on.ca/english/brief.htm.
Magazine Professionally Speaking, May 1997 and September 1997. The magazine of the Ontario College of Teachers

NEW ZEALAND

Booklet A New Zealand Teaching Council? A National Forum.
Booklet Annual report and Financial Statement of the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board, for year ended 30th June 1996
Booklet College of Education Accreditation Committee Statement of Philosophy and Quality Assurance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>College of Education Accreditation Committee Systems Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>College of Education Accreditation Committee Terms of Establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>The Teaching Council Aotearoa: Advocating for the Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion paper</td>
<td>A New Zealand Teaching Council: Meeting the needs of teachers and improving the quality of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>New Zealand Teacher Registration Board. (1996b). Broad Guidelines for the Approval of Teacher Education Programs. An information bulletin prepared by the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board, 30 August 1996.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflet</td>
<td>The Teaching Council of Aotearoa: A Fresh Voice for Teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Teacher Licensing: Compulsory or Voluntary (MR. P. Barlow, Director of the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board), 6th May 1996.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Teachers, and Teacher Education and Development. Paper prepared by Rae Julian and Anne Mead and presented at the APEID regional meeting of Directors of educational research and development institutes, Tokyo, 7-15 July 1997.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUSTRALIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Booklet

Booklet

Booklet

Booklet

Booklet

Brochure

Bulletin

Discussion paper

Discussion paper

Discussion paper

Discussion paper

Discussion paper

Draft policy

Guidelines

Handbook


Leaflet Board of Teacher Registration (Queensland). (1996). Becoming a registered teacher. Leaflet issued by the Board of Teacher Registration, Queensland.


Newsletter  Teacher census ensures that all are registered.  (1991, February). *The Registered Teacher*, p. 3.


Official circular  New South Wales Department of School Education.  (1997). *Qualifications requirements for classification as a primary teacher in the New South Wales Department of School Education*.


Policy

Position paper
Australian Teaching Council. (1996b). Position paper from the Australian Teaching Council on nationally consistent practices to protect school students from those unfit to teach. Sydney: ATC.

Report

Report

Report

Report

Report

Report

Response

Senate report

Submission

Submission

Submission

White paper
APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF INVITATION FOR POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE EVALUATION INTERVIEWS

Letter 1a. Original invitation, to a focus group interview.

Letter 1b. Return slip sent with invitation (Letter 1) that gives invitees the option to accept or reject participation in the focus group or to opt for an individual interview. Most opted for the individual interview, because of time constraints.
Dear [name of invited participant],

For my thesis for a Doctor of Philosophy degree through the Faculty of Education, University of Western Sydney (Macarthur), I am investigating teacher registration, accreditation of teacher education and the provision of advanced certification for Australian teachers. Through inductive procedures, I have developed a model for integrating these mechanisms for professional regulation nationally.

I wish to invite you as senior representative of the NSW [name of participant's organisation] to participate in a focus group discussion to evaluate the model. If you cannot be involved, could you suggest another senior officer of the [********] who has knowledge of the area and who could be involved?

Your participation would be entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. It is hoped that the data collected will contribute meaningfully to the current debate in Australia about the status of teachers and the quality of education. The evaluation will be held at the Bankstown campus of the University of Western Sydney (Macarthur).

If you agree to participate, the procedure for the evaluation is as follows.

1. As soon as I receive your note of acceptance, I will send to you a copy of the model. This is for your information, in preparation for the evaluation. You may keep this copy for your own use.

2. The focus group discussion will take between 90 minutes and two hours. There will be a short orientation, followed by a guided discussion amongst the participants, who will represent major stakeholders. Stimulus questions will be used to orientate the discussion. You will be provided with the stimulus questions in advance of the focus group meeting.

In order to facilitate analysis, the discussion will be audiotaped. No copies of the tape will be made. I offer my assurance that the only people to listen to the tape at any time will be myself and my research supervisors, Professor Don Williams and Dr. Catherine Sinclair. Under guidelines for research practice, I will need to retain the tape for five years following submission of my thesis for marking. The tape will then be destroyed.

Comments made during the evaluation will not be attributed directly to you in the analysis, but a pseudonym may be used to facilitate tracking of arguments as they are presented during the evaluation.

Please give this request your most careful consideration. Please return the acknowledgement form on the following page to me in the post-paid envelope by Tuesday 1 December. Feel free to contact me by telephone if you wish to clarify any aspect of this request.

Yours faithfully,

BRIAN O’DONNELL.

NB. 1. This research project has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Macarthur Ethics Review Committee (Human Subjects). Any complaints or reservations about this research may be directed to the Ethics Committee through the Executive Officer, Kokaia De Silva, phone 02 46 203 641. Any complaint that you make will be treated in confidence and investigated fully and you will be informed of the outcome.

NB. 2. For further information, I can be contacted as follows:

Brian O’Donnell
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APPENDIX C

EVALUATION INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The order of the questions asked during the interviews varied according to the organisation that each participant represented. The following is intended to give a general idea of the order of each interview.

Commencement: The respondent was given a choice of an order for the interview. Either, the respondent could commence by outlining his or her views with respect to the model, or could immediately respond to direct questions.

