

# CURRICULUM PORTFOLIO

## SELF REVIEW

July 2004

|   |    |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION .....  | 1  |
| COURSE AND UNIT PROFILE (TR8, TR9).....   | 1  |
| Undergraduate and graduate level award courses (UG/G) .....   | 4  |
| Award courses at the at the postgraduate level (PG).....  | 12 |
| Short course offerings .....  | 18 |
| STUDENTS, TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT (TR12, TR13, TR14).....   | 20 |
| CONCLUSIONS .....   | 32 |
| PROPOSALS FOR ACTION .....  | 32 |
| <br>  |    |
| APPENDIX A : Faculty of Education student load and enrolment data 1994 to 2004, March 31 .....                            | 35 |
| APPENDIX B : Percentage of Victorian Year 12 students admitted to Education courses above specified<br>ENTER levels ..... | 36 |
| APPENDIX C : Professional Recognition/Teacher Registration : Early Childhood.....   | 37 |
| APPENDIX D : Short courses 2004 .....   | 40 |
| APPENDIX E: Summary of Monquest results 2000 and 2003.....  | 41 |

## TERMS OF REFERENCE ADDRESSED

This self-review report of the Curriculum Portfolio systematically addresses the five following terms of reference:

- 8 The appropriateness and sustainability of the Faculty's profile of award and non-award courses and units, considering such matters as:
  - the existing and potential student profile
  - market attractiveness and student demand
  - professional standards and informed community requirements and expectations
  - flexibility, accessibility, location and modes of offering
  - the allocation of resources.
- 9 The effectiveness of the Faculty's decision making and other processes and procedures for introducing, developing, revising and rationalising award and non-award courses to ensure effective use of resources (human, physical and financial), including where partnerships and other organisational relationships are involved.
- 12 The Faculty's success in producing the graduates it envisions considering:
  - the student profile
  - equity objectives
  - student progress and achievement
  - the qualities and quality of graduates
  - graduate destinations.
- 13 The appropriateness and quality of the curriculum and pedagogy of courses and units (including placements and fieldwork) in relation to the existing and potential student profile and the Faculty's vision for teaching and learning and research training, and the effectiveness of processes and procedures for course and unit development and review.
- 14 The appropriateness of information and feedback to students, considering such matters as:
  - the Faculty's commitment to academic excellence and consistency of standards
  - the alignment of assessment processes and tasks with course and unit objectives
  - the quality and timeliness of feedback
  - complaints and grievancesand the effectiveness of processes and procedures for monitoring, maintaining and developing consistently good practice in this regard.

While the above Terms of Reference are each of relevance to both coursework and research students, the Curriculum Portfolio largely takes leadership of the former, while the Research portfolio takes leadership of the latter. Therefore, this report largely addresses coursework programs with reference to research students only where issues cross over.

The portfolio report also addresses, indirectly or in part, each of the other terms of reference. This is indicated in the body of the text, where, for example, relevance to Term of Reference 1 will be indicated as **[TR1]**.

# SELF REVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM PORTFOLIO

July 2004

## INTRODUCTION

Our courses span initial and further education for teachers of early childhood, primary, secondary and adult learners, counselling and human development, sport and outdoor recreation, and capacity building for individuals, organisations and communities.

Consistent with the values identified in *Monash University: Excellence and Diversity* and the themes of *Leading the Way: Monash 2020 [TR2]*, our vision is of:

**Graduates** drawn from diverse communities who are capable, ethical citizens of the world, distinguished by their knowledge, intellectual engagement and professional skill, and their innovation and flexibility.

In our Operational Plan 2004-6 we state:

The current teaching and learning strategies focus on consolidating quality assurance processes and professional learning opportunities to ensure:

- Theoretically and practically rigorous and current curricula that are internationally oriented and locally relevant and promote a professional ethic of care and justice;
- Varied and productive pedagogies that challenge and extend all students while recognising their differing conditions, circumstances and cultures;
- Consistency of commitment to the nexus between good teaching and research;
- Teaching materials and resources that are contemporary, engaging and professionally presented.

The Faculty will extend its global engagement through international teaching relationships particularly but not only in the Asia Pacific region and provide expanded opportunities for our students to learn and work in different cultural settings. The Faculty will further develop our relationship with local communities – schools and public and private organisations – providing students with models of communities of learners at all stages of development in all kinds of settings.

The Faculty will develop innovative and flexible approaches to course delivery that offer face-to-face and virtual learning and pastoral care sites for students to support connections between students and peers and between students and staff. Through integrated data management and innovative web design, the Faculty will integrate and manage the educational facets of students' course experience including academic study, fieldwork, professional and community experiences and administration.

This review provides an opportunity to appraise our current position in the light of our current strategies as outlined above and provide some challenges for the future. The Portfolio report reflects the quality cycle elements of planning [**plan**], action [**act**], monitoring and evaluation [**eval**], and implementation of improvements [**impr**].

## COURSE AND UNIT PROFILE

At the time of the last Faculty Review, in 1994, the Faculty's suite of programs largely addressed the educational needs of pre-service and in-service teachers in the childcare and school (early childhood, primary and secondary) sectors and of 'school oriented' postgraduate and research students including

prospective or present professional developers, leaders and academics. While students enrolled in Master and Doctoral degrees often came from beyond the school sector, courses were not designed with their particular needs in mind. Indeed, one of the actions identified by the (self) Review of the Faculty of Education in 1994 was to “develop a pattern of core and option units at B.Ed.Studies and M.Ed.Studies which addresses the needs of non-school oriented students (nurses, trainers in industry etc).”

The Clayton campus of the Faculty, called the School of Graduate Studies, offered no courses to undergraduates, its pre-service teacher education program being confined to the Graduate Diploma in Education for secondary teachers. While it offered a Bachelor of Education degree, this was designed as an in-service or ‘end-on’ degree for those with existing teaching qualifications. It also offered a suite of Graduate Diplomas for in-service teachers. The Peninsula campus, called the School of Early Childhood and Primary Education, offered pre-service Diploma, Bachelor and Graduate Diploma qualifications for early childhood and primary teachers, and an in-service ‘end-on’ Bachelor degree. The School of Education, at Gippsland, offered pre-service Diploma, Bachelor and Graduate Diploma qualifications for primary and secondary teachers including qualifications in librarianship, and a Graduate Certificate and Diploma professional development course for in-service teachers. In addition, the Clayton campus had a very large postgraduate coursework and research degree program, neither of which program were offered at the Gippsland or Peninsula campuses.

**Eval** The Faculty Review of 1994 made a number of recommendations in relation to the Faculty’s course profile. Of particular relevance to the course and unit profile, were the External Panel’s opinion that: “in future each School [campus] must offer courses at each level” and “the Faculty must now consider appropriate models of [initial teacher] preparation — concurrent, end-on or double degrees, the balance of provision among the Schools, the size of the intakes in the present circumstances and innovation in delivery for reasons which touch upon both the availability of resources and the potential for improvement in quality.”

**Act** Since then, the range and distribution of courses offered by the Faculty has changed dramatically. Many of the suggestions of that review have either been taken up, or been superseded by other developments.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 8 | The appropriateness and sustainability of the Faculty’s profile of award and non-award courses and units, considering such matters as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>— the existing and potential student profile</li><li>— flexibility, accessibility, location and modes of offering</li><li>— market attractiveness and student demand</li><li>— professional standards and informed community requirements/expectations</li><li>— the allocation of resources.</li></ul> |
|---|--|

**Eval/Plan** Since 1994, the Faculty has grown considerably in enrolments due to a number of strategic decisions. The first of these was to introduce undergraduate teacher education at the Clayton campus in 1997, in the face of declining applications for teacher education places in Victoria in the mid to late nineties. An alternative decision might have been to contract teacher education places but instead we grew them during a period when other institutions did contract. A second decision, in 1998, was to introduce the Sport and Outdoor Recreation program at the Gippsland campus, which provided the campus a growth strategy that did not rely exclusively on teacher education. It is not common for such a program to be located in an Education faculty but we believe that it has been a successful addition and will continue to grow and expand its reach. The third decision was to fulfil our commitment to lifelong learning by introducing an undergraduate qualification in adult learning and development in 1999. The fourth decision, in 2001, in response both to the Australia wide decline in postgraduate coursework enrolments in Education during the nineties, and our analysis of the needs of organisations for the knowledge and skills we had to offer, was to diversify our student base beyond the formal education sectors by deliberately seeking out cohorts of students from public and private organisations outside the Education sectors. Consistent with this we expanded our psychology offerings to develop a counselling program for those who were not seeking psychology accreditation but wished to develop their knowledge and skills in counselling. Finally, we decided to grow our international numbers more aggressively both on campus and through offshore offerings.

In 1994, the proportion of our student load supported by sources other than DEST was 3% these being international students. Five years later in 1999 and following the decision by government not to fund HECS places for postgraduate coursework, it was still 3% since Monash was in a position to provide HECS places for the Master of Education and Psychology. In 2004, notwithstanding a significant increase in DEST places,

18% of students are supported by sources other than DEST, with 13% International and 5% Australian full-fee paying. [TR4]

**Eval** Using the DEST categories of Higher degree research, postgraduate coursework and undergraduate the profile of enrolments looks broadly similar with approximately 40% undergraduate, 50% postgraduate and 10% HDR (see Appendix A [C35] for enrolment and FTE load trends). This categorization, however, masks some quite significant shifts.

Table 1 provides an extract from the data in Appendix A, rearranged to make comparisons more meaningful. Firstly, it makes the distinction between the two levels of 'graduate course' explicit<sup>1</sup>, thus, initial teacher education is separated from postgraduate coursework. Secondly, it groups the Bachelor of Education graduate entry with the postgraduate coursework since in 1994, enrolments in these courses was normally by 3 and 4 year qualified teachers taking a fourth and fifth year of study either to qualify as four year trained or preparatory to entering Masters degrees. They would now be given direct access to postgraduate certificates, diplomas and Masters.

Table 1 Student enrolments in the Faculty of Education (1994-2004)

|                               | '94         | '96         | '98         | '00         | '02         | '04         |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Higher degree research</b> |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Doctorate by research         | 222         | 198         | 211         | 213         | 217         | 195         |
| Masters by research           | 30          | 29          | 35          | 27          | 123         | 155         |
| <b>HDR total</b>              | <b>252</b>  | <b>227</b>  | <b>246</b>  | <b>240</b>  | <b>340</b>  | <b>350</b>  |
| % of enrolment                | 9%          | 9%          | 9%          | 9%          | 12%         | 10%         |
| <b>Postgrad coursework</b>    |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Masters by coursew            | 545         | 550         | 532         | 537         | 540         | 826         |
| Grad dip extend skills        | 171         | 136         | 17          | 67          | 9           | 1           |
| Graduate certificate          | 1           | 3           | 5           | 4           | 30          | 34          |
| Bachelors grad entry          | 349         | 393*        | 269         | 73          | -           | -           |
| <b>Postgraduate total</b>     | <b>1066</b> | <b>1082</b> | <b>823</b>  | <b>681</b>  | <b>579</b>  | <b>861</b>  |
| % of enrolment                | 40%         | 42%         | 30%         | 25%         | 20%         | 25%         |
| <b>Graduate</b>               |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Graduate dip new skills       | 449         | 518         | 760         | 698         | 807         | 883         |
| <b>Graduate total</b>         | <b>449</b>  | <b>518</b>  | <b>760</b>  | <b>698</b>  | <b>807</b>  | <b>883</b>  |
| % of enrolment                | 17%         | 20%         | 28%         | 25%         | 27%         | 26%         |
| <b>Undergraduate</b>          |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Bachelors pass                | 738         | 726         | 882         | 1123        | 1216        | 1347        |
| Bachelors honours             | -           | -           | -           | 2           | 12          | 5           |
| Diploma                       | 150         | 1           | -           | -           | -           | -           |
| Non award /Cross Inst         | 2           | 6           | 1           | 6           | 2           | 10          |
| <b>Undergraduate total</b>    | <b>890</b>  | <b>733</b>  | <b>883</b>  | <b>1131</b> | <b>1230</b> | <b>1362</b> |
| % of enrolment                | 33%         | 29%         | 33%         | 41%         | 42%         | 39%         |
| <b>Education Total</b>        | <b>2657</b> | <b>2560</b> | <b>2712</b> | <b>2750</b> | <b>2956</b> | <b>3456</b> |

\*Corrected University data which incorrectly placed pre-service B Ed under Grad Entry for this year

In 2004, 2173 or 63% of our enrolments are in undergraduate or graduate diploma courses in initial teacher education (ranging from early childhood to adult)<sup>2</sup>, compared with 1340 students (50% of enrolment) in 1994. The increase is largely due to the introduction at Clayton in 1997 of undergraduate entry initial teacher education in the form of double degrees. In 2004, only 25% of enrolments are in postgraduate coursework programs (in which we have included the graduate entry B Ed) compared to 40% in 1994, but in 1994, 21% of students (545) were in Masters programs compared to 24% (826) now. There has, in the interim, been a significant shift in the nature of the student body, a point to which we will return.

In responding to this term of reference, undergraduate/graduate award courses, postgraduate award courses and non-award short courses will be discussed in turn.

<sup>1</sup> Monash University follows the AVCC agreed nomenclature of using 'graduate course' to describe a course designed for graduates of a different field, where the units studied are equivalent to those at the senior undergraduate level. A Graduate Diploma of Education is taught to students who have a degree in a non-education field. Monash uses 'postgraduate course' to describe an advanced course taught to graduates in the same field. A Postgraduate Diploma of Education is an advanced course for those who already have a degree/graduate diploma in Education and draws on Master level units. In reporting to DEST, graduate certificates/diplomas will be reported as Graduate Diploma new skills, while postgraduate certificates and diplomas will normally be reported as Graduate Diploma extend skills.

<sup>2</sup> There are a further 58 (2%) undergraduates in sport and outdoor recreation. The 124 students in BSOR/BEd are counted in Initial Teacher Education. In all BSOR enrolments are 182, or 5% of the Faculty's enrolment.

## Undergraduate and graduate level award courses (UG/G)

Since 1994, the Faculty has both consolidated and expanded its undergraduate/graduate offerings. Primary and secondary teacher education and sport and outdoor recreation are offered at Gippsland, early childhood and primary teacher education at Peninsula, and secondary and adult at Clayton.

### i Course and unit profile (UG/G)

**Act** As Tables 2 and 3 show, in 1994, there were 27 courses in all with the campuses offering 8, 8 and 12 respectively. In 2004, there were 21 courses with the campuses offering 12, 12 and 10 respectively.

Table 2: Undergraduate and graduate courses available to commencing students (1994)

| <b>Undergraduate courses 1994</b>            | <b>Clayton</b> | <b>Peninsula</b> | <b>Gippsland</b> | <b>Offshore</b> |
|--|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| B Teach (Early Childhood)                    |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| B Teach (Primary)                            |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| BA/BTeach                                    |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| Dip Teach (Early Childhood)                  |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| Dip Teach (Primary)                          |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| Dip Teach                                    |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| B Teach (Prim/Sec)                           |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| B Teach/B Education                          |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| B Education (Sec)                            |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| B Education (Prim)*                          |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| B Education Studies*                         | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| B Special Education*                         | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| B Education*                                 |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| B Education (Librarianship)*                 |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| <b>Graduate courses 1994</b>                 |                |                  |                  |                 |
| Dip Education                                | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| GradDip Education (Primary)                  |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| GradDip Education (Sec)                      |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| GradDip Education Studies*                   |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| Dip Education (Primary)                      |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| Dip Education Psychology                     | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| GradDip TESOL*                               | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| GradDip EPA*                                 | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| GradDip Teaching Asian Languages*            | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| GradDip SLE*                                 | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| GradDip Education (Librarianship)*           |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| GradDip Education (Computers)*               |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| GradDip Education (Professional Devt Stud)*  |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| GradCert Education (Professional Devt Stud)* |                |                  | ✓                |                 |

\*These were top up courses for qualified teachers

Table 3: Undergraduate and graduate courses available to commencing students (2004)

| <b>Undergraduate courses 2004</b>               | <b>Clayton</b> | <b>Peninsula</b> | <b>Gippsland</b> | <b>Offshore</b> |
|---|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| B Educational Studies (Special Education)***    |                |                  |                  |                 |
| B Early Childhood Studies                       |                | ✓                |                  | ✓               |
| B Primary Education                             |                | ✓                | ✓                |                 |
| B Arts/B Education**                            | ✓(S)           | ✓(P)             | ✓(S&P)           |                 |
| B Education/B Laws**                            | ✓(S)           |                  |                  |                 |
| B Bus Commerce/B Education**                    | ✓(S)           | ✓(P)             |                  |                 |
| B Info System/B Education**                     | ✓(S)           | ✓(P)             |                  |                 |
| B Music/B Education**                           | ✓(S)           | ✓(P)             |                  |                 |
| B Science/B Education**                         | ✓(S)           | ✓(P)             | ✓(S&P)           |                 |
| B Sport & Outdoor Rec/B Education**             |                |                  | ✓(S&P)           |                 |
| B Visual Art/B Education**                      | ✓(S)           | ✓(P)             | 2005             |                 |
| B Adult Learning & Development                  | ✓              |                  |                  |                 |
| B Sport & Outdoor Recreation                    |                |                  | ✓                | ✓               |
| B Business & Com/B SOR                          |                |                  | ✓                |                 |
| B Education (Honours)                           | ✓              | ✓                | ✓                |                 |
| <b>Graduate courses 2004</b>                    |                |                  |                  |                 |
| GradDip Education (Early Childhood)             |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| Gdip Education (Primary)                        |                | ✓                |                  |                 |
| GradDip Education (Secondary)                   | ✓              |                  | ✓                |                 |
| GradCert Education (Professional Devt Studies)* | ✓              |                  | ✓                |                 |
| GradDip Education (Professional Devt Studies)*  | ✓              | ✓                | ✓                |                 |

\*These are top up courses for qualified teachers

\*\*These nine courses share a common Education structure, with a primary and secondary version

\*\*\*This is a 'top up' course for qualified teachers which is only activated for 'cohorts' of students

The Bachelor of Education (Primary) comes in two versions in as much as the discipline area studies are offered/taken within the Faculty at the Peninsula campus and in other faculties at Gippsland. Nine of the courses are double degrees in which the Education component is the same regardless of course combination or campus, but comes in a primary and secondary version. In effect, there are now 15 different courses commencing students across the Faculty rather than 27, but each campus offers as many or more courses than it did a decade ago.

#### *Initial teacher education*

**Impr** The decade since the last review has seen the development of a suite of double degrees, beginning, for both primary and secondary teachers. In 2004, our partner faculties in these programs comprise: Art & Design, Arts, Business and Economics, Information Technology, Law and Science. The move into double Bachelors degrees saw the Clayton campus of the Faculty taking its first undergraduates. These courses enable those who wish to be secondary teachers to enrol in a teacher education program as an undergraduate but at the same time not have to commit completely to teaching since they have the option of using the non-Education degree to enter some other field. Thus they maintain most of the flexibility of the traditional 'end-on' Graduate Diploma course, with the advantages of two years of Education study with more extended practicum experience, thus enabling them to 'try teaching' relatively early in their study and qualifying them to teach in states requiring two years professional study in Education as a minimum. Prospective primary teachers have also been offered the option of developing a specialisation and a primary qualification.

**Impr** The Faculty also considers it important to provide generalist teachers of high quality and this is recognised through the extension of the single primary and early childhood education degrees. The four-year Bachelor of Early Childhood Education (BECE) introduced in 1997 added to the suite of teacher education programs offered by the Faculty. It is innovative in focussing on the age range 0-12 years. It prepares teachers to work in both the child-care and school sectors, and the latter at both early childhood and primary levels.

When the three-year Bachelor of Adult Learning and Development (BAL&D) was introduced in 1999, it 'rounded out' a comprehensive range of initial teacher education offerings of the Faculty, from early childhood to adult years. The BAL&D is an 'end-on' qualification that prepares teachers for the TAFE and adult sectors, catering largely for students who have some qualifications, but have not completed a degree. Credit for previous qualifications and recognition of prior learning is available for these students who then typically complete two years of FTE study to complete the Bachelors degree. **[TR11]**

The three-year Bachelor of Early Childhood Studies (BECS) was added to the suite of teacher education courses in 2003. It too is an 'end-on' qualification that prepares teachers for the childcare sector (0-6 years). Credit for previous qualifications and recognition of prior learning is available for these students who then complete between one and two years of FTE study to complete the Bachelors degree. **[TR11]** Markets have been identified locally and in Singapore.

In the area of graduate course offerings, the Faculty has continued with its commitment to end-on teacher education programs with Graduate Diplomas of Education in Early Childhood (introduced in 2001), Primary and Secondary. However, the need for the Faculty to respond to the needs of students has seen these courses being offered in a wider range of modes. For example, the GradDipEd (Secondary) now allows on-campus based students at Clayton to take off-campus units.

In recognition of the requirement that primary teachers are able to teach across a wide range of curriculum areas, and the difficulties in accomplishing sufficient expertise in a one year course, the primary graduate diploma has for a number of years 'over-taught', so that students were undertaking many more hours of study for a 6 point unit than university policy allowed and staff were teaching many more hours than could be sustained. In 2003, the Faculty redesigned the course to be ten 6 points units instead of the former eight, but to be taught over one calendar year. The course is, therefore, now weighted at 1.25 of an academic year.

#### *Further teacher education/professional development*

**Eval** At the time of the last review, the Gippsland, Peninsula and Clayton campuses offered a suite of Graduate Diplomas directed at in-service teachers and all campuses offered a graduate entry Bachelor of Education also directed at in-service teachers. During the nineties, the market for these courses fell away as increasingly more teachers became four-year qualified either as a result of one of these upgrading courses, or through their initial teacher education. The Graduate Diploma of Education (Computers in Education) introduced a decade ago is one of the few of these courses remaining. Demand has slowed and it took its last commencing students in 2003. As of 2004, the Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma of Education

(Professional Development Studies) are the only remaining courses that are designed to provide qualified teachers with the opportunity to study undergraduate units for their own further professional development. It provides a fourth year of study and so also serves to upgrade from a 3-year to a 4-year qualification. Essentially, most teachers desiring professional development enrol in postgraduate courses.

As previously indicated, the Bachelor of Adult Learning and Development and the Bachelor of Early Childhood Studies, both offer an initial teacher education qualification at bachelors degree level but each is directed largely at students who already have some qualifications and professional experience. They can therefore be thought of as 'further teacher education' and as serving professional development needs.

#### *Sport and outdoor recreation*

In 1998, the Faculty introduced the Bachelor of Sport and Outdoor Recreation (BSOR) on the Gippsland campus, initially offered as a double degree only, and then also offered as a single degree program from 2002. This course is innovative in combining studies in Sport, Recreation and Outdoor Education within a single degree program thus preparing people for futures in sports training and development, commercial and community recreation, nature and adventure tourism, and education. Those studying double degrees with Education are able to teach both physical education and outdoor education, also an innovation.

#### *Honours*

The Bachelor of Education Honours was introduced in 2002 and provides a direct path for students from the undergraduate degree programs into research degrees.

## **ii Flexibility, accessibility, location and modes of offering (UG/G)**

#### *Courses: Location and modes of offering*

As indicated above, not all bachelor degrees and graduate diplomas are offered on all campuses. Given the geographic proximity of Clayton and Peninsula, the Faculty does not believe it should reproduce courses on those two campuses. To do so would not be an effective use of resources and may undermine the capacity of the Peninsula campus to attract the numbers of students needed for critical mass. [TR4, TR9] Rather, the Faculty sees itself as offering the full range of levels of teacher education from early childhood to adult and a wide range of specialisations on the two-site metropolitan campus formed by Clayton and Peninsula. It sees itself as offering primary and secondary teacher education at Gippsland although not all specialisations may be available. At present, it does not believe that critical mass could be achieved in either early childhood or adult education at the Gippsland campus although in the future some aspects of each program might be offered by supported distance education in collaboration with the metropolitan campus.

**Plan** The University has plans to introduce health studies at Peninsula and for the campus to become a Health and Education Precinct. Given that, there is a certain attraction in the idea of the faculty expanding the BSOR and offering sports studies at Peninsula. In the short to medium term, however, we believe that such a move would be to the detriment of the continued growth of the program at Gippsland, which is necessary if we are to achieve critical mass. [TR4, TR9]

The majority of single and double bachelors degrees are offered in the on campus mode essentially by 'face to face' teaching although BSOR (Gippsland) and the BECS (Peninsula) courses are available flexibly in Singapore through a supported distance model. The initial teacher education graduate diploma programs at Clayton and Peninsula are each offered on campus, and the secondary graduate diploma course at Gippsland is offered off campus (distance). The Faculty anticipates also offering it on campus at Gippsland from 2006.

#### *Units: Location and modes of offering*

**Act** The Faculty offers 25 secondary curriculum specialisations ranging across the humanities and social sciences, creative and performing arts, mathematics and sciences, business and information technology. Until recently, there was a limited range of these specialisations offered at the Gippsland campus and they tended to be of a more generalist nature than those offered at Clayton. In order to provide both on- and off-campus Gippsland students with a full suite of discipline specialisations, the Faculty decided to make the majority available in the distance mode so that where the specialist expertise was not available at Gippsland, the curriculum unit could be taught by distance by the staff at Clayton who already teach it on campus. The intention was and is that students enrolled in the distance Graduate Diploma at Gippsland or the on campus double degree with Education could select from the same range of specialisations as a Clayton student without the expertise having to reside at Gippsland.

**Impr** The offering of curriculum units by distance has, on the one hand, expanded curriculum options for students at Gippsland but, on the other hand, reduced on-campus students' face-to-face interaction with staff and each other and the incentive to be 'on-campus'. Also, many local off-campus students who have family or work commitments that inhibit them from attending regularly on campus would like to come on campus at times to meet and work with other students. For 2004, we decided to offer a bigger selection of the curriculum specialisations on campus at Gippsland to ensure that each student had the option of studying at least one of their two specialisations on campus. **[TR6]**

**Act** The Faculty is in the process of restructuring its elective range for the undergraduate/graduate courses. Until recently each campus offered its own electives essentially only to students enrolled at that campus. The range of electives was restricted by the total enrolment at that campus. Also expertise on one campus was not always available at other campuses. In future, we plan to offer a suite of faculty electives. The name and description of each elective will be posted on the website with its intended audience (eg teachers of adult students) and availability (eg Clayton [on campus, evening], distance). Students enrolled at any campus can then choose to take advantage of any units offered by distance and of any on-campus unit, which they can attend. Thus, secondary music students enrolled at Clayton may enrol in an elective music unit offered at the Peninsula campus, if they chose. Students living in the South East corridor may drive to Peninsula and Gippsland equally readily and, for their electives, may wish to go to one campus for three units and, on a different day, go to another campus for their fourth. Scheduling will have to be carefully done to make this possible and planning is underway.

#### *Flexibility and accessibility*

There is a schedule in place for increasing the flexibility of our unit offerings with almost all Faculty units having been reviewed over a three-year period. Many more students now have access to distance and on line learning opportunities. The Sport and Outdoor Recreation program, for example, has developed a fully integrated platform, "Base camp", which provides a flexible teaching and learning site, manages the students' excursions and placements and produces an ongoing professional experience log book. For example, a student who has returned to Melbourne for the weekend can download an up-coming practical trip briefing form, check out field trip dates for next semester, complete the required medical profile sheet, research and contact a field experience agency, and use the 'compass' to access specific unit related study content, materials and work requirements. Staff can, from any location, complete and submit all of the required risk management documentation for practical programs, update a particular unit with the latest content and access catalogues of digital resources for lectures and presentations. **[TR6, TR7, TR9]**

**Act** During 2003, we began a project to develop a flexible learning platform for the Graduate Diploma in Education (Secondary) to meet the learning, course management and pastoral care needs of students. **[TR6, TR7]** The intention is to provide a virtual home that complements and, in some cases, takes the place of the traditional 'on campus' experience while ensuring that students connect with peers in their cohort. This innovative approach to linking teaching across our three campuses and the other locations in which we teach in both on-campus and off-campus modes will gradually be extended to other courses. The project continues in 2004 and 'The Meeting Place' will be launched in 2005.

**Plan** Consistent with 'The Meeting Place' philosophy, in 2005, we will begin to develop learning centres on each campus where students who are enrolled in either on or off campus units can work together or individually, either in scheduled support groups or on an ad hoc basis. **[TR7]** Since creating a sense of campus life is most critical at Gippsland, we plan to begin the process there, setting up a learning centre for the commencement of 2006.

Although the majority of undergraduate and graduate courses are offered only in the on campus mode, even within the traditional delivery model there is an increasing understanding within the Faculty of the need to recognise and accommodate, as far as reasonably possible, the family and working circumstances of students. Timetabling of units, for example, now allows for choices of tutorial times and attempts to enable students to concentrate their class times. Where possible, placements are organised to suit students' personal circumstances through the development of student profiles and well-publicised placement times. There are also a variety of placements models that operate across the Faculty such as block placements, internships and school-based units. Until recently, most courses were available only full-time: now all but two are available part-time. Students enrolled on campus can take advantage of distance availability of a unit, and can transfer from one campus to another if their circumstances change.

### iii Existing and potential student profile (UG/G)

As indicated earlier, 39% of the Faculty's enrolments and 49% of its load is in undergraduate/ graduate level courses. Of the undergraduates, 50% are mature age students. Consistent with trends across Australia, over 75% of our students are in paid work, often for a considerable number of hours each week [MEQ 2003].

The Faculty now provides undergraduate initial teacher education qualifications across the full age range preparing people for the childcare sector (0-6 years), the early childhood, primary and secondary school sectors and the adult education, training and the community education sectors. It also offers graduate entry teacher education at the early childhood (0-6 years), primary and secondary levels.

The Bachelor of Education (Early Childhood) is unusual in preparing teachers across the 0-12 age range, and has proved popular. The Bachelor of Early Childhood Studies focuses on the years from 0-6 and is intended primarily to provide an upgrading qualification for practicing professionals in the childcare sector with TAFE qualifications and RPL. This course was offered locally and offshore in Singapore from second semester 2003 and has proved an immediate success in both locations.

**Plan** The intention is to increase the flexibility of its offering, and once we are satisfied with the mode of delivery, extend its reach into other locations within Australia. Given the limited number of HECS places likely to be available, this may need to be fee paying and it is reasonably clear that the market will not be able to bear high fees. The Faculty, however, is committed to making this program more widely available on equity grounds and may therefore offer it through Open Learning. The key issue will be how to quality control the placement experiences.

The Bachelor of Adult Learning and Development is similarly a two-year end on degree available largely to practising professionals wishing to upgrade. The Faculty is, however, planning to repackage existing units into a one-year graduate diploma qualification for those with degrees. This will be a full fee-paying program but full fees for one year, given the new loans scheme, should be more attractive than HECS for two years and we confidently anticipate a healthy market for it.

**Eval** The Bachelor of Sport and Outdoor Recreation has grown steadily since its commencement at Gippsland in 1999. The BSOR program has struggled with enrolments in Singapore. We continue to believe that there is potential for it to grow there, but have given notice to our current partner that we will only give it another year to develop. Onshore, the majority of enrolments continue to be in the double degree with education, rather than the single degree or the double degree with the Faculty of Business and Commerce. The double degree qualification ought to be attractive to those in the Sport and the Leisure industries and our small numbers may simply be that the course is not sufficiently visible to those who might be interested.

**Plan** We now plan to re-structure the BSOR single degree to have a stronger health and physical activity focus, which is what we believe our current and prospective students in Australia and Singapore wish. In the coming year we will also engage the Faculty of Business and Commerce in discussions about how to improve the visibility of the course. We are beginning to assess the viability of offering, from 2006, a Graduate Certificate in Adventure Guiding and Outdoor Leadership to capture students from both the tourism industry and those retraining to teach outdoor education.

### iv Market attractiveness and student demand (UG/G) [TR1]

All eight Victorian Universities offer undergraduate education programs although the University of Melbourne offers only pre-primary and primary teacher education at the undergraduate level (the same profile as the Peninsula campus), their secondary teaching course being graduate entry only.

Clearly teacher education is experiencing a 'boom' with teaching once again becoming a career of first choice. Even taking this into account, Monash Education is doing very well in attracting students. We consistently draw over two thirds of the first preferences for undergraduate places in Victoria [TR1]. For the Faculty, the major inhibitor to growth is a shortage of HECS places to meet the demand by qualified and able students.

**Eval** In 1998, 40% of all school leaver undergraduates commencing teacher education at Monash had ENTERS over 80, in 2002 this was 59% and in 2003 it was 76%.  
— Clayton increased from 72% for 1998 to 89% for 2002 and 92% for 2003,

— Gippsland from 26% for 1998 to 34% for 2002 to 55% for 2003  
— Peninsula had a remarkable increase from 13% for 1998 to 44% for 2002 to 70% for 2003.  
This compares with a 2003 Victoria wide average of 44% and a University of Melbourne figure of 63%, the latter offering a similar suite of early childhood and primary undergraduate courses to the Peninsula Campus (see Appendix B [C36]).

In 2002, half of the students entering the Clayton campus, had ENTERS over 90. In 2003, the number increased, but the proportion dropped to 35% because early in 2003 the Faculty was asked to take unplanned Science/Education students to enable Monash to meet its commitments in relation to science targeted places. These additional students had ENTERS in the mid to high eighties. Given the shortages of teachers in these fields, and the general quality and success of the students, the Faculty believes this was a socially and educationally responsible decision to make.

In interpreting this data, it should be recognised that less than 50% of the Faculty's load is in undergraduate places and, of the undergraduate students, fewer than 50% are school leavers. Similar comparative data is not readily available for mature age undergraduates or for graduate entry teacher education. However, our informal feedback suggests that the mature age entrants achieve just as well as the school leavers and the Faculty plans to monitor this in future. Applications are very strong for the graduate entry teacher education programs and entry GPAs are rising. At Peninsula we have over seven eligible first preference applicants for each place, at Clayton we have six, and at Gippsland four. (By 'eligible' we mean they have at least a Bachelor degree appropriate to their chosen specialisation.)

**Eval** The improvement in the quality of our undergraduate students at Peninsula is remarkable with 70% of ENTERS over 80 compared with a state average of 44% and compared with 63% for a similar market at the University of Melbourne. We now enrol the strongest cohort of students in primary and early childhood education in the state. In part this improvement is due to the calibre of students enrolled in double degrees. These double degrees are each taught over two campuses (Peninsula and Clayton or Peninsula and Caulfield), which to the surprise of some, is seen by a good proportion of students as an advantage rather than a disadvantage (MEQ 2003). The option of double degrees for primary teachers is an innovation that, in our view, will enrich the profession considerably. The Bachelor of Early Childhood Studies, the new qualification developed in 2003 and offered locally and in Singapore in 2004 has also proven an immediate success in enrolments and feedback from enrolled students. We anticipate a flow on of students from Singapore coming to Australia to study at the postgraduate and research levels in future years.

At the secondary level we offer a very wide range of specialisations. During the difficult years for teacher education in Victoria (the mid to late nineties), our wide range of offerings almost certainly contributed to our capacity to maintain enrolments against a state-wide trend and to attract the best qualified students. This, however, comes at a cost, a point to which we shall return.

At the time of the introduction of double degrees, there was a perception in a number of faculties that teacher education would be used as a 'back door entry' to programs for which students would otherwise not achieve the ENTER and entry to double degrees was restricted to those achieving the ENTER for either constituent degree. It is our belief that this perception has largely disappeared as the quality of entrants to teacher education and, in particular, to the double degrees has improved. Indeed, minimum ENTERS to the double degree in Science/Education is generally some five points above those for Science, and, at Clayton, minimum ENTERS for double degrees with Arts hover around 90. We are now sought out by other faculties to engage in double degrees. **[TR1]**

**Act** Recently we have seen an increase in international undergraduate and graduate load from 20 in 2000 to 96 in 2004. We are presently targeting Canadian students for the Graduate Diploma of Education, a qualification understood within the Canadian system. Many Canadian Teacher Registration Boards recognise the accreditation of our initial teacher education course with the Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT). We have a medium term target of 80 students.