Stage 2: Directed questions. After the respondent had given his or her views, or if the respondent had opted to answer direct questions immediately, then the following questions were used. The order was varied according to the direction that the conversation was taking.

1. Basic Principles.

(a) Do you agree with the three basic principles outlined in Section 1 of the model?
(b) Could you give your views with respect to the need for a system of regulating the teaching profession through registration, accreditation and advanced certification?
(c) Do you agree or disagree with the three basic principles outlined in Section 1 of the model?
(d) Do you think that the nexus implied between registration, accreditation and advanced certification in Section 2 of the model is appropriate?

2. Jurisdiction of the Regulatory System.

(a) Do you feel that the people specified in Section 3 of the model are the appropriate people to be covered by the requirements of registration?

(b) Do you think any other group should be subject to mandatory registration, or that any of those groups shown in Section 3 should not need to be registered?

(c) When someone is registered, should they be registered generically as “teachers” or should they be registered under specialisations, according to their teacher education?

4. Registration and the Right to Practise.

(a) Would you comment on the appropriateness of the graded system of registration shown in Section 4 of the model?

(b) Do you accept the principle of registering someone as an intern for two years before they qualify for full professional registration?

(c) Do you accept the general principles for progression from intern to registered teacher to advanced certified teacher?

(d) Should there be a pre-professional level of registration for student teachers, as proposed in the model?

(e) Should there be an allowance for specialists who have no teacher education to teach as instructors for limited periods, as in the model?

(f) Do you feel that we should have a renewable registration or do you accept the concept of once-only registration together with a renewable Practising Certificate?
(g) How public a document should the Register be, and what information should be in the Register? What information should be available to the public?

5. Advanced Certification.

(a) Do you think the institution of advanced certification might contribute to an improvement in the professional status of teachers or to improvements in professional practice?

(b) Should advanced certification be a permanent status or should it be renewable periodically?

(c) Should advanced certification be conditional upon the holder contributing to the professional development of other teachers?

(d) Should particular promotions positions be held in reserve for teachers classified with advanced certification?

6. Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Would you comment on the appropriateness of the role of teachers in accrediting teacher education, as implied in the model?

7. Professional Discipline.

The role of the registration authorities in the model are subsidiary to the industrial relations between the employer and the employee, as well as to statutory authorities that, under law must be given precedence when certain matters of professional misbehaviour are being dealt with. Do you feel that the role of the registration bodies with respect to professional discipline, as outlined in the model, is appropriate?

During the transitional stage, there will be a need for some form of interim provisions to deal with registration of people who are already teaching, whether their qualifications meet those specified by the boards or not. Do you agree with the interim provisions as outlined in the model, in Section 8?

9. Could you comment on the proposed compositions of the regulatory boards?

Closure: Do you have any other comments to add to what you’ve already said?
APPENDIX D

VERBATIM INTERVIEW PRESENTED AS AN EXAMPLE

The following interview with the representative of AHISA is presented verbatim. Editing has been limited to punctuation, spelling and formatting of the document. This was felt necessary for the sake of readability.

Interviewer: [Brief introduction to the purpose of the interviews and the development of the model.] The paper basically is a model that comes out of that. It's basically a discussion paper. What I am trying to do in the interviews is get the views of the key stakeholder groups.

I'm particularly after contrasts between, say, in your case, representing the heads of independent schools, a contrast with the NSW Secondary Principals Council. That would be one aspect. The groups really are quite polarised [in their views]. That's really clear.

AHISA: Yes, sure. Strange, I think. They are polarised in their thinking, but certainly not in regards to the legislation [referring to the recent legislation in NSW for the
Teaching Standards Bill. They are in a very united position [regarding the legislation], but for very different reasons.

Interviewer: Let’s face it, the legislation was really quite dreadful. [At this point the order of proceedings was discussed and agreed to.]

Do you have any general comments [about the model]?

AHISA: I have some responses. There are two issues here. One is the nature and quality of the model itself—and my reaction is that it is a very sound and solid model. I have a problem evaluating the model without knowing the background rationale of the model, and that’s obviously discussed in the previous chapters.

Interviewer: Right! I’m discussing it from the point of view of teacher professionalism. The professional standing of teachers. I’ve argued that over the last ten or twenty years the status of teachers has diminished. I feel that the public do appreciate what teachers do, but as a profession it is not well regarded. It is not particularly well paid, and that’s one aspect, and I don’t see that there’s going to be any significant increase in pay. It’s a “mass profession”—200,000 teachers in Australia. Governments and other employers can’t afford pay increases of the order of those in Canada. The other way of addressing the problem of the decrease in status and morale of teachers is to try to increase its recognition as a profession, and teacher registration is one way that is proposed to improve the professional image of teaching.
AHISA: Sure. I can understand that "small t" thesis. I think the Association [that is AHISA]—and I’m trying to separate my own views, but they are very, very parallel. There are several issues, which it is easy to confuse. One is the status and professionalism, the second is the issue of effectiveness. And they are not exactly congruent. The third one is the matter of probity that you raise.

I’m not of the view that registration will, of itself, increase effectiveness. One of the concerns that we [AHISA] have is that the kind of model that you propose may preclude some people who are very effective teachers because they don’t hold professional qualifications—what I call the Sydney Grammar argument.