#### **v Professional standards & informed community requirements and expectations (UG/G)**

The Victorian Institute of Teaching accredits teacher education programs of the Faculty every five years. The Double Degree program and the Graduate Diplomas in Education have just completed the process for the second time and all have been approved. Such accreditation processes are valuable mechanisms for providing external feedback on our courses and affirmation that our courses respond to the current requirements of the profession **[TR1]**. The BSOR and BECS courses have also been accredited in Singapore and BECS is accredited in NSW.

Over the past year, the Faculty has confronted the reality that states have reciprocal recognition of the registration of teachers from other states while that registration remains active, but they do not have reciprocal recognition of accreditation of qualifications. Thus, the Faculty cannot claim that a Monash qualification accredited in Victoria will qualify our students to teach in other states or indeed internationally. Similarly, our early childhood program may be recognised as a teaching qualification for the school sector and yet not be recognised for working as a qualified teacher in the childcare sector in the same state. At present we advise students who wish to teach outside Victoria to check locally [TR10]. The Faculty has begun a systematic process of determining whether or not our initial teaching qualifications are recognised in each Australian state and submit them for accreditation where they are not. Appendix C [C37] shows the complexity of this matter.

The Monash University Employer Survey (2003) reported that generally feedback from employers on the Faculty of Education was positive “covering areas such as professional attitudes displayed by graduates, enthusiasm of graduates and excellent graduate attributes such as computer and interpersonal skills” (MUES Report Faculty of Education, p 24), and described our graduates as “quality”, “well rounded” and with “very good generic skills” (p 22). [TR1]

Membership of our Faculty Board includes academics from other universities, from professional associations, the school sectors, and partner organisations who can therefore exercise some oversight of our academic programs. In our courses, there are also significant opportunities for input from the community through practicum committees, mock-interviews and course reference groups.

#### **vi Allocation of resources (UG/G) [TR5, TR6]**

The Faculty’s approach to the allocation of resources (whether human, IT, library or physical) is generally neither course nor campus based. That is, generally program areas or courses do not have specific allocated budgets.

#### **Act** *Human resources*

Academic staff may teach across a number of courses and even program areas. We have guidelines for the number of hours of teaching allocated to units, and we attempt to control staff teaching loads to provide for equity across the Faculty, making appointments that are informed by a combination of information about teaching loads and gaps, and the strategic directions of the Faculty. Consistent with this, generally program areas or courses do not have specific funds for sessional teaching but rather draw on a central pool in order to balance teaching loads across the Faculty. There are some exceptions to this with BSOR having a specific allocation to pay for specialist instructors in specific sports and outdoor skills (as well as drawing on the general fund for sessional relief for teaching). Teacher education generally on each campus has tagged budget allocations to make teacher payments for student placements. Campus coordinators also have modest budgets to fund guest lecturers or special relief when a particular event occurs and that a staff member needs to be away when a class should be held. Some areas (in particular, BSOR at Gippsland, Science at Clayton and Peninsula, Art and Technology at Peninsula) also have technical staff assigned particularly to the program. Academic support has increased considerably over recent years and staff of the Academic Services Team provide assistance with the range of course related publications, the development of print and online unit materials, assignments management, and so on. Their services are not, however, ‘allocated’ to particular program areas, courses or units.

**Plan** Although the Faculty tries to ensure equity in teaching loads and in student staff ratio, each of these can mask issues that influence the quality of our offerings. In particular, each broad program area needs to have a critical mass of staff to ensure the range of expertise to undertake good teaching and research. Staff numbers need to be sufficient to ensure that no person has to teach across too many units or in areas outside their expertise. Minimal numbers of staff must be maintained to make a program area viable and optimal numbers are needed to make the same area excellent and competitive.

#### *Other resources*

Campus coordinators manage the budgets for general teaching materials and other resources. In addition, some program areas require a high level of infrastructure, for example, the Sport and Outdoor Recreation program at Gippsland requires certain levels of sporting facilities regardless of the number of students. The music facilities at Peninsula are underused but needed. Drama at Clayton needs better facilities but the number of units/students that would use the facilities is insufficient to support it. IT facilities have been a problem in the Faculty although this has improved considerably over recent years.

The University has now moved to a Strategic Cost Management (SCM) budget model that involves faculties paying directly for space and this is and will continue to have implications for the way in which we resource and budget for various teaching activities. At present it is difficult to disaggregate costs to various courses and so determining whether the level of resourcing is appropriate is quite difficult. As part of the SCM process, however, the Faculty has engaged in an Activity Based Costing exercise, which we expect will prove illuminating.

#### **vii Appropriateness and sustainability of undergraduate/graduate award courses [TR4]**

**Eval** The Faculty has a commitment to excellent teaching and to high quality, current, and internationally and locally relevant courses. However, in general, if we accurately acknowledged the hours of teaching and students access, its DEST based initial teacher education programs cost more than they earn with unacceptable consequences for other academic work. The level of DEST funding will not support the level of preparation demanded by various Registration Boards but, even in a slightly more deregulated environment in terms of full fee places, we will have to remain competitive as graduate teachers' incomes are not significantly influenced by the status of the University or by market forces such as shortages in specific areas.

When accurately assessed, it is clear that the cost of school placements has escalated alarmingly as it becomes increasingly difficult to find suitable placements. This not only increases the cost of finding the placements but also means that only one or two students may be placed in particular schools thus increasing the visitation costs. We conservatively estimate the cost of placement for a one year Graduate Diploma student to be at least \$2500 per enrolment when one includes the administration of the placement, cost of teacher payments and academic staff time and travel costs for visits.

Many Faculties of Education now formally build the placement into the credit point structure of their degrees and diplomas but in general Monash Education does not do that. Thus, the secondary graduate diploma involves eight taught 6 point units plus 50 days of placement. This is not sustainable and is part of the reason that the Faculty is experiencing very high student staff ratios.

Undergraduate degrees require conservatively \$4000 in placement costs but this is spread over the whole enrolment. However, the double degree program provides the Faculty with a maximum of two years of load for a four year course so the proportional cost of placement is hardly any less. This also applies to the Gippsland primary BEd, which, for sound pedagogical reasons, requires students to take a considerable part (40%) of the course outside the Faculty.

**Plan** It is imperative that we grow certain program areas strategically to ensure that they have the critical mass of students required to support the number of staff and the level of facilities needed for a high quality program. In particular, BSOR needs to increase its size by some 40% if it is to be sustainable in the longer term. This recognition was the motivation for venturing into Singapore, but so far that has not proven the hoped for success.

**Eval** One challenge the Faculty faces is that it offers what is really an unsustainable number of units. There are some 335 units across the faculty, with 265 being taught in 2004 of which 212 are at the undergraduate/graduate diploma level. In 1994 the Faculty had 462 units (and 120 FTE staff) so that 335 units (with 92 staff) is a modest ratio reduction. However, these figures mask the fact that in 1994 campuses did not have units with common codes and names. Now there are a large number of cases where ostensibly the same unit is offered on different campuses, but is actually developed separately by staff on those campuses. Academic staff teach across five or more units each year, a problem that is not evident in student staff ratios. In addition, the administrative and print costs are out of proportion to the enrolments. Given the size of the Faculty, certain economies of scale ought to be possible but finding the right balance between autonomy, ownership and efficiency is proving elusive. In part the issue is that we support a very large number of specialisations, more than any other Victorian University and probably more than any in Australia. The Faculty must assess whether the number of specialisations is warranted or whether some more generalised curriculum units might take the place of some curriculum specific units.

**Eval** The Faculty should reconsider the structure and content of its suite of Initial Teacher Education programs. The goal should be to find a common structure that will introduce efficiencies without being experienced by staff and students as a straight-jacket and inhibitor to innovation and responsiveness to local student needs. We need to implement whatever efficiencies and economies are possible without a diminution in the richness and quality of the student experience. In short, like most universities we need to find innovative approaches to providing high quality and high demand teacher education at an affordable cost.

## Award courses at the at the postgraduate level (PG)

### i Course and unit profile (PG)

The developments that have taken place in the Faculty's offerings at the professional and postgraduate level over the past decade have been substantial. In 1994, the Faculty offered five Masters programs, in 2004 it offers 23 in addition to 33 postgraduate certificates and diplomas.

#### *Master of Education and postgraduate certificates and diplomas*

**Plan** In 1998, the Faculty made the shift from a 96 credit point Master of Education to a 72-credit point degree bringing the Faculty into alignment with the structures of many other programs around Australia. At that time, the Masters program was designed to have a series of pathways. With one exception, each pathway comprised a set of three nested qualifications, a postgraduate certificate of 24 points (two 12 point units), a postgraduate diploma of 48 point units, and a Masters of 72 points. The pathways are at present:

- General
- Bilingual/Immersion Education
- Early Childhood
- Gifted Education (postgraduate certificate/diploma only)
- Inclusive & Special Education
- Information and Communication Technology in Education
- International Education
- Leadership, Policy and Change
- Literacy Studies
- Mathematics and Science Education
- Music Education
- Work and Learning Studies
- School Leadership
- TEFL
- LOTE
- TESOL
- TESOL – International

**Eval** The introduction of these tagged pathways in the Master of Education degree has proved to be attractive to students. The articulation from Postgraduate Certificate has assisted some students to ease themselves into postgraduate study, to meet their need for further professional learning and to build their degrees around other responsibilities such as career and family commitments and to achieve their goals in a more measured and incremental way. While the Postgraduate Certificate can serve as a 'way in', the Postgraduate Diplomas are often used as a 'way out' for those who have enrolled in a Masters but for various reasons elect not to complete the full 72 points.

**Act** At the time of the last review, Masters level units were offered to reflect staff interests and a large number of units were developed and taught over the years, even when there were very small enrolments. By the late 1990s, it was clear the program of offerings was financially unsustainable and that rationalisation was required. The development of the pathways in the Masters degree resulted in some rethinking of the units on offer but these adjustments were not sufficient and in 2001 there were around 80 units being offered most years. A significant number would have very small enrolments, so small that up to 20 would be withdrawn at the last minute much to the chagrin of students enrolled in them. The various pathways were somewhat idiosyncratic in their structures, which made advising students quite difficult.

In 2001, the Faculty undertook another restructuring of the Masters of Education. In essence, each Masters pathways became available in three forms, structured to accommodate a range of students: those wishing to undertake a wholly coursework program (6 x 12 credit point units), those wishing to complete a professional project (12 credit points), and those wishing to complete a minor research thesis (24 credit points) enabling access to doctoral programs.

| Model 1                       | Model 2                       | Model 3                  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Research unit                 | Research unit                 | Research unit            |
| Faculty program elective      | Faculty program elective      | Faculty program elective |
| Specialist unit 1             | Specialist unit 1             | Specialist unit 1        |
| Specialist unit 2             | Specialist unit 2             | Specialist unit 2        |
| Specialist unit 3 or Elective | Specialist unit 3 or Elective | Research thesis          |
| Elective                      | Professional project          |                          |

There is a set of nine Faculty program electives common to all pathways although, in some pathways, a particular program unit is required (that is, it is not elective!). These nine units include some that are specialist units in other pathways. For the other electives, students can select any masters unit for which they have the prerequisites. The latter change gave students a wide range of options but at the same time enabled us to reduce the overall number of units offered. Units with large enrolments are offered each year and some each semester, but those with smaller enrolments are offered two years in three with the schedule advertised three years ahead. The reduction in the number of Master of Education units to 44 with around 35 offered in any year meant that class sizes increased somewhat, and the Faculty guaranteed to students that, barring exceptional circumstances, units advertised as being available would run, even if the numbers enrolling were small.

**Eval** This restructuring of the Master of Education course has been successful in enhancing the pedagogy, clarity and efficiency of our offerings. We have, however, had some difficulty in developing research units which are, on the one hand, appropriate to the various cohorts in our programs but, on the other hand, do not inadvertently prevent students from making a late decision to enrol in a research thesis. **[TR17]** Faculty members differ in their views of what is essential learning in this regard and we have, to be blunt, gone around in circles. Coming to a resolution of this matter is major priority for the remaining part of 2004.

Finally, in 2001 the Faculty introduced the Master of Education (Coursework and Thesis), which is a Higher Degree by Research and comprises two 12 point units of coursework (one a research methodology unit) and a 72 point thesis (40 000 words).

#### *Master of Psychology and postgraduate diploma*

The Faculty also offers postgraduate programs in Psychology. We offer the Postgraduate Diploma in Psychology jointly with the Department of Psychology in the Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences although they are the managing faculty. **[TR1]** Education also offers the Master of Psychology (Counselling) and Master of Psychology (Educational and Developmental) and the Master of Counselling. These courses complement rather than overlap the courses offered by the Department of Psychology.

#### *Related 'named' Masters degrees*

In addition, since 2002 the Faculty has offered a 72/48/24 point Master/Postgraduate Diploma/ Postgraduate Certificate in Organisational Leadership, a Master in Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers jointly with the Faculty of Arts **[TR1]** and a 48 point Master in Counselling and has recently added a 48 point Master in Mentoring and Coaching although we have not yet enrolled students in the latter. This semester, we commenced a cohort of 40 students in a new specially designed 48 point Master in School Leadership in response to a DE&T tender.

## **ii Flexibility, accessibility, location and modes of offering**

### *Location and modes of offering*

In 1994, postgraduate education at the Masters level was located at the Clayton campus in what was then the School of Graduate Studies. While the great majority of courses at this level still reside at Clayton, certain programs have become available more widely with staff from each campus contributing to the Masters level offerings. In 2003, we launched the Master in Organisational Leadership in Gippsland with the endorsement and support of the Gippsland Community Leadership Program. **[TR1, TR18]**

**Eval** The main inhibitor to expanding Masters courses at Peninsula and Gippsland has been attracting sufficient numbers in any particular field to those campuses to make a course viable, even a course with fixed units let alone one with an elective range. Even at Clayton class sizes are sometimes small, and the difficulties are exacerbated by location at the other campuses. The Masters pathway in early childhood, for example, is

actually taught at Clayton, even though all the staff teaching the specialist units are Peninsula based. The students and staff chose to have the evening classes at Clayton for the convenience of all involved.

A decade ago, all Masters courses were offered on campus, 'face to face' one evening a week, from 4.30 to 7.30. In the intervening years we offered a summer school in order to increase the study options for students but a university policy that summer school courses had to be fee paying made that non viable and we closed the summer offering.

**Act** The Faculty's commitment to making programs available in ways more in tune with the working lives of professionals, has led to an increase in the availability of courses through the off-campus and mixed modes of delivery. In 2000 and 2001 the Faculty offered just 8 courses through the off-campus, distance education mode. By 2002 that number had more than doubled to 17 and in 2003 and 2004 the number again significantly increased to 24 and 25 respectively. The majority of these off-campus courses were offered as tagged postgraduate certificates, diplomas and Masters degrees.

Both the Master in Counselling and the Master of Education (Leadership, Policy and Change) are now being offered in Singapore in partnership with TMC and APMI respectively, 74 students in all. Each course is taught using supported distance education materials as well as a twenty-hour block of intensive teaching in Singapore, and the Master in Counselling is also supported by local tutors.

#### *Flexibility and accessibility [TR18]*

**Impr** In addition, a number of pathways are offered to cohorts of students under contract or partnership arrangements and these may require special tailoring both of content and mode of delivery. We have for a number of years offered the School Leadership program through a sequence of intensive weekend workshops/seminars rather than weekly classes. We now also deliver courses to cohorts of staff of the VISY organisation involving site visits by academics to Sydney, Coolaroo, Laverton, Clayton and Melbourne to support student learning. Classes for VISY, Kangan and Box Hill TAFEs run on quite different timetables, involving a combination of intensive workshops, distance materials and ongoing contact.

**Act** Recently, the Faculty has changed its policy on admission to Masters courses to make it more consistent with University wide practice. Students with a three-year degree in a related area and a credit average in the final year can gain access to the Master of Education. Those with a degree in a related area must demonstrate considerable professional experience in a related area.

**Eval** The Faculty has in place mechanisms and procedures for the recognition of prior learning but they rely on labour intensive assessment of individual cases. There is some work to be done on aligning alternate entry requirements, recognition of RPL and credit arrangements and making transparent and efficient the processes for entry of candidates with non-traditional educational backgrounds. [TR11]

#### **iii The existing and potential student profile (PG)**

**Plan** Over recent years, the Faculty has been increasingly intent on diversifying its offerings in professional and postgraduate education and as a result has been successful in attracting new cohorts of students. While the Faculty sustains a strong commitment to the further professional learning of teachers and others in the Education sector, the traditional students in Education faculties, it has a broader view of education which embraces the need for human resource and organisational learning and development in a range of settings. This view is reflected in the vision statement on the Faculty's web page: "Our focus is learning and development - the learning and development of individuals of all ages, and of organisations and communities".

**Act** For example, in 2002 we introduced the Master in Organisational Leadership. It is identical in structure and broad content to the Master of Education (Leadership, Policy and Change) but caters to students who may not work in a formal education sector and/or may prefer a title less closely linked to those sectors. The Master of Education has been available as a HECS place or for full fees, while the Master in Organisational Leadership is only available as a full fee paying course.

**Eval** We have actively sought out cohorts of students through partnerships with various organisations. [TR1, TR18] For example, through a relationship with Victoria Police we now have over 100 police officers enrolled in either the Master of Education (Leadership, Policy and Change) or the Master in Organisational Leadership and around 10 in higher degrees (and two ongoing research projects). Similarly, a partnering

with three TAFE colleges, has led to 75 Masters students (and one research project – NCVER) in the Master of Education (Work and Learning). The VISY organisation has provided 20+ students for Organisational Leadership and we have recently reached an agreement to extend our programs with them (and to engage in research projects).

The leadership pathway offered in Singapore is very successful currently having 58 students. **[TR1]** To give an idea of the range of students who enrol in these courses, of one class of 47 students in Singapore, only 18 were from an education sector (4 principals, 11 teachers, polytechnic lecturer, university administrator, life education centre administrator), the other 29 include a business manager, volunteer services manager, engineer, civil defence officer, 8 Ministry of Defence bureaucrats, doctor, urban planner, engineer, systems analyst and museum administrator.

**Act** We have also diversified our intake for the Psychology program, developing a fee paying Master in Counselling course. The Master of Psychology is designed for psychologists whereas the Master in Counselling is designed for those who are not psychologists but who work in a range of professions such as human resources, health, social welfare and education and who wish to expand their counselling skill and their capacity to deal with human relationships.