We could go through the individual sections [referring to the graded system of registration of the model], but also those people who might fall under your category of Instructor, and I’m talking about the musicians, the outdoor educators, chaplains. I was saying at the weekend, when I was reading this, that someone I know who is a careers counsellor, who does work and she does Myers-Brigg training as a psychologist, would be a good person, a resource, to have. She has a bundle of postgraduate qualifications in psychology and so on. In terms of this [the model], she would not qualify to be a registered teacher. And I can see that in that case she would be a loss if I could not employ her.

Interviewer: But would you employ her as a teacher [or perhaps as a professional counsellor]?
AHISA: Well, it depends on how you define a teacher. I mean, if she's going to teach people how to ready themselves for the outside world . . . .

Interviewer: But in terms of a teacher being defined as someone employed to deliver the curriculum . . . .

AHISA: Then probably not. I can see that. There is the danger that it becomes all-embracing. Anybody working in a school—and then we have first- and second-class citizens: those who are teachers, and, those who are dealing significantly with children who are not [teachers].

Interviewer: There will be, almost certainly, as a result of the Children’s Commission, a requirement that everyone employed in a school will be expected to undergo probity checks.

AHISA: I don't think any sane person will have a problem with that, and my view, and I think the view of the Association, is that this is something that needs separating from effectiveness. Now, I can understand that both of them bear on the central issue of standards. They each bear, but from a very distinct point of view, on the teaching profession.

My own preference is that we should have a separate register—as you propose—on matters of probity and police records, one that is separate from issues that address professional competence. If a teacher is deregistered for this reason, there could be some confusion for that reason.
These are some broad responses that occur at the beginning.

Interviewer: [In an aside, recommended that AHISA should become acquainted with the paper by B. Mowbray on teaching standards since this could point to the future approach by the Department of Education and Training to registration.]

[Interlude, while secretary brought coffee to table]

Interviewer: One thing that surprised me—and one of the [other] respondents pointed this out—is that on the face of it the model is very strongly directed to probity issues. It wasn’t deliberate. It was just that probity was a very difficult area to sort out, and I think it got an undue emphasis [in the model]. It is a necessary part of the whole argument, but I prefer to see the whole thing directed to the issue of teacher professionalism—not even teaching standards per se.

The argument I’m putting here is that it is the profession that should set standards for entry to the profession. In terms of standards, as I see, the standards for entry to the profession would be the completion of an accredited teacher education course and the quality of the standards of that course should be guided by the National Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education by Kym Adey’s reference committee, which are receiving a lot of interest. It [National Guidelines for Initial Teacher Education] is an outcomes-based model. At this stage, this is where I’d see the standards being initially determined.
AHISA: That's based on premise. And I agree that there are professional standards which, subject to argument, that can be a consensus view. But I still see some almost unbridgeable cleavage between the regulation—and that's your word, I've got the word regulating teachers there underlined—and I've got a question about the need to regulate teachers. I can point to teachers who are excellent in terms of training and their procedures, but they are lousy teachers because they have no interest. Now . . .

Interviewer: And again, this is a point that people from the Ministry [that is, Mowbray and Brock (NSW Department of Education and Training, 1998)] have pointed out.

AHISA: Yes. And I accept that.

What are the standards for empathy? What are the standards for relationship? I'll say it's about turning kids on . . . and that's an oversimplification, I know that. I know that sounds awful.

Interviewer: . . . and they're the same terms that Mowbray and Brock use. It's the dilemma that they have where they are trying to define teaching standards.

AHISA: Yes. Anyway, it's part of the fun. These are, essentially, performance standards as opposed to qualifications standards.

How do you measure it?

Interviewer: How do you measure it?
AHISA: Some of the questions, I've circled . . .

Interviewer: What if we go through it from those basic headings? I’ll just give a brief introduction, and you can give your comments.

AHISA: Yes, OK.

Interviewer: Basically, I’ve premised this on the idea that the status of teaching needs to be improved. Teaching should be regulated through registration. There are two ways—rather, several ways. It can be state or national. It can be voluntary or compulsory. I’m arguing that it should be mandatory for all teachers in all schools, government or non-government. I’m also arguing that it should be national. And I’m arguing that the majority of people on the [registration] authority should be not just eligible to be registered as teachers—as the Teaching Standards Bill would have it—but actually be registered practising teachers elected by members of the Register.

AHISA: I can see that that is a reasonable way of regulating teachers. It doesn’t answer the question of why it needs to be done. It doesn’t answer the question that we’ve raised about effectiveness. It does raise some concerns with me about the exclusion of some [academically qualified people who have no teacher education and therefore cannot be registered to teach]. If you remember [that this was raised in] the [Sydney Morning] Herald editorial “A license not to teach.” And some of those issues still remain.
I think one of the problems I have in New South Wales is that teachers are already registered in independent schools. All government schools have their own regulation—you can’t teach without formal qualifications. That’s fine. In independent schools, teachers are registered de facto through the registration of schools . . .

Interviewer: Well, that is an issue that I was going to come to in a few minutes.

AHISA: OK. So what you’re talking about is some national consistency across sectors. I can see the logic of that. We [AHISA] don’t necessarily agree with it, but we can see that the logic behind it is quite copious.

I think the problems of interstate mobility of teachers has been quite large, and I think this could resolve some of it. But beyond that I would like to separate probity and competency issues in global registration.