Sixty percent (221) of the Faculty's 371 international students are in Masters coursework programs. They therefore comprise 27% of all postgraduate coursework students enrolled in the Faculty and 36 % of the FTE load. One third of these are enrolled offshore in Singapore with the remaining two thirds enrolled at Clayton. They have over 50 countries of origin.

#### iv Market attractiveness and student demand (PG) [TR1]

**Eval** The various postgraduate courses vary in the extent to which they attract students. Table 4 shows the EFT load in each Masters program. Organisational leadership, TESOL and Psychology/ Counselling show consistently strong enrolments. Not surprisingly, TESOL International is the strongest performer for onshore international students.

The Organisational Leadership and Work and Learning courses are proving particularly attractive to organisations. **[TR1, TR18]** The strong enrolments in these courses are largely a result of the formation of strategic relationships with Victoria Police, VISY, Box Hill TAFE and Kangan Batman TAFE each of which has arranged to enrol senior management staff in a program of professional learning that will result in a recognised Masters degree. The Faculty has also recently won a tender with the Victorian Department of Education and Training to deliver a Master in School Leadership to three successive cohorts of 40 aspiring school leaders.

Table 4 Load and enrolment in Masters courses, March 2004

|  | FTE LOAD | ENROLMENT |
|--|----------|-----------|
| M Ed (Leadership, Policy & Change)                         | 74       | 121       |
| M Organisational Leadership                                | 44       | 81        |
| M Ed (School Leadership)                                   | 3        | 7         |
| M ED (TESOL Int'l)   | 67       | 87        |
| M Ed (TESOL)   | 12       | 27        |
| M Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers                | 1        | 2         |
| M Psych (Counselling)                                      | 53       | 88        |
| M Psych (Education & Development)                          | 38       | 53        |
| M Psych  | 4        | 12        |
| M Counselling  | 32       | 58        |
| M Ed (General)   | 35       | 66        |
| M Ed (Work and Learning Studies)                           | 26       | 61        |
| M Ed (Inclusive & Special Education)                       | 18       | 40        |
| M Ed (Information & Communication Technology in Education) | 16       | 35        |
| M Ed (International Education)                             | 16       | 35        |
| M Ed (Early Childhood)                                     | 10       | 13        |
| M ED (Music Education)                                     | 10       | 22        |
| M Ed (Mathematics/Science)                                 | 8        | 14        |
| M Ed (Literacy Studies)                                    | 2        | 4         |

**Eval** Some of the pathways we offer at the Masters level have very small enrolments. In some cases (eg Early Childhood, Music) the pathway is new but we anticipate it growing. Others (eg Literacy studies, Mathematics/Science) have struggled for years to maintain enrolments. In the past we have relied upon advertising and marketing brochures to produce students. It is, however, becoming increasingly clear that any course that relies solely upon individual students coming to us via traditional advertising is destined to struggle for numbers. On the whole our successful programs have developed through extensive networking, relationship building and word of mouth. While dedicated general staff can and do play a major role in relationship building and marketing, they may not have access to the professional networks or the academic reputation that is central. The 'new' marketing needs to rely upon academic staff being involved directly, identifying potential student groups and developing and building upon their own networks and relationships. While in one sense, this is unfortunate in that it takes them away from their teaching and research, which are both their primary responsibilities and what they are most qualified to do, on the other hand, it can help to keep them 'grounded'. Apart from Music no other academic are has marketed their programs.

**v Professional standards & informed community requirements/expectations (PG) [TR1]**

The Faculty's psychology programs are designed for accreditation by the Australian Psychological Society (APS), which is the largest professional organization of psychologists in Australia. Accreditation by the APS is necessary if our graduates are to be able to use the qualifications to gain full registration as psychologists since their standards are the basis for recognition by the Psychologists' Registration Board of Victoria and the equivalent boards in the other States and Territories. Every five years the APS conducts a university wide investigation to ensure all its requirements are met. The requirements include properly credentialed staff; approved curriculum and unit availability; basic staff-student ratios; adequate resources including appropriate laboratory facilities; a wide range of psychological test materials for teaching and practice purposes; and a high standard of research project reports.

**Impr** Until 2004, the Faculty of Education offered a Postgraduate Diploma of Psychology, as did the Department of Psychology, each of us with a particular emphasis, ours being educational and developmental, and counselling. The Australian Psychological Society (APS), however, signalled that it was not prepared to accredit two such courses at the same university! As a result, the Faculty and the Department agreed to offer the course jointly, under the management of the Department. The Faculty's two Masters of Psychology courses were last accredited in 2003. The MPsych (Educational and Developmental) met all requirements while the M Psych (Counselling) was required to pay greater attention to issues of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy than it had previously. The biggest challenge for the Faculty is to ensure that APS requirements relating to the number of research students any one staff member can supervise can be met.

**Plan** The Australian Counselling Association does not at present accredit courses but has recognised the Master in Counselling as a training course. We are also on the list of courses recognised by the Singapore Counselling Association. In future the latter Association will formally accredit courses and we are in the process of preparing a submission to them.

Three of our Masters programs, the TESOL, LOTE and Inclusive and Special Education pathways have been designed also to provide a teacher education program with associated placements and are therefore subject to the state accreditation processes described earlier for teacher education.

Perhaps the best indicator that we meet informed community requirements and expectation is our capacity to attract public and private organisations that want us to educate their workforce and who are prepared to pay for it fully or subsidize and support it **[TS19]**. These include, for example, DE&T (School Leadership, LOTE, Mentoring and Coaching), Catholic Education (Inclusive and Special Education), various TAFES (Work and Learning), VISY (Organisational Leadership), Victoria Police (Organisational Leadership).

**vi Allocation of resources (PG) [TR5, TR6]**

**Eval** There are several significant human resource issues related to our postgraduate coursework programs.

Firstly, the Faculty now has well developed approaches to costing new initiatives but we are somewhat less well disciplined at controlling the amount of actual work undertaken. For example, in seeking to diversify our student base, the labour involved in tailoring a course to a particular specialist group may be significant but masked if staff spend more time in preparation or in providing that 'extra bit' of good will service than we have accommodated in the teaching and administrative load estimations used in costing. This has

predictable consequences in their degree of overwork and stress and/or in the time they can commit to their other research and collegial responsibilities.

Secondly, certain program areas are in considerable demand at present and are stretching our capacity to respond. Often a cohort will 'appear' at what is in the university environment a short time line and it is quite difficult to predict staff workloads in advance. When we have attracted a group of students as a result of the expertise of particular staff, it is not obvious that we can have it taught by others. On the one hand, we must take care to ensure that the Faculty does not over-extend itself without sufficient staff infrastructure to adequately develop and deliver high quality courses. On the other hand, the question of how much we can grow high demand areas with ongoing staff is constantly with us. Patterns of demand may well change!

Thirdly, many of our postgraduate coursework students enrol in a professional project. We have attempted to emphasise to students and staff that the professional project is not a mini research thesis and does not involve individual 'research' supervision but have had some difficulty convincing both groups of this leading, in some cases, to dissatisfaction by students when they do not get individual supervision and, in other cases, dissatisfaction by staff when they supervise each project separately with the resulting work overload.

Fourthly, all of our Postgraduate Diploma in Psychology and Master of Psychology students and a significant proportion of the other Masters students complete a substantial research thesis that does require supervision. With a staff of some 90 academics and 350 HDR students, this additional supervision load is almost impossible to resource. On the one hand, the allocation of teaching points to the thesis supervision is such that the enrolment does not pay for the supervision (particularly since these thesis attract no research quantum not being HDR enrolments). On the other hand, the allocation is insufficient to realistically cover the work required.

Fifthly, the distance versions of the Master of Psychology (Counselling) involves as much contact, taught in blocks, as the on campus versions, due to perceptions about what the APS demands. Previously this was partly accommodated by the fact that postgraduate psychology was weighted at 2.8 but under the new Commonwealth funding regime, this has dropped to 1.3. The cost of supervision cannot be sustained at this level of funding and nor can the student staff ratio demanded by the APS.

Sixthly, a high proportion of our international students are in coursework Masters programs and, although it is not normal practice to provide office space for coursework Masters students, this group of students need working space on campus. Many of our classes are held in the evenings and full time students need somewhere to work during the day. Also, many of our students are on scholarships. They do not have the funds to 'set themselves up' and need to use the IT resources of the Faculty. Finally, they are mostly undertaking a minor research thesis and need the same facilities as HDR students. We are finding this very difficult to accommodate but are trying to find ways. The planned refurbishment/ replacement of the Education Building at Clayton is expected to provide space for these students to work on campus, but since the Faculty will directly pay for all space, it will be an ongoing difficulty for us.

#### **vii Appropriateness and sustainability of postgraduate award courses [TR4]**

There are two aspects to the question of the sustainability of our postgraduates programs. The first relates to our capacity to sustain the growth of recent years in some program areas, and the second relates to our capacity to maintain those courses that have not grown or have declined in enrolments.

**Impr** With respect to the first, enrolment in our postgraduate programs began to decline during the late nineties reaching a low of 230 EFTSU in 2001. The decline was not as dramatic as it was in many universities because Monash continued to offer HECS places for the Master of Education degree, nevertheless, we experienced the effect of the general decline in the orientation of school sector educators towards studying for higher degrees. Three years later, in 2004, that load has more than doubled to 470. This is a result of the diversification of our student body, the increased flexibility and tailoring of our courses, and the development and nurturing of a range of partnerships and arrangements.

**Eval** Diversification and development have brought benefits to a Faculty which six years ago was predicting a severe decline in enrolments<sup>3</sup>. It has, however, come at a cost in terms of staff workloads and the complexity

---

<sup>3</sup> In 2000, total EFTSU was 1988 and the Faculty predicted load falling to 1915 in 2001 and 1907 in 2002. Instead it achieved 2095, 2224 and 2356 in 2001-3 and 2554 as of March 2004.

of their work and introduced a range of pressures that bring into question our capacity to sustain the pace of growth.

**Eval** With respect to the second, there are a number of courses that are not able to cover their cost mostly due to very small enrolments. In some cases, the specialist units in the pathway are popular amongst students in other pathways. Consequently, even were we to drop the course, we would want to maintain at least some of the units. So far the Faculty has taken the view that so long as unit enrolments are of a reasonable size, little is lost by offering the pathway. There is, however a considerable administrative burden in maintaining separate courses and, since the Faculty must seriously address the issue of workload across academic and general staff [TR5], we will have to consider whether it is appropriate to maintain separate pathways with very small enrolments or units with consistently small enrolments [TR4]. The Faculty has also attempted to become more flexible in its offerings and is committed to more units becoming available in flexible modes, however, a significant number of units are available in two modes with small enrolments in each, which also comes at a cost. Developing criteria that enable us to decide what should stay, what should go and what should grow is critical [TR9]. Clearly no Faculty expects all aspects of its operations to be self-sufficient and expects there to be cross subsidies. However, the subsidies should be transparent, widely agreed to and based upon principles about what we do and do not wish to support.

### Short course offerings

In keeping with a commitment to a broader view of professional education and lifelong learning, the Faculty offers a variety of short courses ranging from half-day workshops through to certificate level courses carrying credit towards further formal studies in education.

Students may undertake as professional development a short course that is equivalent to one of our units. If they participate but are not assessed they receive a certificate of attendance from the Faculty. If they complete the normal assessment for the unit they receive a certificate of completion. They can then gain credit for the unit should they later decide to enrol in a related award course.

Offerings vary from time to time but include, for example, leadership development, managing change, curriculum design, student welfare, special education, mathematics and science professional development, workplace training and development, teaching languages other than English (LOTE) and teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), and integration aide and teacher aide courses. The integration aide and teacher aide courses are our biggest programs. (See Appendix D [C40]) One interesting development in short courses is that, in collaboration with a TAFE provider, we now offer our students in award teacher education courses at Clayton the opportunity to take a Certificate IV in Assessment and Workplace Training, which enables them to teach in the VET sector as well as VCE programs.

Some of our short courses are marketed in conventional ways to individual students who approach as directly. At other times, a professional development course may be sponsored or subsidized by an employer, government or other organisation and delivered under contract. These include a considerable number of international cohorts who are resident for several weeks. For example, since 2002, we have provided programs for teacher education students from Hong Kong University who study a curriculum unit on the teaching of English while gaining an immersion language experience and visiting schools. Recently, they extended this program so that we also offer a course for advanced professionals. Recently, we won a tender with the Australia Japan Foundation to deliver short courses to Japanese Ministry personnel and teachers on integrated studies with a focus on Australian Studies. [TR19]

**9** The effectiveness of the Faculty's decision making and other processes and procedures for introducing, developing, revising and rationalising award and non-award courses to ensure effective use of resources (human, physical and financial), including where partnerships and other organisational relationships are involved.

**Eval** In general terms, the Faculty's decision making and other processes and procedures for introducing, developing, revising and rationalising award and non-award courses appear to be reasonably effective. Some are, however, more cumbersome than they need be and there is undoubtedly room for improvement in the processes for consultation between different portfolios, and for consultation within the Faculty on course development and review. [TR3] We propose to undertake a process mapping exercise in 2005, which

we had originally planned to do in 2004, but could not resource. This will seek to provide the optimal balance between quality and efficiency.

#### *Processes and procedures*

A change in University policy two years ago resulted in the devolution to faculties of many course approval processes. Faculties now take responsibility for ensuring adequate approval procedures for new courses and units and for the redevelopment of courses and units and advise the university's Education Committee. Where proposals may affect another Faculty, the Faculty of Education must advise the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic) of proposed developments indicating that consultation has occurred. Where courses will be offered offshore or are of strategic or policy significance in the university more broadly, the Faculty must forward proposals to the DVC (Academic) for approval.

The Curriculum Committee of the Faculty of Education is responsible for reviewing, documenting and recommending course and unit changes for forwarding through Executive Committee to the Faculty Board for approval. When these responsibilities were devolved to the Faculty, procedures were developed at short notice and essentially reproduced the processes previously used centrally although they have evolved somewhat over time.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that both general and academic staff are overburdened with the amount of compliance work and that the paper work involved in quite minor changes is out of proportion to its significance. Often what is required is obscure and it can act as an inhibitor to innovation and flexibility. In the Operational Plan 2005-7, the Faculty has committed itself to reducing paper work and compliance activities to exactly what is needed but no more to ensure transparency and consistency of decisions and quality of outcomes. In particular, we plan *"to review our suite of Faculty policies, procedures and course structures to identify and remove any unnecessary compliance and paperwork, inconsistencies, and unintended inhibitors to innovation and flexibility in teaching and assessment."*

#### *Decision making*

Some issues in relation to the Faculty's decision making about course and unit offerings were implicit in the comments under Term of Reference 8. We have suggested that we need to develop principles for determining course design to ensure course currency, quality and sustainability and for determining the balance between commonality and difference across campuses. We have also suggested that we develop principles for determining whether we should and should not maintain courses and units with small enrolments. These are each aspects of the broader issue of the extent to which our curriculum decisions are principled, systematic and fully informed.

**Eval** In the past some of our decisions were sometimes rather ad hoc. This is not to suggest that they were not thoughtful and taken seriously but rather that they were made with little reference to the broader picture of where the Faculty was going or wished to go, or in consideration of competing priorities or of the implications of decisions. For example, several years ago we decided to convert all 12 point undergraduate/graduate units to 6 point units. The decision was made without consideration of the cost involved in actually making the change or of the ongoing cost of teaching and administering twice as many units. Nor was the impact on student and staff workload considered. A consideration of these matters may not have necessarily changed the decision, but it may have influenced the time line and/or the resource allocation to the process.

Over the past several years, this situation has improved somewhat. Now, for example, all proposed curriculum changes are fully and realistically costed and this information is presented alongside the academic information. Proposals/decisions are presented to Executive Committee, which is expected also to consider the 'whole picture' before items are forwarded to the Board.

Feedback from Faculty staff suggest that many do not have a sense of where or how decisions are made in relation to the curriculum of the Faculty and even members of the Curriculum Committee feel that they do not have many opportunities to really discuss curriculum matters. The Associate Deans (Teaching) are also concerned that the committee is not able to deal with the very policy issues it was designed and constituted to engage with. Meetings of the Curriculum Committee are increasingly consumed by the minutia of course and unit approval matters.

If alternative more streamlined approaches for dealing with minor amendments to course and units were developed it would have the dual advantage of reducing the load on those producing the documentation and releasing Committee time to address matters of substance and policy. Having one committee to deal with all course matters across the Faculty is probably unrealistic and the Faculty should consider whether there

should not be two committees consistent with there being two Associate Deans, one for Undergraduate/graduate and the other for Postgraduate.

In addition, the role of Program Leaders in providing curriculum leadership for academics within the program area needs to be reaffirmed and communicated more widely. These are new positions (2003) and the Program Leaders are, in some cases, 'finding their feet'. The Program Leaders are, however, in a position to encourage, enable and vet proposals for change to courses and/or units, and to act as a voice for the staff working in the programs at Curriculum Committee level (as would be the elected staff member). There could be an increased expectation that some of the procedural checking of changes could be better handled by the Program Leaders before they are sent to the Associate Deans (Teaching) and on to the appropriate Curriculum Committee (UG/G or PG).

## STUDENTS, TEACHING, LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

- 12 The Faculty's success in producing the graduates it envisions considering:
- the student profile
  - equity objectives
  - student progress and achievement
  - the qualities and quality of graduates
  - graduate destinations.

The Faculty's Vision statement calls for "*graduates drawn from diverse communities who are capable, ethical citizens of the world, distinguished by their knowledge, intellectual engagement and professional skill, and their innovation and flexibility.*"

The Faculty's success in producing such graduates depends both on the student and the Faculty. The Faculty must attract students with a particular range of characteristics or qualities, it must provide an education that engenders or enhances the qualities or outcomes it values, and students must themselves engage and graduate.

### i The student profile

As Table 5 shows, and not surprisingly, the pattern of graduations in the Faculty broadly follows the pattern of enrolments provided in Table 1, allowing for course length (from six months to four years FTE) and different distributions of part-and full-time students in different courses.

Table 5: Graduation (completions) in the Faculty of Education 1994-2003

|                               | '94        | '96         | '98         | '00        | '02        | '03         |
|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| <b>Higher degree research</b> |            |             |             |            |            |             |
| Doctorate by research         | 16         | 28          | 23          | 21         | 26         | 17          |
| Masters by research           | 2          | 4           | 6           | 1          | 3          | 2           |
| <b>HDR total</b>              | <b>16</b>  | <b>32</b>   | <b>29</b>   | <b>22</b>  | <b>29</b>  | <b>19</b>   |
| <b>Postgrad coursework</b>    |            |             |             |            |            |             |
| Masters by coursew            | 191        | 373***      | 341***      | 174        | 157        | 196         |
| Bachelors grad entry          | 290        | 332         | 169         | 50         | -          | -           |
| Grad dip extend skills        | 42         | 68          | 11          | 29         | 6          | 3           |
| Graduate certificate          | -          | 1           | 1           | 5          | 10         | 21          |
| <b>Postgraduate total</b>     | <b>523</b> | <b>774</b>  | <b>522</b>  | <b>258</b> | <b>173</b> | <b>220</b>  |
| <b>Graduate coursework</b>    |            |             |             |            |            |             |
| Grad dip new skills           | 320        | 567         | 575         | 398        | 507        | 518         |
| <b>Graduate total</b>         | <b>320</b> | <b>567</b>  | <b>575</b>  | <b>451</b> | <b>507</b> | <b>518</b>  |
| <b>Undergraduate</b>          |            |             |             |            |            |             |
| Bachelors pass                | 93         | 108         | 165         | 166        | 277        | 287*        |
| Bachelors honours             | -          | -           | -           | -          | 4          | 10          |
| Diploma/Assoc Dip             | 39         | 12          | 2           | 1          | -          | -           |
| <b>Undergraduate total</b>    | <b>132</b> | <b>120</b>  | <b>167</b>  | <b>167</b> | <b>281</b> | <b>297</b>  |
| <b>Education Total</b>        | <b>991</b> | <b>1493</b> | <b>1293</b> | <b>940</b> | <b>986</b> | <b>1044</b> |

\* Five of these students were in the single BSOR degree, the rest in initial teacher education.

\*\* Drop in graduations in 1999 marks change from 3-year to 4-year Primary degree

\*\*\* This increase in graduation rates was due to the reduction of the Masters program from 96 points to 72 points resulting in earlier than anticipated graduation by students.

In 2003, our research degree graduations declined almost to its 1994 level although the previous year had been a little higher as we encouraged students to complete. We anticipate a growth this coming year as the Master of Education (Coursework and Thesis) students begin to graduate. We should maintain and indeed increase moderately the number we graduate with higher degrees by research in order to help address the sector wide issue of capacity building in the field of Education. [TR17]

**Act** Related to this is the rise and fall over the decade of graduations in the Master by Coursework. The Faculty of Education is addressing enrolment to an extent through its strategy of diversifying the student base both by drawing students from fields other than Education and by increasing the numbers of international students and we confidently expect numbers to return to their previous level in the medium term.

**Eval** We are pleased with these graduates we are beginning to produce, professionals who can bring their understanding of learning and development to their work in a range of cultures, settings and organisations. We are less pleased, however, that we are not producing many graduates for the profession in which our origins lie – that of teaching. Recently, we won a tender to deliver a Masters in School Leadership to three successive groups of 40 students and that will enhance our connections to, and reaffirm our commitment to, the school sector. However, those of our Masters courses that have the most to say to practising classroom teachers are the least well subscribed to. This may be due to the courses themselves — they may be more provider driven than they ought be. It may be that we do not promote and market them appropriately as suggested earlier. Or it may be something more systemic relating to the profession generally or even relating to the possibility that the higher education sector is now a less desirable career destination. It is probably a combination of all three. However, if we are to continue to make a contribution to our professional ‘heartland’ and to address the looming capacity problems in higher education, we do need to address this growing gap in our postgraduate profile.

Graduations in the Graduate Diploma in Education, having increased through the nineties dropped in the period 1999-2001 but this was offset by additional places for undergraduate entry (with a resulting lag in graduations). Over the past decade we have increased the number of teacher education graduates by 77% from 452 to 800. During the same period, there was a shift from a 1-year graduate diploma to undergraduate double degrees requiring 2 years of Education study, and there was a shift from 3-year to 4-year primary qualifications. Even allowing for the reduction in load to the Graduate entry Bachelors degree, which some teachers used to upgrade from 3- to 4-year qualified, there has been considerable growth in the overall load commitment to teacher education in a decade in which there was a decline in places in many institutions. In 1994, the total load for initial teacher education was 892 (of which 331 was GradDip). In 2004, it is 1876 (of which 630 is GradDip).

The student body generally is more diverse than it was five years ago. Our 300 International students come from over 50 countries. We have almost 100 police officers studying our courses. Our leadership, work and learning, and counselling programs attract students from diverse fields.

**Eval** The average age of students of the Faculty is 34 years. These are not school leavers! It is a nation wide phenomena that some 50% of students entering initial teacher education are mature age students and this is also true of Monash Education. Given the good achievement levels of these students and the indications that mature age entrants to teaching on average spend longer in the profession than school leavers, this is an advantage to the profession.

What is of concern, however, is the age profile of those enrolled in our higher degrees by research suggesting that we may not be producing the next generation of academics [TR16]. Over 44% of those in our doctoral programs are over 50 years of age and another 28% between 40 and 50 years. Many of our graduates justifiably see their higher degree as a culmination of their professional career and we applaud that. However, inevitably they will not have many active years to contribute to building a research trajectory, and possibly too few will be either willing or able to enter higher education as the next generation of academics. Those who have established professional careers often would have to take a drop in income to enter higher education at a level matching their research profile. Those who do enter will not have as many years to build their research and teaching profile.

The age profile of Education faculties in Australia bodes ill for the next decades unless we are able to educate a new generation of Education academics fairly quickly. It seems that we must find ways of

encouraging younger people within the education community to enter higher degrees and preferably full time.

## ii Equity objectives

The Faculty considers itself obliged to contribute to the formation of professions that reflect the range of attributes, backgrounds and experiences of the wider community. It seeks to broaden the social and cultural base of its student cohort and facilitate access to teaching by students from under-represented groups.

**Eval** Analysis of VTAC data provides information about demand for undergraduate programs by school leavers. Our applicants are from a range of schools, both government and non-government, and from a wide range of locations across Victoria. The percentage of enrolled students under 25 from low SES backgrounds has remained at around 22% for the past five years. While this compares favourably with the University figures (around 16%), we would like the figure to increase to the population proportion of 25%. That this percentage has remained steady, however, during a five year period in which ENTERS have risen substantially is positive. In other words, higher ENTERS have not been at the expense of access by low SES students. The percentage of students over 25 from low SES backgrounds is considerably lower and closer to the university figure of 12-13%. The explanation for this is that 85% of our students over 25 are in postgraduate and research courses and, while they may have initially come from low SES backgrounds, they are typically already employed in occupations that are not low SES. Only 10% of each of these groups is classed as low SES but, amongst over 25 year olds undertaking undergraduate degrees, 20% are low SES. Each year we enrol around 25 students into second year after they have successfully completed a transition Diploma of Foundation Studies at the Gippsland campus. This provides an alternative route for students with potential who, for various reasons, have not qualified for direct admission into first year. They complete two first year units in Education during the Diploma year. Across our courses, the success rate for low SES students is almost identical to that for all students. Some also take two BSOR units as electives.

The number of Indigenous students enrolled in Faculty programs increased from 5 in 2002 to 15 in 2003 and 2004, so that the proportion of indigenous students in the Faculty exactly matches the population proportion (and is almost double the university participation rate). However, given past history, the teaching profession needs considerably more indigenous teachers in schools and the Faculty is committed to increasing these numbers. During 2003, the Faculty offered five full fee indigenous scholarships and, working closely with Monash's Centre for Australian Indigenous Studies (CAIS), actively promoted these scholarships in schools and other community settings so that all were taken up -- all at Peninsula or Gippsland. Disconcertingly, this did not increase overall numbers for 2004, but with pipeline over a period of years it should. Across our courses, the success rate for indigenous students is almost identical to, and usually slightly higher, than that for all students.

Not surprisingly, 70% of the Faculty's enrolment is female and this applies also to higher degrees. Somewhat to our surprise, however, only 20% of our students come from rural backgrounds compared with population of 24%. Although this is only second to Nursing within the University, and the University figure is 12%, we would have expected higher. By contrast our attraction of isolated students is double the population average. The success of each of these groups is equivalent to the general population.

**Eval** Perhaps the most worrying and surprising statistic is that only 2.6% of our students come from non-English speaking backgrounds compared with a population percentage of 4%. We are increasingly attracting international students into our programs, but typically these students are postgraduates who will return home. In part this may be attributable to geography, since our campuses do not draw strongly on parts of the state with high proportions of NESB students. Nevertheless that we do not enrol local NESB students into our teacher education programs is disconcerting and it is not clear what sorts of strategies we should use to attract them into our programs although that we do so is important.

## iii Student progress and achievement

**Act** Over recent years there has been an increase in student retention to the extent that it has caused us difficulties in maintaining commencing load in some of our programs. For example, the Bachelor of Primary Education course at Peninsula has retention rates of well over 90% each year. The one course that causes us concern is the part-time off-campus Graduate Diploma in Education at the Gippsland campus where retention is quite variable but often hovers around 70-75%. In part this is a result of the nature of the cohort, in that many are attempting to make a career change while being in full time work and/or with childcare

commitments. Often they underestimate the extent of the time commitment required particularly but not only in relation to undertaking school placements. In response to this problem, during 2004 a member of our Student Services team at Gippsland has kept in ongoing email contact with students in the course and we believe that we are less likely to lose students this year. While we will not know this for sure until school placements begin, which is typically the time when students 'drop out', the indications so far are good. This instance apart, however, student retention is generally very good.

**Eval** Student progression rates<sup>4</sup> for Education, have improved steadily over recent years from 0.907 in 1999 to 0.947 in 2002. The progression rate for undergraduates is a little lower than for graduates, and postgraduates but still high, improving steadily from 0.896 to 0.938 in the same period. Our progressions rates (along with Law, Medicine, Art and Design and Pharmacy) are consistently above the University average, which varied between 0.862 and 0.885 in that period. Progression rates for the Gippsland campus are a little lower than at the other two campuses and this can be almost completely explained by the higher ratio of external students who historically have lower progress rates.

There has also been a steady downward trend in the numbers of students being asked to 'show cause' over the past five years across all campuses:

Table 6: Students asked to show cause in the Faculty of Education, 1999-2003

|              | 1999       | 2000      | 2001      | 2002      | 2003      |
|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Clayton      | 62         | 34        | 30        | 32        | 13        |
| Gippsland    | 48         | 42        | 39        | 21        | 23        |
| Peninsula    | 19         | 9         | 11        | 14        | 12        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>129</b> | <b>85</b> | <b>80</b> | <b>67</b> | <b>48</b> |

We attribute these improvements to a number of factors. At the commencement of each unit, all units are expected to provide a unit guide, which provides explicit and transparent guidelines to students on assessment matters, procedures for dealing with difficulties that may occur and their rights and responsibilities. **[TR10, TR14]** There are better processes and procedures which include identifying and counselling students 'at risk' mid-year, and we have a single Faculty-wide Academic Progress Committee which operates in, we believe, a much more consistent, fair and transparent way than the somewhat idiosyncratic processes that preceded it. **[TR4]** Finally, and possibly most significantly, the quality of students entering our courses has improved.

The consequence of the improved retention and progress is that we commence relatively fewer students but graduate more, in our view a much more satisfactory situation for the students themselves and for meeting our responsibilities to the profession and broader community. One of the challenges we face is persuading colleagues, governments, and local professional and community members of this latter point!

#### **iv The qualities and quality of graduates**

The Faculty has a long-term commitment to enhancing the quality of the education profession. The quality of *graduates* of Faculty programs is the significant issue and that will largely be dependent upon the learning experiences provided and exit standards set. It will, however, also be influenced by the standard of students at entry. This is reflected in the ENTER or GPA of applicants, but it also encompasses intellectual curiosity, the ability to communicate, sensitivity and a commitment to education.

##### *Entry levels of students*

The ENTERS and GPAs of those entering Education has improved steadily over recent years. The Faculty does not take the view that it should not admit students with lower ENTERS or GPAs and a range of equity measures are in place to take account of group disadvantage or individual circumstances (such as poverty, difficult family circumstance, or illness) which may have hindered applicants in demonstrating their potential to benefit from study at Monash. The Faculty, similarly, does not take the view that those with lower ENTERS will make less good teachers. However, it is good for the profession to have highly able students enter, and for it to be seen once again as a career of first choice for many capable students. (As suggested earlier, the higher ENTERS and GPAs now needed to access our courses do not appear to have been at the expense of equity groups or of the diversity of the student body but we must continue to monitor it.)

---

<sup>4</sup> A student who passes all subjects in a year has an SPU of 1, one who passes half the subjects has a SPU of 0.5, and so on. Withdrawals and failures are treated alike.

### *Employers' views of graduates*

In 2003, Monash University carried out a survey of employers [MES 2003]. Some 70 employers of Education students were surveyed. The data suggested that they were generally well satisfied with graduates from Monash, describing them particularly as having good interpersonal skills, working well in teams and being able to learn new skills. They commented on students being professional, competent, well skilled and enthusiastic, able to develop professional knowledge, understand professional ethics and understand different viewpoints. These qualities resonate with our vision of our graduates.

- Eval** Employers did not suggest, however, that our graduates stood out or were 'distinguished' in any particular ways nor that they were innovative or exhibited the capacity to work in an international or multicultural context. Since these are qualities we hold particularly important, we will need to consider our curriculum and pedagogy in light of this feedback.

With regard to being distinctive or innovative, the review of the teacher education program in particular will consider ways to ensure opportunities for students to develop their capacity to be creative and innovative amidst the constraints of school structures and systems.

With regard to the capacity to work in international or multicultural contexts, the Faculty is committed to graduates being 'students of the world' and able to educate the next generation in all that this means. One aspect of this is to ensure that students have experienced countries and cultures different from their own. Each year a group of students travels to the Cook Islands to undertake a school placement, and two years ago a group travelled to London for a placement supported by scholarships which the Faculty obtained from Timeplan, a private organisation that places teachers. In addition, each year a group of students travels to Europe to study European music. These experiences are universally regarded as valuable but at this stage only just over 3% of our students have an overseas experience as part of their program. In part the difficulty is that the majority of our undergraduate programs are double degrees and all involve extensive placement and finding space for a 'semester abroad' is challenging. Many of our other programs are very intensive (the Grad Dip) or largely involve part time students in full time employment.

The Faculty has, however, plans to extend the opportunities for overseas placement and is considering the possibilities inherent in our overseas campuses, and through partnerships with Universities overseas. In addition, at the postgraduate level, we have recently signed a memorandum of agreement with the University of Jyväskylä in Finland which will involve international collaboration on research training and teaching including exchanges of students.

### *Graduate attributes*

- Eval** We have other feedback from employers that they hold our programs in high regard, and we are increasingly sought out by organisations interested in engaging their employees in our award courses. However, we do not require our courses to attend to graduate attributes explicitly or assess them directly. We have, however, audited courses to determine whether the attributes are attended to. We are not convinced that out of context assessment of 'graduate attributes' is particularly helpful, but we do consider it remiss of us not to have assured that they are systematically embedded in our courses and that we should address this as part of a process of reviewing our teacher education programs in particular.

## **v Graduate destinations**

Employment rates for Monash Education students are very good. Some 95% of our undergraduates are in full time employment four months after graduation and the Good Universities Guide rates graduates chances of employment as 'better' (than average). At Clayton and Peninsula, the placement officers keep an informal record of where the graduates of the BEd and GradDip gain positions, but we do not systematically collect data about the particular destinations of the range of our students. Perhaps we should consider doing so.

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 13 | The appropriateness and quality of the curriculum and pedagogy of courses and units (including placements and fieldwork) in relation to the existing and potential student profile and the Faculty's vision for teaching and learning and research training, and the effectiveness of processes and procedures for course and unit development and review. |
|----|--|

## i Feedback on courses and units

The Faculty recognises graduate satisfaction with its programs and the employability of graduates as significant indicators of the quality of its programs. We have reported earlier on employers' views and on graduate destination data.

### *Feedback from students on award courses*

**Eval** The results of the DEST Course Evaluation Questionnaire (completed in April of the year following graduation from undergraduate programs, so 2003 data is for 2002 graduates) show improvement over the period from 1999 to 2003. Amongst the 2002 graduates, 87% were satisfied with generic skills development and 84% with their course as a whole. Disconcertingly, for a Faculty that teaches teaching, students are less satisfied with the teaching they receive although this has improved considerably over recent years from only 68% of students graduating in 1998 satisfied with the teaching to over 77% of graduates of 2001 and 2002 satisfied. The 2003 Monash Experience Questionnaire [MEQ, 2003] for current students painted a similar but somewhat more positive picture on the same scales with 89% of students satisfied with generic skills development, 88% with the course as a whole and 85% satisfied with the teaching they received. Their descriptions of the teaching aspects of their Monash experience suggested that they considered staff to be friendly and approachable and as providing an intellectually rigorous program with opportunities for discussion and engagement. The same data, however, suggests two particular areas of concern for students, one pedagogical and one administrative: the lack of timely and informative feedback on their assigned work [TR14] and the organization and management of school placements. [TR7] The former will be considered under Term of Reference 14, the latter will be addressed below.

As a part of our self-review, the Faculty made an electronic call for comment 'Have Your Say' which was circulated during June 2004 through Monash Memo, through a global Monash-wide email and through the Alumni Office (Electronic Survey 2004, Report available). People could respond to an electronic survey, or send an email. The great majority of the 216 respondents to the electronic survey were alumni, one indicated he was a student 30 years ago. Comments were broadly similar to those above. Large proportions highly rated the quality of the courses offered (71.0%), learning environment (67.1%), teaching activities (64.3%), and information and communication processes (59.9%). Small proportions of students expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of the learning environment (4.7%), courses offered (6.1%) and research activities (6.7%). A slightly larger proportion was dissatisfied with information and communication processes (14.0%) and teaching activities (11.4%) than with other aspects of the Faculty's educational program.