I have no problem at all with registration from the point of view of probity.

It does raise a second question, and that is about the quality of the [teacher education] course, which you raise quite thoroughly.

Interviewer: . . . and which even some of the [teacher educators] question.

AHISA: . . . and we need to make sure that these prerequisites—if that is what they are for registration—are worth having, and are going to make a professional that’s worthy of the name.
One of the differences in structure that I have is that teachers are not like some other professionals, in that they are not sole practitioners. If you’re an accountant, or a physiotherapist, and you hang up your shingle outside your rooms, and I go along to you to have my back rubbed or to have my tax done, I want to know that you are competent. Most teachers are, of course, employed in institutions like this [a school].

Interviewer: But then you have a significant number of psychologists, significant number of doctors, and of law practitioners, who are employed in private industry and who most often in those positions are required to be registered.

AHISA: I acknowledge that. But in those professions the different one is the nursing profession. The nursing profession is probably more parallel to ours, often in status, and in income too, but because you can’t go and operate on your own. Nurses don’t stick up their shingle. Teachers don’t stick up their shingle. Legal practitioners, whether employed by government or privately, doctors, likewise psychologists, they can. And there is that dual function of solo practitioner or the employee. That’s an area that I question—not the model, but the need for the model in what is a regulated industry.

Interviewer: But is it regulated? You’re saying that in independent schools it [the teaching profession] is regulated through the need for schools to be regulated. But are the requirements on school registration (a) rigid enough, and (b) policed enough. I hate using that word “policed.”
AHISA: I know that, and I would question whether “rigidity” is the issue. My question would be “are they flexible enough”? Is the regulation implied in this [the model] for it to be good practice and professional practice? Because there is a definition of “professions” and “what is a profession”? One of the definitions I use, and I can’t quote the source but I think it’s from an IARTA paper from around six or seven years ago—“Professionalism is something that serves the needs of the client.” I think the registration process [of schools], structurally is thorough, but I don’t think it is administered thoroughly. Because many of the same kind of criteria in the registration handbook are expressed implicitly. It talks about professional competence. I have to list at [school] registration—you’ve probably been involved in this in your work previously—the qualifications and the backgrounds of teachers. It’s something inspectors used to look at, probably more thoroughly than they do now.

Interviewer: Well, I think the times I’ve been involved with that [applying for a school to be registered or re-registered] it wasn’t looked at particularly thoroughly.

AHISA: No.

Interviewer: In those days the regulators were so limited that you could, without proving the qualifications of staff, nominate them.

AHISA: I remember one of the clauses—that people who don’t have formal qualifications need to be under proper professional supervision. I think that they [inspectors] are examining thoroughly—and that’s another thing—if they are
examining thoroughly the process of teaching, the progress, the registration of courses, there is a recognition that the people doing the work are doing it properly. So, it is a backdoor scrutiny. I agree with you that it’s not as rigid . . . it is probably not as heartily policed as it might be.

Interviewer: I think that in most independent schools it would be a very poor school that didn’t [abide by the regulations], but the fact is that there are schools that don’t!

AHISA: Of course.

Interviewer: This is why I think that registration of schools per se does not work. Especially in some of the small community schools, you can have significant numbers of untrained people who may be supervised by one [qualified] person.

AHISA: Sure! But I’ve seen schools full of trained people who are still woeful teachers.

The test of “educational probity” at times of school registration and inspection need to test process. Because, to me, there is no causal relationship between structural, instrumental requirement and effectiveness. And the corollary applies, too.

Interviewer: One of the difficulties of those woeful teachers in schools is that it is difficult to get rid of them. And I’m not advocating that this is the model that should be based around getting rid of woeful teachers. I’m arguing that that should be an act between the employee and the employer....
AHISA: Absolutely.

Interviewer: ...and the unions. Registration comes in later. Section 6 deals with that.

AHISA: You do make that distinction quite clearly, and that’s a point that I make in my letter to the Minister and the Premier [referring to the letter that AHISA had provided as a supplement to this interview], that—and I think the Minister sees this perhaps as some sort of panacea [to the problem of incompetent teachers]. I think I’ve sacked more people in my 14 years as Head than the DSE [Department of School Education] has. But for reasons of competence. And I think he sees this as perhaps a chance to have a “cat’s paw” to do the work that the employer needs to have the guts to do.

Interviewer: And, I think unfortunately, at the MACQT conference when he announced the Teaching Standards Bill, there was general applause at the announcement. But the announcement was heavily biased towards [registration] being a way of getting rid of incompetent teachers.

AHISA: Yes. That’s right.

Interviewer: Even the Teaching Standards Bill didn’t have that intent.

AHISA: No.

Interviewer: Ultimately, if someone were shown to be incompetent, they could be barred from teaching, but it wasn’t the way to get rid of incompetents.
The model proposes a gatekeeping function, in the hope that you won’t get incompetents into the system . . . you’ll never have a foolproof way of doing that.

AHISA: *I can understand when you say that’s not the way it has been seen. But, like you, I think the responsibility resides with the employer to make sure that people are performing competently, and to give them help if they are not, and ultimately responsibility to the needs of the kids if there is no improvement.*

Interviewer: And also, to counsel those people in the gentlest possible way to leave teaching.

AHISA: *And, sometimes in the harshest possible way.*

Interviewer: Let’s move along. In Section 2, I talk about the nexus between registration, accreditation and advanced certification. Now, I don’t think that registration by itself is all that helpful.

AHISA: *No.*

Interviewer: But I think those three things must be combined. That is part of the argument.

AHISA: *Yes. And I think that is what gives a lot of strength to your model. My only question is that it creates four bureaucracies, and who’s going to be on it?*
Interviewer: And this is something that came out in one of the very first interviews. If you trace the path of one person who is appointed to the state registration board [STRB], and that person goes to the national registration board [NTRB], and then becomes a member of ACATE or of ACAPTS, that's an onerous workload for one person.

AHISA: That's right. And this is a footnote. It's interesting to hear some noises coming—unofficially—from the Board of Studies about the registration of schools, because it is very easy by comparison to register a system. You know, the DSE or whatever we call them now, . . . the Catholic systemic schools are now registered globally and they monitor their own standards. But in independent schools such as this [referring to a non-sectarian, non-systemic independent school] create an enormous workload for the Board of Studies whose responsibility it is at the moment, and for other volunteer workers such as [name deleted] who is on the registration panel. And they don't want the work. They want us to do it ourselves. And this is part of the problem as I see it. It can be very good professional development, but when you're dealing with the four layers here [referring to the model]—and I call them bureaucracies not wishing to be unkind about it—somebody is going to have to do the work, and somebody is going to have to pay for it. Either the schools are, by releasing people, or if the governments want this to happen they're going to have to fund it, and they won't.
And if it's going to increase effectiveness, improve effectiveness, I don't mind the expenditure. And when I say "I", I'm speaking as a mouthpiece for AHISA. If it's not going to improve effectiveness, I wonder about it [the extra expenditure], however small it might be in the global budget for education nationally or for the state education whether that would be better spent on effectiveness.

Interviewer: Advanced certification. Now, as part of the industrial system, years ago now, the Advanced Skills Teacher [AST] classification was introduced. Now, basically, what was behind it was sound. It was meant to reward people who were experienced teachers and keep them in the classroom. I think we'd both agree that it failed in independent schools. I'm a member of the classification committee in my school . . .

AHISA: I am the committee!!

Interviewer: Right. My argument is that the system is such in independent schools that you'd be hard pressed to [fail an applicant for] Advanced Skills classification.

AHISA: Well. OK. I am someone who has refused it.

Interviewer; And I am, too.

AHISA: Because I take quite seriously the notion of a merit barrier. And I think the notion of a merit barrier is a good thing. I think however little the money is it's still worth a merit barrier being in place.
Interviewer: I think teachers, on the whole, are more interested in the intrinsic rewards and recognition than money.

AHISA: I agree. Absolutely. That’s right. But where the ST1 exists under our award, there are award-defined criteria. I have used those, particularly the one about professional development and training in the subject areas. And people who are “better trained” generally are better teachers. And there are such people, still. And I’ve encouraged them to boost their academic qualifications in a special area.

You know, for example, about the generic HSIE teacher who says “I’m a teacher of geography, economics, legal studies and commerce, and . . .” And I say “. . . how can you be a teacher of all of those things? If you want to be a ST1 in a school, then you are a specialist. Now, where is your speciality? If it needs beefing up, beef it up!”

But the other criterion, about consistent professional development and contribution to professional life within and beyond the school. I take that one quite seriously. We didn’t set the hurdles “that high”, but there are questions we ask in the normal process of evaluation of staff that I think are quite healthy.

OK! In Section 5.1.3, you’ve got advanced certification being a permanent state. Is that out of alignment with your three-year renewal of registration?

Interviewer: No. The aim of the three-year renewal—the concept of a renewable Practising Certificate—is that it allows more frequent police records checks. That’s been one of the arguments in some of the systems overseas, that once-only police
records checks are too infrequent. Another argument is that sometimes people leave teaching, and when they come back curricula have changed, methodologies have changed, structures have changed, and there is a need for them to be brought up-to-date. It doesn’t exclude their re-entering teaching, but they might be given conditional registration.

AHISA: I read that, and it’s a slightly different case to advanced certification. Let’s take, as an example, the hypothetical case of a parent [teacher] who goes on more than three years parental leave. They resign. Let’s imagine they’re a deputy head when they resign. As I understand it, if they come back without having practised they come back on a conditional footing. I wonder what the unions say about the equity in that.

Interviewer: Well, I’ll be seeing the unions on these matters.

AHISA: And I take your point about refreshing the certification. I don’t think it’s a bad notion at all. I find a logical inconsistency between the need to refresh that, especially for somebody who has been a very respected leader in the school . . . and there isn’t a need to refresh the advanced certification.

Interviewer: It’s a good point. When I put that into the model, it was based partly on the NBPTS system in America. [Interviewer gave a brief explanation of NBPTS certification, and compared it with AST in Australia].

AHISA: Is that [NBPTS certification] for life?
Interviewer: No. For 10 years.