**Eval** Also recently we held a forum of fourth year students in our double degree programs at Clayton campus, in which we asked them about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and the innovations they believed we should try. Interestingly, a major concern for these students was that they wanted to be able to 'bond' as Education students earlier in their course. They also had concerns about the extent to which their more developed skills were acknowledged when they shared classes with Graduate Diploma students. Finally, they also had some advice to offer of the way the placement operated. In particular they noted that many students were placed in several government schools or several private schools, and they wanted us to better monitor this across their whole course so that a mix of school types was experienced by as many students as possible.

### *Feedback from students on units*

**Eval** It is the Faculty's expectation that unit coordinators obtain student feedback on their units on a regular basis. The Faculty has developed a student survey for units in collaboration with CHEQ, the Centre for Higher Education Quality. It includes 20 items covering content and objectives, teaching methods, assessment procedures, student workload and study behaviour, evaluation mechanisms, expertise of the teaching staff. Staff may include five of their own items to customise the questionnaire for their units. The questionnaire template invites students to use the reverse side of the form to provide written comments should they wish to give additional feedback.

There is a three-year cycle in place over which every unit must obtain student feedback. The uptake was originally slow but, at the end of 2003, 210 or 64% of active units had been reviewed by students and the current rate of unit reviews is quite high (almost all scheduled in Semester 1 complied). Feedback from these evaluations has been distributed to staff so that they can plan and implement strategies to strengthen the unit, as part of the improvement phase of the quality cycle. The remaining units are being surveyed in semester 2, 2004, and the cycle will be repeated in 2005-7. We are currently considering alternative sources of feedback on our units including on-line surveys.

**Act** Although individual reports are available to unit coordinators, summary reports for the whole Faculty or subsets of it cannot readily be produced at present, a matter to which we must attend. The Associate Deans Teaching, or Program Leaders, however, read all reports. Trends emerging from the student evaluations suggest that they are generally satisfied with the units they study and the teaching methods adopted. There are examples of outstanding evaluations from students and it will be necessary to build in ways of recognising such efforts. There is some concern from students over the quality and quantity of feedback they received, and its timeliness and the opportunities they have for offering feedback during their units. There was also concern over workloads in some units, particularly at the Peninsula campus. A review of the Graduate Diploma in Education (Primary) also highlighted this problem and units have been restructured to bring the workload requirements of these units in line with University and Faculty expectations. It is more difficult to obtain student feedback from students studying in DE mode. However, feedback from these students is consistent with that above. In addition, however, they express concern about the quality of the print materials.

In addition, Monash has available Monquest surveys through which staff can gather student feedback on their teaching (lecturing, seminars, assessment, practical classes, etc). Staff cannot be required to collect Monquest data, and so we do not have comprehensive data available of the quality of the teaching of individuals. However, each year CHEQ publishes comparative data by Faculty of those who do participate (a summary is provided in Appendix E [C41]). While it is certainly the case that lecturers are self selected, this is true of all faculties and Education participates in Monquest surveys to a similar extent to other faculties.

These data suggest that students in Education units are consistently happier with their experiences than students across the university as a whole. In Semester 1, 2003, for example, of 23 items on lecturing, Education was the top ranked faculty on 14 items, equal top on six, and second or third on the remaining three. In 2002 (latest summaries available), the surveys on seminar teaching showed a similar pattern. Only three faculties were reported on in this category (Arts, Business and Economics, Education) due to sample size, but Education ranked top on all but one of the 27 items, that one being "I did preparatory work or study for each seminar".

#### *Unit evaluations*

**Impr** In addition to collecting feedback from students on every unit over the past three years, staff have been encouraged to collect other forms of review data such as peer review. Those that do, could get a teaching load allocation for revising their unit. From 2005, staff will be required at least every five years to undertake a proper review of each unit which involves four major data sources: students, academic peers, educational advisors and the teachers of the unit through self-review. However, the Faculty expects that staff will do this in alignment with the collection of student data every three years. Guidelines are provided about the kinds of data one might collect. For example peer review may involve:

- sending course documentation to a colleague in the field (at Monash University or another university here or overseas) for comment
- presenting a seminar at a course, program, faculty level or at a conference
- documenting practice for presentation at a planning meeting (eg. Application of problem-based learning in EDFxxxx)
- documenting practice in a professional forum eg within a teacher education or psychology forum
- team teaching with a colleague and documenting each others' practice
- inviting a colleague into your class as a critical friend
- inviting colleagues to exhibitions of your students' work eg. Drama performances, art exhibitions, debates, student conferences, etc.

#### *Feedback on non-award short courses (equivalent to 'units')*

The Faculty of Education operates an extensive and complex program of short courses. These short courses are designed for particular markets with each program evaluated and a report provided to the stakeholders. For example, international professional development programs are evaluated in terms of the contractual arrangements entered into with the stakeholders concerned. Similarly domestic short courses in leadership development are evaluated to meet the requirements of the contractor, the Department Education and Training (DE&T). As a result, the evaluation of short courses has tended to be separate from the evaluation program instituted for award courses, which are aligned with university timetables, schedules and practices of evaluation.

**Act** As a consequence the university evaluation approaches cannot easily be applied to short courses and so a reasonably ad hoc approach to evaluating short courses existed prior to 2001. However, a dramatic growth

in international short courses from 2002 to 2004 (prior to 2001 three international short courses were run and from 2002 to 2004 over 20 short courses have proceeded) has led to the development of a far more systematic approach to the evaluation of programs. This has resulted in the implementation of a rigorous evaluation system for all short courses (examples available) [TR20].

A feature of these evaluations is that they are far more rigorous in interpreting the quality of the teaching and learning experience of the participants than the evaluation processes currently used for award courses. This is in part due to the contractual imperative to immediately review programs and make changes to the program prior to the next delivery. A recent example of this process is the Australia Japan Foundation PD program where a 54 page report identified issues for improvement and examples of excellence. This evaluation led to an improvement in many aspects of the program's delivery and a significant strengthening of the relationship between the contractor (the Australia Japan Foundation) and the Faculty.

## ii Delivery quality standards for courses and units

### *Technical quality/delivery of units and unit materials*

**Impr** To ensure that students are provided with appropriate unit advice [TR10] and to enhance the professionalism of our print materials, the Faculty has developed a Unit Guide template to which unit coordinators have progressively converted their units. The guide is provided to all students at the beginning of each unit and is available in print and generally on-line (electronically). Feedback from students has been very encouraging and, importantly, there has been a marked decrease in the number of grievances (appeals) from students about assessment since the standard Unit Guides were developed.

In addition, all unit coordinators are required to submit a copy of their unit guide to each campus and also to the Faculty centrally. This practice ensures ready availability to all staff, the requirements and information relating to each unit taught in the Faculty. It also ensures that relief staff or staff having to suddenly take on a unit have access to critical information about the unit. As part of the Socio-technical Systems Project, the Faculty is developing a web-based process for automatic updating of all unit guides to ensure consistency and currency of standard advice. [TR10]

The Faculty has also developed policies and guidelines for the preparation of units and unit materials that describe what students have a right to expect by way of tuition (whether they are studying on or off campus), and what sorts of print and other resources should be provided. They also provide advice about the support available, the timelines and they summarise relevant policies such as those relating to assessment. They are published on the staff website and link to other websites relevant to the preparation of a unit: <http://insite.education.monash.edu.au/curriculum/unitPlanning/preparingYourUnitGuide.shtml>

Finally, the Faculty has introduced an audit process for units to complement the lodging of the unit guides. Data about pre-requisites, staffing, placement requirements, unit objectives, on-line material status is collected, and so on, as well as a documented trail of amendments to each unit. This data is used to help identify areas that need improvement in the more technical aspects of the delivery of units. As part of the audit, the link between the unit objectives as approved by the Faculty and assessment in each unit is reviewed. Where there are inconsistencies, unit coordinators are expected to revise one or the other or both to bring them into alignment. This audit information can be viewed on the Website and is also part of the University's database for the development of published handbooks (CUPID database). We need to strengthen and investigate the use of CUPID as a tool for the above.

### *Distance and flexible delivery*

**Eval** Two years ago the Faculty restructured the secondary Graduate Diploma to increase consistency between the on campus version at Clayton and the off campus version at Gippsland, to produce economies in unit development and to provide students at each campus with flexible and mixed delivery modes and a full suite of specialisations without requiring staff expertise in every specialisation at each campus. This meant that many Clayton based staff were suddenly expected to produce distance versions of units they had previously taught only face to face. Similarly, our offshore developments have required staff, who had never done so before, to develop distance materials. In retrospect, it is clear that we underestimated what was required to make the transition.

Until recently a relatively small minority of academic staff at the Clayton or Peninsula campuses has been involved in distance and/or on-line delivery and the instructional design issues are often new to them. Many staff members have not understood the difference in genre between notes you provide to complement face-to-face teaching and the teaching that must be provided for distance delivery whether print based or on-line. They are now beginning to recognise the level of resources required, the time involved in preparing them,

and the significance of meeting timelines so that off campus students can receive their units in time. Although Gippsland has a long history with distance pedagogy, there has also been a significant staff turn over and many there are also inexperienced in this area. Even those who do understand the genre of distance print materials, may not necessarily have the same level of expertise with e-learning.

**Impr** To improve this situation, the Faculty produced a guide for staff preparing their distance education units and negotiated with the Centre for Learning and Teaching from within the University to run a number of workshops to assist staff in curriculum design for distance delivery. These workshops have been of limited value, while the guide has been of great assistance to staff.

**Act** Dedicated time for academic and general staff development is planned to ensure that sufficient high quality 'tuition' is provided for students studying in modes other than regular on campus face-to-face classes, that the pedagogies adopted are innovative, excellent and appropriate to adult learning whether at a distance, in intensive blocks or on-line, and that all learning resources are of a high professional standard. In 2004, we participated in a major pilot project involving 30 staff across all three campuses in the development of units using WebCT Vista. The units will begin to roll out in 2005. Participants are working in professional learning teams so that support is available as they move through the program, facilitated by the Coordinator of Flexible Learning and by the University's Centre for Learning and Teaching Support (CeLTS).

#### *Placements for teacher education*

**Eval** The management of placements has improved over the past several years. Still, we are sensitive to the feedback from MEQ: 2003 and from forums of students that there are problems. When placements are found just before the school experience is to begin or are changed at the last minute, the student and the school are less well positioned to prepare for the placement. The reality, however, is that there are too few schools and teachers who want to take the numbers of students we need to place. Students are individually placed to suit their areas of specialisation, the level at which they will teach and, where possible, their circumstances, and to provide a variety of contexts and levels. We make several thousand placements a year, and 80% of them are placed reasonably efficiently but the additional 20% take as much time as the 80%. It is not an exaggeration to say that placement officers could spend up to a day and possibly contact ten or so schools to place a single student in some specialisations.

**Impr** We are constantly searching for ways to better manage the process and are developing improved software and processes to assist with the placements and communication about placements. This work has begun and we anticipate the new software will be ready for 2005. The Faculty undertook a review of possible school placement models in 2003 and looked at other models of professional practice such as social work and medicine. Some further work is continuing in this area and the models of school placements within the Faculty will continue to evolve. Continuing efforts are made to create good working partnerships with schools and there are many opportunities for stakeholders to participate in parts of the teacher education program such as through principal 'mock' interviews, guest lecturing, secondments and so on.

### **iii Curriculum and pedagogy**

**Eval** Our vision is of "*graduates ...who are capable, ethical citizens of the world, distinguished by their knowledge, intellectual engagement and professional skill, and their innovation and flexibility.*" Feedback from students and staff and indeed from our own reflections, suggest that we do well on some of these qualities but not on others and we do not systematically build the development of these qualities into our curriculum. In general, the feedback we receive suggests that our courses are 'solid' but perhaps somewhat conservative, not particularly innovative, forward looking or distinctive and that perhaps our graduates reflect just that. This suggests to us that we should take a systematic approach to reviewing our courses, which is driven by some agreed understandings about what we expect them to achieve and which demonstrate fidelity with the research-teaching nexus that we believe to be the essence of a university education.

The rhetoric of the Faculty is to equip its graduates for the long term; for teaching, counselling and other forms of professional work in their own local and national settings as well as internationally; and for teaching and human development in a wide range of formal and informal settings. Its curriculum must, therefore, be at the cutting edge of thinking in the field: innovative, internationally oriented and broadly focussed but in ways that acknowledge and support differences between people, and the specificity of local circumstances and professional practices. We have already identified instances of excellent practice in this domain and snapshots of what certain academics are already achieving will be shared with the University and the Faculty.

**Impr** The Faculty should extend its support to general and academic staff to increase their professional knowledge, skills and orientations for internationalisation of the curriculum and for providing learning experiences and support services which resonate with students' diverse backgrounds and professional spheres of activity. **[TR3]**

**Eval** It is not unreasonable to expect a Faculty of Education to model exemplary adult teaching practice for its own students and for the University as a whole and one of the roles of the Faculty's planned research groupings will be to help realise the benefits of the research-teaching nexus, to ensure that our programs reflect and inform best practice, and that our research is informed by our practice. **[TR16]** Although some of our pedagogy could do with 're-freshing', the pedagogy adopted in some units is outstanding and clearly leading practice (and also leading to excellent publications). **[TR15]** We need, however, to find better ways to share this knowledge amongst ourselves and hence to extend its reach.

For some staff researching their own practice in teacher education is their major research agenda, with seven of these, representing all three campuses, presenting papers at the recent Australian Teacher Education Association conference. However, we can do better at building a culture of research on our curriculum and pedagogy and the recently formed research grouping, "Professional Learning" should provide a critical mass of staff that will enable such a research culture to be further developed. **[TR16]**

**Impr** We will need to continue to prioritise professional development relating to the pedagogical practices and implications of flexible delivery, student diversity and globalisation for both curriculum and assessment. We will also need to continue to invest in support staff with web, e-learning and desktop publishing skills and professional development for existing general staff. With academic staff, we should focus particularly on three areas of quality teaching and learning. They are, firstly, the pedagogy of distance and/or on line 'delivery', secondly, recognising and addressing diversity and difference, and, thirdly, assessment and feedback (including also professional and academic conduct).

14 The appropriateness of information and feedback to students, considering such matters as:  
— the Faculty's commitment to academic excellence and consistency of standards  
— the alignment of assessment processes and tasks with course and unit objectives  
— the quality and timeliness of feedback  
— complaints and grievances  
and the effectiveness of processes and procedures for monitoring, maintaining and developing consistently good practice in this regard.

#### **i Academic excellence and consistency of standards**

The Faculty is committed to excellence and consistently high standards. The Associate Deans Teaching chair the Board of Examiners on each campus, and this plays an important role in the maintenance of consistency of standards. The Faculty does not generally support normative assessment and we have not consistently analysed grade distributions. Recently, however, there has been some concern expressed at the variation in grade distributions for units and consequently for courses. The question has also been raised of whether we pay enough systematic attention to moderation of results between tutors in large units and between the same unit taught on separate campuses. We are, therefore, considering whether the Board of Examiners process needs reviewing in order to enable it to take a more active role in ensuring consistency of standards within and between units, across courses and campuses.

On a related matter, one of the ways we ensure the maintenance of standards is through the external examination of research theses. Three years ago we were experiencing quite a number of cases where examiners reports on 24 point Masters theses were quite variable. As a result, the Faculty developed a set of guidelines that made clear what the expectations should be for that level of theses, and for criteria for assessment. There has been a marked change in the consistency of reports since the guidelines were developed. **[TR17]**

We have recently had to deal with a spate of plagiarism problems. While our cases of plagiarism have often been of the 'old fashioned' kind, the growth of the internet and the increasing accessibility of digital information has blurred the edges of what is 'common property' and what must be sourced, acknowledged and cited. It seems that there may also be cultural differences about meaning of the use of the work of others. Whatever the cause, the incidences of detected plagiarism have grown considerably over the last two years and, although the issue is not peculiar to the Faculty of Education, the question of invigilated assessment is increasingly being discussed within the Faculty.

**Act** University procedures require that whenever any situation that might involve cheating, copying or plagiarism in raised the students involved must be counselled in regard to the nature of cheating, copying and plagiarism even if there is no conclusion of guilt. This counselling must be registered, with no presumption of guilt, in a register that also contains all examples of situations where there has been a conclusion of culpability. Staff are required to consult the holder of the register when new cases occur, in order to determine whether the student has previously been involved in problematic behaviour or counselled. This procedure has worked well in alerting students to the requirements of the conventions of academic writing and acknowledgment of intellectual property.

However, we believe that an educational program is needed and we plan to develop a program for both staff and students that addresses the contextual and cultural issues involved in the ways we acknowledge and respect the contribution and work of others.

Finally, the Faculty's commitment to academic excellence and consistency of standards has led it to take very seriously the matter of language support for international students [TR7] since for many international students, their capacity to demonstrate the results of their learning is considerably inhibited by language related difficulties. While support is provided to the Faculty, pro-rata to international enrolment, the Faculty supplements this considerably.

**Act** Academic language and skills teaching/training/advice is provided to both international and 'local' postgraduate students by the Faculty's International Unit [TR17]. This service is provided through workshops, small study groups and intensive 1:1 teaching with individual students. International Unit staff who provide Faculty academic advising services have reviewed teaching models and have proposed, in consultation and collaboration with individual lecturing staff:

- introducing a Research Thesis Writing workshop program – small group workshops continuing throughout semester focusing on questions of language, structure, voice and critique in research writing
- expanding Thesis Writing Groups – small groups that focus on issues in the development of the Minor Thesis (includes Ethics applications)
- expanding Study Groups – small group sessions that focus on individual course readings, assignments and group oral presentations. These groups have been very successful.
- expanding sessions on assessment tasks within units. These sessions include a focus on the linguistic and rhetorical structures of course readings and course assignments, as decided in consultation with the course lecturer /coordinator.
- continuing intensive 1:1 advising as time and staffing permit
- introducing regular staff and student focus sessions on issues such as assessment, plagiarism and research project writing processes. These would provide a forum for discussion and clarification of what could be considered plagiarism (under university policy), cross-cultural issues related to this and to writing and doing research/being a researcher/ being positioned as a student researcher.
- continuing academic advice related to international (and local) students' studies and consultation on pastoral care needs.