AHISA: As I say, I don’t have [a problem with it]. I think the recognition that people would accrue from it and what you say about ST1 [ST1 is the equivalent of AST], when people have that . . . . and interestingly in our magazine when it lists staff there is a little group of them called “senior teachers.” And that was [there] before I came. It was in recognition of that classification. I can see great virtue in this. As I say, the only problem I have is with that being for life but certain other aspects of registration under the Practising Certificate not—that is, you know, being prone to review.

Interviewer: And, I think, in evaluating the model that will be an aspect that would be changed, that it should be for a limited period of time. I wouldn’t see a need for a person to go through a full [assessment] process again.

AHISA: NO! NO! Say, every five years. Maybe at the end there needs to be some base-touching. I mean, what is it? [Conversation about “shelf-life” of postgraduate qualifications].

I think a period of five years out of teaching, even for this advanced certification, would need some refreshing.

Interviewer: I’ve argued elsewhere that advanced certification should only hold if a person is involved in further developing staff in the school, and once that involvement is gone, what happens to advanced certification?
I’ve also argued that certain positions of responsibility should be reserved for those with advanced certification. Now, in state schools, one position might be “leading teacher.” In independent schools, there are staff development opportunities.

AHISA: If I could illustrate. A few years ago—and I didn’t do it—I was about to appoint somebody as a head of department emeritus. He had been a head of department and was bored stupid with the humdrum nature of running a department, but a fantastic teacher. And I was going to say to him “keep the head of department allowance but I’ll give you a full teaching load. Offer a model of excellence to others and lead others in instruction.”

Interviewer: And this is essentially what I see the advanced certified teacher being.

AHISA: Yes.

Interviewer: It’s a chance for people like that to stay in the classroom, and even lead by example . . . to help other people see what teaching should be. But also by explicitly being involved in the development of other people.

AHISA: Yes. And the AST or ST1 hasn’t really worked.

Interviewer: Well, it hasn’t worked because in each jurisdiction it’s been . . . there’s been no real consistency between jurisdictions . . .

AHISA: Which isn’t necessarily a bad thing.
Interviewer: Well, in my proposal it should be a qualification that is transportable from system to system, from state to state. It should be nationally recognised.

Let’s move on to jurisdiction of the Teachers Registration Boards. You don’t specifically agree with the need for registration.

AHISA: No.

Interviewer: But if registration were to occur, would you think these would be appropriate groups of people to be registered [referring to the model]? And do you think that there are people that I’ve included who should not be registered? And do you think there are people who I haven’t included who should be registered?

AHISA: I don’t have a problem with any of these groups. I would add—and I do have a strange feeling about it, and you mention it elsewhere—that university lecturers are teachers. They are not dealing with children. And I understand the issues of probity, and the issues of, say, cognitive development are different. But there are still issues of pedagogy. And I would argue very strongly that if this is to apply to the teaching profession it must apply equally, if differently, to people teaching in universities.

Again, in the margins [referring to notes he has pencilled into the margins of the model] I think it’s something I would want from our point of view. Because the corollary can apply. If, for example, you have somebody with all the post-doctoral qualifications and knowledge in, say, the diseases of rice, and you can impart those, you go back to the Sydney Grammar argument depending on the kind of children you
are teaching. The very bright boys and girls, perhaps, don’t need people with the kind of instructional understanding . . . See, I’ve got a person here, [name mentioned]. I think you know [him]. At the moment, for the last two years, because of the nature of his discipline he is only teaching Years 11 and 12. Now, I’ve a problem with that. But because he’s doing that, and doing it well, are the needs of their training different from the needs of someone dealing with Year 7? Yes, they are. And somebody at Sydney Grammar School who may be very highly qualified academically and who may be used to teaching boys who are very bright indeed. The needs. The specific needs for pedagogic understanding and practice might be very different from somebody who might be teaching in [a contrasting, non-academically orientated school] High School.

Interviewer: And this is a matter I’ll touch on. When you register somebody, do you register them generically, as a teacher, or do you register them to teach Mathematics or English, or do you register them to teach junior mathematics or senior Mathematics?

The Register. If a Register were constructed, how public a document do you think that should be?

AHISA: It depends on the basis of its construction. I think if it’s to do with probity it needs the kind of access you describe [in the model], proper controlled access by people employing the teachers. For all applicants, now, who apply for a position [in
the school of which AHISA is principal] I append a disclosure that they have to give me the freedom to access police records.

Interviewer: And I think it’s only safe to do that.

AHISA: Of course it is. I don’t always do it, but it gives me the freedom to do so. And I’ve asked them the question: “are you on a list somewhere”? And I seek that permission from them. I think if it [the Register] is a list that deals with professional competence I don’t see any problem with it being public. If it deals with probity issues it ought to be closed.

Interviewer: [Showed AHISA a copy of the NZ Register] That’s a copy of the Register from New Zealand. What do you think about the nature of the information that is disclosed there? Do you think it is a reasonable thing to be in the public arena?

AHISA: Again, I think if my own name were on this list because I’m no good as a teacher I’d have a problem with it being there if it is in any way confused with my being a paedophile.

Interviewer: This is what is given to schools in New Zealand, but it is also a public record that the public can get hold of, and [your point] has been criticism that has been made almost unanimously [by other respondents].

AHISA: That’s why you need separate lists, to separate the two issues [AHISA looked through Register for the name of a New Zealand teacher he had recently employed]
Interviewer: In Section 4, I have a graded system of registration. I have a classification of teacher education student. Basically, what I'm saying is that a person should not be accepted into a teacher education program unless they've gone through a basic police check. Do you agree?

AHISA: Yes. *In the present climate I do have problems about the presumption of innocence, and I know that legislation was recently passed to protect teachers from mischievous allegations. And I know that was a necessary safeguard. Is the accuser always holy? Of course not. And some of these lists that deal with people against whom allegations have been made, I think are very dangerous, because they are sometimes not proven. And so, they are not infallible.*

Interviewer: Teaching Intern. This, effectively, is twofold. It is recognition that a person is inexperienced. It is recognition that they must be given some form of structured induction when they are beginning. It is also a chance after the two years of formalising the way of saying to someone “you’re not measuring up. I can’t judge you as satisfactory.” And for the Head to do that, there must be appeals systems, and a body to deal with those appeals.

AHISA: *I wish there were more of it [summative judgements] in pre-service training.*

*One of the things I wrote about here [in his margin notes] was a certain model of internship that relates to the culture of the school into which the teacher is going. And it does bear upon the assessment of teacher training programs. There needs to be the*
flexibility for those programs to meet the culture, if you like, of a school. Imagine Montessori and Steiner schools, for example. There are independent schools—and some of us are working loosely in dialogue with teacher trainers about a model for internship for preparing people to teach in independent schools. Not your formal degree/Dip.Ed/go-out-and-do-it model, but there is a transitional period in which a teacher is a paid intern, with an academic discipline, who may have some university background in teaching, perhaps some units of a professional qualification. But some units can be earned in conjunction with the school, the system. It’s interesting that the AIS . . .

Interviewer: This is much like the lighthouse schools, the Holmes Group . . .

AHISA: Yep. Yep. Right. But if I say. Imagine AHISA saying “we are going to do a unit which is practically-based on the teaching of whatever-it-is in independent schools. That model needs very much to be subject to the scrutiny of ACATE [a body proposed in the thesis] to make sure that the model is sound.

Interviewer: One of the things about the ACDE standards is that they are outcomes-based. It’s not saying to a university “this is what you will teach, and this is how you will teach it.” But it is saying “this is what we expect at the end of the program.”

AHISA: Some of the professional work the AIS plans could be part of this model. It could be a part of the certification of the internship. And I think we would end up with
a better initial training qualification than the end-on kind of stuff with its six week practicum.

Interviewer: After the internship, you become a registered professional teacher. Do you think that continued professional registration should be dependent upon certain levels of CPE being completed?

AHISA: As long as there's a flexible approach to what you mean by continuing professional development.

I've a particular point of view of the common in-service mode. It doesn't change practice.

Interviewer: Talking to someone from the Department. They'd agree with that. They're looking at models that are extended over a period of time, not the one-off short in-service model.

AHISA: They have their place. If there is a new curriculum in Geography, then go and do a day in-service. Get some pegs to hang things on. But if it is about change of practice.

Interviewer: Let me go on. The classification of Approved Teacher Educator.

AHISA: Yes.
Interviewer: And you would think that every university lecturer, whether they are preparing people as teachers or chemical engineers, should be registered?

AHISA: If you are going to argue pedagogy is something that needs to be recognised professionally, then yes.

Interviewer: Right. Now Section 4.1.6 is particularly relevant to independent schools, but also relevant to state schools. That’s the classification of Instructor. Now I’ve based this fairly closely on the requirements for bringing a person to teach from overseas on a temporary visa.

AHISA: I don’t agree with that from the point of view of some para-professional work. There are the music directors and art directors, the chaplaincies, and that sort of thing. Whether they are teachers or not maybe needs some definition. I do recall [from the model] that you can only have one period as an instructor. If someone is a good instructor. Let us imagine that some are better instructors in their specialist fields than some registered teachers. They should be able to continue in the role as instructor.

Interviewer: Do you think there should be some way of assessing their performance?

AHISA: Yes. Yes. I’ve got a case in point. A young man who is a past student who teaches here and is first class in outdoor ed. And has some token qualifications in mountaineering, ropes and things. Heaven knows what. But I won’t put him out in the bush without a teacher simply because of insurance. He doesn’t need to be under
supervision. Sometimes, in fact, sending a teacher with him is a liability because
they’re a burden to what he is trying to do, and I trust him absolutely. Now, I’ve
encouraged him to do some teacher training, but not for reasons that it will make what
he does better. But I want to use him more broadly. For reasons of insurance. And,
he could earn more.

Interviewer: It could extend his professionality and give him more options?

AHISA: So, I’ve got mixed feelings about it. The natural progression from being a
good instructor is to become an educator. If a good instructor is doing something, and
that is what the school wants him or her to do, I don’t see a need to put a limit on the
capacity to do that.

Interviewer: I’ll come back to Professional discipline later. Section 7 is about Interim
Provisions. What I’ve argued here is that people who are currently teaching in any
system should be given registration [upon introduction of registration].

AHISA: I think that’s the only logical way to proceed. The trouble with it is that it
would, de facto, mean that you are registering some incompetent people.

Interviewer: Yes. And that unfortunately is pragmatism. I don’t know how you’d get
around that.

AHISA: Nor do I.
It means also that you’d be registering paedophiles. Those that haven’t been discovered.