## **ii Alignment of assessment with objectives**

Every unit has been audited and data has been collected about their compliance with Faculty and University guidelines on assessment, privacy, copyright and plagiarism, and consistency of assessment with objectives and advice in handbooks. As suggested earlier, where inconsistencies or non-compliance was found, staff were asked to make the necessary changes.

## **iii The quality and timeliness of feedback**

The Faculty is highly sensitive to the problems of assignment turn around times and the detail and quality of feedback.

**Eval** Data from unit evaluations and MEQ all highlight the need to focus on the quality of feedback provided to students so that it is constructive, timely and meaningful. Students are taught about high quality assessment practices within the teacher education programs, however, in student feedback they note that there is inconsistency between what the Faculty advocates and what the Faculty does. The timing and quality of feedback is not always helpful to students so that they can improve their work before the next assessment task submission date.

These problems have been exacerbated by escalating workload and complexity but, whatever the cause, we must address the problem. Our data on turn around times is anecdotal at present and we plan to investigate a mechanism for monitoring turn around times and using it to inform the PMS process. [TR3]

A series of workshops on improving assessment has commenced – with the first held at Clayton, and planned workshops for Gippsland and Peninsula beginning later in second semester, 2004. The focus is on sharing quality practice and on building better assessment processes into our units, particularly providing higher quality and more timely feedback. We plan to use more of the Teaching/Research time-slots on Wednesdays to work on our assessment practices as we are aware that students' assessment experiences are critical in determining the quality of their learning — and also that we should be modelling the latest innovations, such as clear rubrics. The following are under consideration and some are beginning to be implemented:

- designing and implementing transparent assessment criteria and, where appropriate, accompanying rubrics;
- adjusting the Unit Guide template to incorporate an expectation that all assessment tasks will have explicit criteria provided;
- assisting staff develop a broader repertoire of assessment tasks that model quality assessment practices;
- further trialling of innovative assessment, like the problem-based learning processes already developed at Peninsula;
- designing self- and peer-assessments so that high quality formative feedback can be given;
- improving the timeliness of feedback by more careful planning of the number of assessment tasks (minimising busy tasks and over-assessment), when assessment tasks are due (particularly in relation to the teaching blocks), and in what form the best feedback can be provided; generating feedback pro-forma – some in e-versions – that can provide explicit feedback that students can use for ongoing improvement in their learning;
- assessing group work and oral presentations in more consistent ways; developing mechanisms for improving inter-rater reliability when more than that staff member works in a unit (i.e. moderation tactics);
- raising awareness of how raw scores, indicative grades and final marks and grades can be more transparently managed;
- designing assessment tasks that minimise opportunities for plagiarism, and procedures for detecting it when it occurs;
- monitoring the distribution of grades between staff members teaching in a single unit and also across units and courses to build in a level of moderation and consistency in our programs.

This work is an ongoing professional learning exercise and more workshops are planned, drawing on the recent reports on improving assessment in higher education conducted in Australia and the United Kingdom. Initially the work is development and educative, but it ought become an accountability issue through the Performance Management Scheme after a learning period of one or two years.

This will need to be an ongoing priority and will require some professional development for staff to reconceptualise how they provide students with feedback and how students are assessed.

#### **iv Complaints and grievances**

Informal complaints are dealt with in an ad hoc manor. They come to a variety of sources — lecturers, course coordinators, program leaders, the Dean and senior members of the General staff. Generally they are resolved via discussion or referral to another person in the faculty or to a group such as the University Counselling Service. There is no documented process for dealing with these issues and therefore the resolution of complaints does not always follow consistent practice. Some staff have also indicated that they do not know how to handle complaints or where to refer them. We have concluded that the Faculty needs to establish a complaint handling procedure.

Formal Complaints are handled through the provisions of the University's Student Academic and Administrative Grievance Procedures (Ref – Secretariat: Policy Bank). Academic Grievances are handled at the Faculty level while administrative grievances are handled at the University level. The resolution process proceeds through a number of stages – discussion with the lecturer, then to discussion with the Program Leader then to mediation led by a senior member of the Faculty's academic staff and, if no resolution is found at the earlier stages, the matter proceeds to a formal Grievance Committee hearing.

## CONCLUSIONS

The Faculty is committed to *“advancing the public interest through high quality, innovative and ethical ... teaching that takes seriously the complexity of the local and global horizons of a public university.”*

This review suggests that the quality of our curriculum and teaching, and of our graduates, is generally good and often very good but not that it is outstanding, distinctive or exciting. There are pockets of excellence and innovation, that are clearly leading practice, an increasing understanding of the implications of internationalisation and diversity, and an increasing level of professionalism in our curriculum materials. But there are also areas that are in need of improvement, particularly in relation to our assessment practices and our distance provision.

We have implemented course and unit reviews and audits of curriculum materials, and collect data on students' views of our courses and our units. Feedback suggests that our graduates are generally well regarded and well satisfied. We do not, however, have policies or processes in place to ensure the regular systematic feedback on teaching in award units at the level of individual teachers (although we do for non-award course). Nor do we have robust processes in place to ensure that assurance and enhancement of the quality of our teaching is integral to performance management processes.

Our rhetoric is to encourage a culture of innovation and review, but we do not always support it and some of our processes and practices may even inhibit it. The means through which we manage load and class sizes and allocate teaching load may also make innovation and flexibility more difficult.

Some staff who are interested in renewal and change, are unsure about how to be more involved in the discussions that influence and determine the curriculum of the Faculty or have difficulty participating to the extent they would like. Others feel overwhelmed by the amount and complexity of compliance paper work involved in any sort of course or unit change. The Curriculum Committee, which is intended to provide leadership in relation to matters of curriculum and pedagogy, and quality assurance of both, instead finds itself dealing predominantly with procedural matters partly because of the volume of course and unit matters to be dealt with and partly because of the laborious nature of some of the processes.

While feedback from students is generally positive in relation to the learning environment, there are some aspects of our students' experience that could be enhanced and some students that may need more support. Some students feel isolated in their off-campus or on-line learning and disengaged from the community of scholars.

We are fortunate in attracting able students to each of our campuses and to all levels of courses, and in the increasing diversity of students both in their national and ethnic origins and primary locations, and in their work and professional backgrounds and orientations. Our enrolments are strengthening. However, fewer of our 'traditional' postgraduate students, teachers, are enrolling in postgraduate courses with us, a situation we should work to reverse, because 'schools' (at all levels) are our 'heartland', because we believe that we have something to offer the school sector and because it is critical for capacity building in Education in universities.

## PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

The report has identified a number of issues and the following proposals for action flow from these. Some are underway and some have already been incorporated in the Operational Plan 2005-7. Others are new.

### Leadership, organisational structure and management

- 1 The Faculty should set up two Curriculum Committees one for Undergraduate/graduate and the other for Postgraduate coursework, consistent with the responsibilities of the two Associate Deans Teaching, and in line with the situation in most faculties. Membership should include relevant program leaders, elected members of staff and informed community members.
- 2 The role of Program Leaders in leading a culture of innovation, excellence and reflection in the interests of curriculum and pedagogical enhancement should be reaffirmed and communicated.

- 3 The Curriculum Committee(s) will initiate a review of the Faculty's curriculum policies and procedures to identify and remove unnecessary compliance and paperwork, and inhibitors to innovation and flexibility in teaching and assessment, and to streamline the processes for developing and changing courses and units.

### **Environment, resources and support services**

- 4 The Curriculum committee will work with the Staff Committees to set up a working party to consider and report on
- what the expectations should be on all staff to collect and use feedback on their teaching (as distinct from unit reviews)
  - how we should monitor 'turn around' time for assessment and enhance the timeliness of feedback and the submission of results
  - how the above might be built into the performance management process for ongoing staff
  - how the above should be realised for sessional staff.
- 5 To enhance learning and communication for students enrolled in courses regardless of the nature of their enrolment or their location, the Faculty should:
- continue to support the development of the Meeting Place – a flexible integrated IT platform which will act as a learning and pastoral care site for on and off campus students
  - begin the development of physical learning centres on each campus, starting with Gippsland.
- 6 In order to improve the management and productivity of placements, the Faculty should:
- prioritise the development of better electronic communication and management processes for school and field placements
  - review our policies and practices about placement and visits to ensure that we are clear about the purpose and proposed outcomes
  - improve liaison and partnerships with schools
  - Improve communication with schools about the management of cross-cultural issues.

### **Course and unit profile**

- 7 The Curriculum Committee (UG/G) will:
- set up a cross campus working party to develop, in consultation with staff, students and the informed community as appropriate, a set of graduate outcomes and a short set of principles to guide the content, structure and delivery of each of the Faculty's pre-service teacher education courses
  - based on the agreed outcomes and principles, begin the progressive review and revision of the pre-service teacher education courses to ensure their appropriateness, currency and innovation, pedagogical quality and sustainability within feasible cost structures.
- 8 The Curriculum Committee (PG) will:
- develop criteria and processes for regularly reviewing the suite of units offered at the Masters level taking into account and balancing: students' choices, interest and needs; staff interests and enthusiasms, particularly in relation to supporting the nexus between teaching and research; public interest; and the efficient use of resources
  - develop criteria and processes for regularly reviewing the suite of pathways in postgraduate courses to determine which should stay, which should go and which should be developed
  - in collaboration with the Research Committee, design and implement an appropriate set of research methodology units to create a more flexible articulation from coursework to research degrees.

### **Students, teaching, learning and assessment**

- 9 The Faculty should resource a professional development program for staff and additional service through the Academic Services Team to support innovative and productive pedagogies and, in particular:
- prioritise professional learning in productive pedagogies particularly, but not only, in relation to the flexible delivery of courses/units in various on and off campus modes including e-learning technologies
  - increase the support available to academic staff to deliver 'just-in-time' assistance when courses and units are being prepared

- provide models, support and incentives for academic and general staff in the development of instructional design skills and flexible delivery strategies.
- 10 The Curriculum Portfolio will provide professional development for academic staff to enhance the quality and timeliness of feedback to students and, in particular, use professional learning workshops to:
- devise mechanisms for providing better quality, more consistent and timely feedback to students
  - reduce over assessment and repetitive assessment and the rewarding of 'busy work'
  - develop a broader repertoire of assessment tasks that model quality practices for teachers and other professionals
  - identify several units in the undergraduate program where academics can work collaboratively to trial innovative assessment practices (for example, problem-based learning)
  - discuss their understandings of the issues involved and the factors that affect their judgements of plagiarism
  - design and refine assessment processes that discourage plagiarism and that detect it when it occurs
- 11 To ensure fairness and transparency in assessment and the maintenance of consistent high standards across courses, units and campuses, the Curriculum Portfolio will:
- develop policy and processes in relation to the generation and moderation of grades and the consideration of the distribution of grades
  - develop an educational program for both graduate and postgraduate students that addresses the ways we acknowledge and respect the work of others which acknowledges and takes account of the contextual and cultural issues involved.
- 12 The Faculty should devise strategies to attract postgraduate students from the school sectors, in particular, practising classroom teachers, in order to ensure that we continue to make a contribution to our professional 'heartland'.
- 13 To enhance the international orientation of our courses, the Curriculum portfolio will:
- prioritise the professional learning of academic staff to enrich understanding of how best to internationalise the curriculum at all levels while ensuring that it remains locally relevant and takes account of diversity and difference within the student population
  - develop a plan for expanding the opportunities students have for international experiences in their teacher education programs.
- 14 The Curriculum Committee in conjunction with Admissions and Student Services will develop a complaint procedure .

**APPENDIX A Faculty of Education student load and enrolment data 1994 to 2004, March 31**

|                                | 1994        |               | 1996        |               | 1998        |               | 2000        |               | 2002        |               | 2004        |               |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
|                                | Enrols      | Load          | Enrols      | Load          | Enrols      | Load          | Enrols      | Load          | Enrols      | Load          | Enrols      | Load          |
| Higher degree research         |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |
| Prof'nal Doctorate             | 70          | 38.6          | 71          | 35.3          | 120         | 74.1          | -           | -             | -           | -             | -           | -             |
| Doctorate by research          | 152         | 93.6          | 127         | 84.4          | 35          | 19.8          | 213         | 117.0         | 217         | 119.8         | 195         | 112.5         |
| Masters by research            | 30          | 14.3          | 29          | 17.4          | 155         | 93.9          | 27          | 15.1          | 123         | 62.1          | 155         | 77.4          |
| <b>HDR Total</b>               | <b>252</b>  | <b>146.6</b>  | <b>227</b>  | <b>37.1</b>   | <b>310</b>  | <b>278.9</b>  | <b>240</b>  | <b>132.1</b>  | <b>340</b>  | <b>181.9</b>  | <b>350</b>  | <b>189.9</b>  |
| Graduate-postgraduate          |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |
| Masters by c'work              | 545         | 281.2         | 549         | 283.3         | 760         | 507.8         | 534         | 267.0         | 539         | 304.0         | 826         | 470.0         |
| Masters preliminary            |             |               | 1           | 0.5           | 2           | 0.7           | 3           | 1.0           | 1           | 0.5           | 0           | 0.0           |
| Grad dip new skills            | 487         | 333.1         | 518         | 385.3         | 17          | 6.8           | 698         | 446.6         | 807         | 552.6         | 883         | 630.0         |
| Grad dip extend skills         | 133         | 63.2          | 136         | 61.6          | 5           | 0.9           | 67          | 32.3          | 9           | 5.5           | 1           | 0.4           |
| Graduate certificate           | 1           | 0.3           | 3           | 1.3           | 0           | 0             | 4           | 1.5           | 30          | 12.9          | 34          | 13.6          |
| Cross-institution - PG         |             |               |             |               |             |               | 0           | 0             | 0           | 1.9           | 0           | 0.4           |
| <b>Graduate-postgrad Total</b> | <b>1166</b> | <b>677.6</b>  | <b>1207</b> | <b>767.2</b>  | <b>1405</b> | <b>840.5</b>  | <b>1306</b> | <b>748.4</b>  | <b>1386</b> | <b>887.4</b>  | <b>1744</b> | <b>1114.4</b> |
| Undergraduate                  |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |             |               |
| Bachelors grad entry           | 349         | 177.2         | 613         | 284.6         | 269         | 142.9         | 73          | 27.9          | 0           | 0             | 0           | 0.0           |
| Bachelors honours              |             |               |             |               |             |               | 1.0         | 6             | 12          | 8.5           | 5           | 3.3           |
| Bachelors pass                 | 738         | 541.9         | 588         | 564.0         | 882         | 862.7         | 1123        | 1076.9        | 1216        | 1153.6        | 1347        | 1242.0        |
| Associate diploma              | 135         | 116.8         | 1           | 0.1           | 4           | 1.8           | 0           | 0.0           | 0           | 0.0           | 0           | 0.0           |
| Non-award course               | 2           | 1.3           | 6           | 2.9           | 1           | 0.2           | 6           | 1.3           | 2           | 0.5           | 10          | 2.4           |
| Cross-institution - UG         |             | 1.0           |             | 2.3           | 0           | 1.2           | 0           | 0.9           | 0           | 1.6           | 0           | 1.9           |
| <b>Undergraduate Total</b>     | <b>1224</b> | <b>838.1</b>  | <b>1208</b> | <b>853.9</b>  | <b>1156</b> | <b>1008.7</b> | <b>1204</b> | <b>1107.9</b> | <b>1230</b> | <b>1164.2</b> | <b>1362</b> | <b>249.5</b>  |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>2642</b> | <b>1662.3</b> | <b>2642</b> | <b>1722.8</b> | <b>2716</b> | <b>1943.1</b> | <b>2750</b> | <b>1988.3</b> | <b>2956</b> | <b>2223.5</b> | <b>3456</b> | <b>2553.7</b> |

**APPENDIX B**
**Percentage of Victorian Year 12 students admitted to Education courses above specified ENTER levels**

|                                | % of students with ENTER over 50 |            |            | % of students with ENTER over 60 |            |            | % of students with ENTER over 70 |           |           | % of students with ENTER over 80 |           |           | % of students with ENTER over 90 |           |           |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
|                                | 1998                             | 2002       | 2003       | 1998                             | 2002       | 2003       | 1998                             | 2002      | 2003      | 1998                             | 2002      | 2003      | 1998                             | 2002      | 2003      |
| Monash                         |                                  |            |            |                                  |            |            |                                  |           |           |                                  |           |           |                                  |           |           |
| Clayton (Sec)                  | 100                              | 100        | 100        | 100                              | 100        | 100        | 99                               | 100       | 100       | 72                               | 89        | 92        | 14                               | 52        | 35        |
| Gippsland (Pri, Sec)           | 100                              | 100        | 100        | 100                              | 100        | 97         | 71                               | 95        | 97        | 26                               | 34        | 55        | 3                                | 9         | 7         |
| Peninsula (Early Ch, Prim)     | 100                              | 100        | 100        | 100                              | 100        | 100        | 56                               | 100       | 98        | 13                               | 44        | 70        | 1                                | 6         | 16        |
| <b>Monash total</b>            | <b>100</b>                       | <b>100</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>100</b>                       | <b>100</b> | <b>100</b> | <b>76</b>                        | <b>99</b> | <b>99</b> | <b>40</b>                        | <b>59</b> | <b>76</b> | <b>7</b>                         | <b>24</b> | <b>22</b> |
| Aust Catholic Univ (Prim, Sec) | 99                               | 100        | 100        | 81                               | 98         | 100        | 32                               | 80        | 76        | 15                               | 35        | 33        | 2                                | 8         | 5         |
| Deakin Uni (Prim, Sec)         | 100                              | 100        | 100        | 97                               | 99         | 100        | 67                               | 84        | 96        | 22                               | 45        | 55        | 4                                | 5         | 7         |
| La Trobe (Prim, Sec)           | 98                               | 100        | 100        | 72                               | 99         | 99         | 38                               | 84        | 88        | 14                               | 28        | 39        | 2                                | 7         | 15        |
| RMIT (Early Ch, Prim, Sec)     | 100                              | 97         | 98         | 92                               | 97         | 96         | 42                               | 88        | 86        | 14                               | 42        | 35        | 2                                | 6         | 5         |
| Uni Ballarat (Prim, Sec)       | 89                               | 99         | 100        | 63                               | 98         | 95         | 28                               | 63        | 60        | 12                               | 20        | 15        | 0                                | 3         | 3         |
| Uni Melbourne (Early Ch, Prim) | 100                              | 100        | 100        | 100                              | 99         | 99         | 92                               | 93        | 94        | 45                               | 38        | 63        | 7                                | 8         | 12        |
| Victoria Univ (Prim, Sec)      | 78                               | 94         | 86         | 29                               | 90         | 69         | 8                                | 63        | 39        | 0                                | 0         | 11        | 0                                | 0         | 4         |
| <b>Education in Vic total</b>  | <b>97</b>                        | <b>99</b>  | <b>98</b>  | <b>85</b>                        | <b>98</b>  | <b>96</b>  | <b>53</b>                        | <b>83</b> | <b>83</b> | <b>22</b>                        | <b>40</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>4</b>                         | <b>9</b>  | <b>9</b>  |

## APPENDIX C : Professional Recognition/Teacher Registration : Early Childhood

### Part A: Overview of Early Childhood Education and Care Qualification Recognition

A significant aspect of Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) in Australia is its diverse and at times complex nature. Variations in policy approaches to, and the delivery of, ECEC arise out of the number and mix of jurisdictions involved in developing policy and funding frameworks for the care and education of young children. Whilst a degree of national consistency exists for policy and services which fall under the Commonwealth programs, there is no national framework for ECEC which encompasses all relevant portfolio areas. There are also considerable variations between and within State and Territory areas of portfolio responsibility. This is particularly evident in the areas of school education, preschool education, early intervention and the regulatory environments for ECEC.

This preamble from the OECD report highlights the complexity of qualification recognition in the Early Childhood area. Factors which impact on qualification recognition include:

- 1 The distinction which exists between early childhood education and early childhood care.
- 2 The diversity which exists between the various state and territory regulations for early childhood teaching and early childhood care and the related departmental jurisdiction issues.
- 3 The range of providers that exist for early childhood education and early childhood care. In general early childhood education is provided by state or territory Education Departments, except in Victoria. Early childhood care on the other hand is provided by a range of community, church, local government and private providers who operate within the 'Community Service' government regulations for that state or territory.
- 4 The distinction between early childhood qualifications provided by the universities and those provided by TAFE and other Registered Training Organisations.

With respect to the distinction between early childhood education and early childhood care the OECD report suggests that the clearest delineation "lies between pre-schools and schools on the one hand, and on the other, the remaining settings for children under five." It suggests that pre-schools and schools are perceived to be educational in their primary focus while the non-preschool settings, catering for under five year olds, reveal a multitude of purposes such as: enabling parents to participate in paid work, providing respite for parents and families and supporting families at risk. The report does suggest that as the demand for long day care increases and with the advent of accreditation of long day care centres the integrated nature of early childhood education and early childhood care is starting to be recognised. This will most certainly have implications for qualification recognition of early childhood workers in the future.

The staffing of ECEC varies according to the regulatory requirements of each state and territory and across the different services. In general the pre-school education sector requires at least one staff member to have a teaching qualification, but not necessarily an early childhood degree. Early Childhood teaching qualifications are gained through the university sector and according to the OECD report "An early childhood degree enables teachers to work in all ECEC services and in some instances in the early years of school up to year 3." (OECD Report Country Note p 26)

Training for the early childhood care sector is described as vocational training and is primarily serviced by the TAFE sector or by other Registered Training Organisations (RTOs), via nationally endorsed packages which set out the relevant competencies to be obtained. The qualifications offered through these training packages begin with Certificates II, III and IV in Community Services (Children's Services) and progress to the Diploma of Community Services and the Advanced Diploma of Community Services. There are mechanisms for the diploma and the advanced diploma to articulate into university degrees. For example, Monash's Bachelor of Early Childhood Education gives up to one year of credit for a Diploma of Community Services (Children's Services) providing the applicant obtained a distinction average.

The attached table, which is a summary of data from the OECD report, from State and Territory Departments of Education and where possible Departments of Community/Human or Family Services, provides an overview of the ECEC regulations and staff requirements (including qualifications) with respect to the 'early childhood education' and 'early childhood care' sectors.

In summary, the Child Care Sector operates under the regulations of the relevant state or territory department responsible for child/community/family services. There is no registration of Child Care Workers in any state of Australia and no automatic reciprocal recognition of qualifications.

The School Sector operates under the regulations of the relevant state or territory department of education. A number of Australian states have teacher registration boards and an agreement has been reached which provides reciprocity of recognition of registration (but again not of qualifications) between states. Thus a person who is actually registered in one state can teach in another state while that registration remains current. In some cases, the registration needs to be updated after a period.

The sequence is typically: formal child care —> Kindergarten (K)/Preschool (P) —> School

The Kindergarten/Pre-school period is attached to the Child Care Sector in some jurisdictions and to the School Sector in other jurisdictions.

## Part B: Staffing Qualification for Early Childhood Education and Early Childhood Care, Australia

| State/Territory              | Early Childhood Education  | Early Childhood Care<br>(qualification specified by regulations)  |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Australian Capital Territory | Kindergarten level attached to primary schools<br>Monash 3+1 model accepted as teaching qualification at all levels<br>GradDipEd(EC) teach K-2<br>No Teacher Registration Board in ACT   | 2 year tertiary qualification<br>GradDipEd(EC)- telephone conversation indicates definitely OK for after school care, awaiting further advice from Children's Services  |
| Queensland                   | Pre-schools attached to primary schools<br>Monash 3+1 model provisional teacher registration, given 5 years to update<br>GradDipEd(EC) teach K +<br>Queensland has Teacher Registration Board  | Diploma of Children's Services<br>Currently developing new regulations which consider level of study and content<br>GradDipEd(EC) definitely meet more flexible regulations to work in child care settings  |
| New South Wales              | Kindergartens are attached to primary schools<br>Monash 3+1 model accepted for teacher registration K-12<br>GradDipEd(EC) teach K+<br>NSW has Teacher Registration   | 3 year university course in early childhood studies or Child Care Certificate: a Certificate of Child Care Studies or Associate Diploma of Social Sciences (Child Care Studies) from TAFE<br>GradDipEd(EC) <u>not</u> approved to work in child care settings |
| Northern Territory           | Pre-schools are attached to primary schools<br>Monash 3+1 model accepted as teaching qualification<br>GradDipEd(EC) teach in pre-schools<br>Registration Board being established   | 2 years post secondary qualification<br><br>GradDipEd(EC) according to Family and Children Services Dep't would be acceptable for work in child care (Vicki Bradshaw)   |
| South Australia              | Kindergartens under Dept of Education<br>Monash 3+1 model accepted, registration spans K-12<br>GradDipEd(EC) teach K+<br>SA has Teachers Registration Board  | 2 year Associate Diploma in Children's Services or 3 year Early Childhood teaching qualification<br>GradDipEd(EC) now confirmed for after school and long day care (Cathy Wright)   |
| Tasmania                     | Kindergartens under Dept Education<br>Monash 3+1 would be given provisional teacher registration<br>GradDipEd(EC) teach K+<br>Tasmania has Teachers Registration Board   | Diploma of Children's Services or equivalent<br>3 years tertiary study in early childhood education<br>GradDipEd(EC)- currently awaiting advice on status in Tasmania (need to send material to Vivienne Mitchell)  |
| Victoria                     | Preparatory year attached to primary school (Education Dept,) not considered preschool education.<br>Preschools/Kindergartens under Dept Human Services<br>Monash 3+1 model accepted for teaching<br>GradDipEd(EC) teach K<br>Vic. has Registration Board VIT (2002) but not for EC teachers | Diploma of Children's Services<br>2 year post secondary qualification in early childhood education<br>Monash's GradDipEd(EC) approved for child care settings AECA (Vic) on behalf of Dep't Human Services.<br>Listed in Children's Services Regulation 1998. |
| Western Australia            | Kindergartens are attached to primary schools<br>Monash 3+1 model accepted for employment as teacher<br>GradDipEd(EC) teach K+<br>Don't have Teachers Registration Board   | 2 year TAFE Associate Diploma in care settings<br>GradDipEd(EC) able to work in child care settings with children 3-12years eg after school care, long day care   |

Derived from the NOOSR Guide to Professional Recognition in Australia, which outlines the pre-primary, primary and secondary education organisational frameworks in each state/territory, and from personal conversations with contact representative in each state and territory.

## APPENDIX D : Short courses 2004

The Educational Leadership Programs: designed to provide teachers with a structured and informative approach to effective leadership and management, while encompassing strategic planning, people and resources (programs allow participants to undertake professional development with the possibility of credit towards further studies at the postgraduate level):

- Leading Teacher and Assistant Principal - Principal Aspirant Program
- Leading Teacher Development Program
- Teacher Practical Leadership Program Phase 1
- Teacher Practical Leadership Program Phase 2
- ETWR Skills Development Program

Other short courses include:

- Adolescent Counselling (Professional Certificate)
- Integration Aide (Certificate of Education)
- Teacher Aide (Certificate of Education)
- Working in a School (SSO)
- Educational Planning for Students with Special Needs
- Supporting Students with Additional Needs in Early Childhood Programs

The Faculty also offers a range of courses under contract to public and private organizations. These courses are available on a cohort basis, that is, for groups of students. Following are examples of recent and current programs. Others can be arranged.

- Auckland International College TESOL Professional Development Program
- Professional Experience Program (Chile and USA)
- Hong Kong University Immersion Program for Postgraduate Certificate in Education students.
- Hong Kong Institute of Education English Language Immersion Program
- Australia-Korea Foundation and Korean-Australian Foundation
- Chilean Government TESOL Professional Development Program
- Cook Island Exchange Program
- Hong Kong Polytechnic TESOL Professional Development Program
- Hong Kong TESOL Professional Development
- Indonesia TESOL Program
- Kazakhstan Educational Capacity Building Program
- Korean TESOL Professional Development Program
- Mozambique/Australia Aid Program
- Philippines/Australia Science and Mathematics Project
- Philippines/Australia Technical and Vocational Education Project
- Philippines Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao Study Program
- Philippines Professional Development for Workplace Trainers Program
- Singapore Leadership Programs
- Languages' Teaching Methodology for Teachers in Ethnic Schools
- Australia Japan Foundation - Integrated Studies Program
- Malaysia-Australian program for Senior Officials undertaking the Instructional Leadership Program

## APPENDIX E: Summary of Monquest results 2000 and 2003

| LECTURING                                     |   | 2000 |        | 2003 |        |
|---|---|------|--------|------|--------|
|   |   | Univ | Educ   | Univ | Educ   |
| <b>Organising and structuring of lectures</b> |   |      |        |      |        |
| 1.1   | During each lecture, the lecturer described what students were expected to learn from that lecture  | 4.1  | 4.4 ET | 4.1  | 4.3    |
| 1.2   | The topic of each lecture in the series was indicated by the end of the first week of that series   | 4.3  | 4.5    | 4.3  | 4.5    |
| 1.3   | The sequential position of each lecture contributed to the coherent and logical development of the subject overall  | 4.2  | 4.5 T  | 4.2  | 4.5 T  |
| <b>Effects on learning and understanding</b>  |   |      |        |      |        |
| 2.1   | The lecturer's explanations and arguments built on concepts and ideas that I had previously learned, or with which I was already familiar   | 3.7  | 4.1    | 3.8  | 4.2 T  |
| 2.2   | Each lecture was presented in a way that helped me to see how its sections were interrelated or connected   | 3.9  | 4.3 ET | 4.0  | 4.3 T  |
| 2.3   | The lecturer drew the students' attention to important ideas or information   | 4.1  | 4.5 T  | 4.2  | 4.5 T  |
| 2.4   | The lecturer illustrated points and ideas with examples, applications or analogies  | 4.2  | 4.5 ET | 4.3  | 4.6 T  |
| 2.5   | The examples, applications, or analogies that were used prompted me to make new connections or interpretations  | 3.9  | 4.2 ET | 3.9  | 4.3 T  |
| 2.6   | The lecturer related the material to that presented in other parts of the subject (eg assignment topics, tutorials, other lectures)   | 3.9  | 4.3 T  | 3.9  | 4.3 T  |
| 2.7   | The lecturer's visual presentations (eg drawings, charts, diagrams, graphics, schematics) assisted my understanding of lecture content  | 4.0  | 4.2    | 4.0  | 4.4 T  |
| 2.8   | The lecturer made suggestions as to how students might think about or learn the material presented  | 3.6  | 4.2 T  | 3.7  | 4.2 T  |
| <b>Interest and motivation</b>                |   |      |        |      |        |
| 3.1   | My attention or interest was sustained during each lecture  | 3.6  | 4.0    | 3.6  | 4.1 T  |
| 3.2   | I found myself wanting to learn more about, or to develop further, ideas presented in each lecture  | 3.3  | 3.9 ET | 3.4  | 4.0 T  |
| <b>Lecturer's interaction and support</b>     |   |      |        |      |        |
| 4.1   | The lecturer appeared enthusiastic about the task of lecturing  | 4.3  | 4.6 T  | 4.3  | 4.7 T  |
| 4.2   | The lecturer reacted positively to students' comments or questions during lectures  | 4.3  | 4.7 T  | 4.3  | 4.7 T  |
| 4.3   | The lecturer's responses to student questions were focussed on resolving those questions  | 4.1  | 4.5 ET | 4.2  | 4.5 ET |
| 4.4   | There was opportunity for students to clarify possible misunderstandings of lecture content, either during each lecture or at some time shortly afterwards                        | 4.3  | 4.6 ET | 4.3  | 4.5 ET |
| 4.5   | The lecturer appeared willing to assist students (either during or outside lectures) with difficulties that they had with lecture content   | 4.4  | 4.7 T  | 4.4  | 4.6 ET |
| 4.6   | It was possible for me to consult the lecturer out of class about each lecture  | 4.1  | 4.6 T  | 4.2  | 4.5 ET |
| 4.7   | Supplementary materials referenced during each lecture (eg articles or books, other than prescribed texts) were available for students to use (eg library, dept copies, handouts) | 4.0  | 4.5 ET | 4.0  | 4.4 ET |
| <b>Physical aspects of presentation</b>       |   |      |        |      |        |
| 5.1   | The lecturer's pace of presentation allowed me to think about the content as it was presented   | 3.8  | 4.2    | 3.9  | 4.3 T  |
| 5.2   | The lecturer's pace of presentation allowed me to take adequate notes   | 4.0  | 4.3    | 4.0  | 4.2    |
| 5.3   | I could comprehend the language and vocabulary used by the lecturer   | 4.4  | 4.7 ET | 4.4  | 4.6 ET |

T = Top rating faculty

ET = Equal top rating faculty

see over ...

| <b>SEMINAR TEACHING</b>                       |  | <b>2002</b> |             |
|---|--|-------------|-------------|
|   |  | <b>Univ</b> | <b>Educ</b> |
| <b>Structure and organisation</b>             |  |             |             |
| 1.1   | I knew what the learning objectives (descriptions of the learning and development expected of the student) for each seminar were before that seminar | 4.3         | 4.5 T       |
| 1.2   | The topics that were chosen for each seminar proved to be effective generators of discussion   | 4.3         | 4.6 T       |
| 1.3   | Each seminar's position in the series supported the coherent developments of the subject overall   | 4.3         | 4.5 T       |
| 1.4   | Key points or issues raised within each seminar were reinforced, either by the teacher or a student  | 4.3         | 4.5 T       |
| 1.5   | The teacher's comments made relevant links to contexts outside the prescribed seminar readings   | 4.3         | 4.6 T       |
| 1.6   | Connections were made, either by the teacher or a student, to previous seminar discussions   | 4.0         | 4.3 T       |
| 1.7   | The teacher indicated any student preparation needed for coming seminars   | 4.4         | 4.6 T       |
| 1.8   | I did preparatory work or study for each seminar   | 3.3         | 3.3         |
| 1.9   | Each seminar addressed its agenda of activities or discussion topics   | 4.3         | 4.5 T       |
| <b>Management of group discussion</b>         |  |             |             |
| 2.1   | My attention or interest was sustained during each seminar's activities or discussion  | 4.0         | 4.2 T       |
| 2.2   | The teacher encouraged student participation in each seminar's activities or discussion  | 4.6         | 4.8 T       |
| 2.3   | The teacher allowed diversity of discussion provided that it was relevant to the seminar's objectives  | 4.6         | 4.7 ET      |
| 2.4   | Students developed or built upon each other's contributions  | 4.1         | 4.5 T       |
| 2.5   | Student participation (other than as a main presenter) in each seminar was distributed equitably around the class                                    | 3.5         | 4.0 T       |
| <b>Interaction</b>                            |  |             |             |
| 3.1   | The teacher was an interested and enthusiastic participant in each seminar   | 4.7         | 4.9 T       |
| 3.2   | The teacher ensured that student questions were properly addressed, even if by another student   | 4.5         | 4.7 T       |
| 3.3   | The teacher made comments or asked questions that focused student attention on important ideas   | 4.5         | 4.7 T       |
| 3.4   | The teacher indicated how or whether students' ideas or contributions could be developed   | 4.1         | 4.3 T       |
| 3.5   | When they occurred, the teacher helped students deal with any confusions or concerns with each seminar's material                                    | 4.3         | 4.6 T       |
| 3.6   | The teacher prompted me to reflect on how I learned or came to understand each seminar's material  | 3.9         | 4.2 T       |
| 3.7   | It was possible for me to consult the teacher out of class about each seminar  | 4.5         | 4.6 T       |
| <b>Perception of intellectual development</b> |  |             |             |
| 4.1   | Seminar discussions prompted my awareness of variations in students' understanding of each seminar's material  | 4.1         | 4.4 T       |
| 4.2   | Seminar participation practised my critical thinking and analytical skills   | 4.1         | 4.3 T       |
| 4.3   | Seminar participation improved or reinforced my confidence in presenting my ideas  | 4.0         | 4.3 T       |
| 4.4   | Seminar discussions prompted new connections or interpretations that built on my previous understanding of the seminar material                      | 4.1         | 4.4 T       |
| 4.5   | I found myself wanting to learn more about, or to develop further, ideas encountered in seminar activities or discussion                             | 4.1         | 4.4 T       |

T = Top rating faculty

ET = Equal top rating faculty