Interviewer: But that happens now. And no matter how good probity checks are, you’re not going to discover such people if they don’t have a criminal record.

**AHISA**: The danger of it is that that very logical fact weakens the value of registration.

Interviewer: I’d acknowledge that. This is if it’s prefaced on child protection [alone].

**AHISA**: Yes. That’s number one. If it’s prefaced on efficiency and competence, the same applies.

Interviewer: OK. I’ve said here that those people should be registered if they’ve gone through probity checks anyway.

**AHISA**: Yes. You’re always going to have huge transitional problems. If you introduce a model like this there are always going to be problems in moving from where we are to where we’d like to be. And that transitional period is going to have enormous flaws in it. The danger is that it may weaken the virtue of what it’s trying to achieve.

Interviewer: Professional Discipline. What I’m trying to argue is that matters of professional discipline should be between the employer and the employed in the first instance, and the industrial system, union system, legal system should be played out first, before a registration authority becomes involved. Do you agree with that?
AHISA: Yes, I do. Absolutely.

Interviewer: No matter what happens with the Children’s and Young Peoples Bill and the Ombudsman Amendment Bill, that’s going to take much of those concerns out of the hands of any registration authority. The registration authority could still be involved with criminality checks.

AHISA: I do see that as a reasonable approach. Because. Not only is it the right way to go—it’s a responsibility and obligation on the employer—but any judgement that a registration board should make about someone’s competence is going to rest largely on the assessment of those who are supervising this person. So it has to happen first. Some board sitting in Sydney isn’t going to be able to tell if “Joe Blow in Bowral” is or is not a good teacher.

Interviewer: Do you have any specific point you’d like to discuss?

AHISA: Yes, I do.

Section 6.4. In the first line, are schools under the jurisdiction of the NTRB or are teachers? I would argue most vehemently that schools should not, must not, be. We are under the jurisdiction of enough people as it is.

Interviewer: Right. Teachers are meant to be under that jurisdiction. The registration board is a body for teachers.
AHISA: So teachers in schools and pre-schools are under the NTRB. Can I say that anything as suggestive as 6.4 that threatens to erode the independence of independent schools any further would be resisted by the organisation [AHISA] that I represent? Because there is independence in the nature of diversity, there is strength in diversity. You can’t impose a monobloc model of “what is a teacher” even on schools without diluting that diversity, and there is a danger of that.

Interviewer: And I’d anticipate that the AIS will object to that this afternoon, but that’s what this [the interviews] is about.

AHISA: If we are going to impose a model of what is a teacher and what is good practice, no matter how good it may be within itself, then we are going to lose some of the richness of educational diversity.

Section 7.3 I don’t know the stats on this. How many fail teacher education programs other than by failing to complete? How many fail teacher ed. programs on the grounds of being the wrong person or being inefficient?

Interviewer; I don’t know. But I’d say the failures are predominantly failures to complete.

AHISA: That’s right. And that needs to be addressed in the monitoring [accreditation] of training standards.
Interviewer: The ACDE in *Preparing a Profession* is aware of that. They’ve addressed the problem of how you assess people ultimately.

The composition of the Boards.

*AHISA*: I don’t have any comment on the composition of the boards. They can be a bit large and unwieldy. One of the problems of what you call the “non-systemic independent schools”... the real problem is where you go to identify the body that represents them. You can go to the AIS, but the AIS doesn’t have universal coverage. It doesn’t include many of the independent Catholic schools, for example. It does include some Christian community schools, but not others. There is a problem. Non-systemic independent schools are non-systemic. And the government assures us that we are [systemic, or part of a system].

I’ve one remaining question about the compositions of the boards, and that is that there is an apparent problem with self-regulation. I wonder if the perception of a bunch of schoolteachers monitoring their own standards is going to promote an improvement in the status of teachers that we hope for. Particularly in the transitional stage. And I would like to think that we could do it, and we should do it, because we understand it. My colleague [name] quotes often that a politician believes that a good education is far too important to be left to the educators. Now, I take issue with [the named person] on that because as a consumer of medicine I don’t want the entire control of public and private health to be entirely in the hands of doctors. It is a community responsibility to make sure that health is good. There is a community
responsibility to make sure that education is as good as it can be. So, I have mixed feelings about the predominance of teachers [on the boards].

Interviewer: The registration boards in Queensland and South Australia have a majority of teachers on them. They’re not necessarily elected. Both seem to work very well. The Queensland one has probably been the one that has been most forward in its actions and in developing policies. The guidelines for accreditation came from the ATC and the Queensland Teachers Registration Board. There is an enormous number of stakeholder [groups] with interests in education . . .

AHISA: But there is a danger in a lot of dilettante do-gooders running around sticking their nose in, trying to establish what are good criteria for teacher education.

Interviewer: But you need to draw a balance between public interest and the interest of the profession. I think the [NSW] Teaching Standards Bill showed a great deal of distrust of teachers.

AHISA: I agree.

Another marginal comment. I am [outlined his own entry into teaching, at the age of 18, in England, as an unqualified teacher]. There are plenty of people at your school and mine who would not qualify for registration.

Interviewer: this is a significant problem for religious schools.
[taping ended at this stage, because the conversation moved to discuss issues beyond the scope of this work]