

# Australian Journal of Teacher Education

---

Volume 18  
Issue 2 *School-Based Initial Teacher Education*

Article 1

---

1993

## Contents page, and, Introduction by Rod Chadbourne, Guest editor

Rod Chadbourne  
*Edith Cowan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Chadbourne, R. (1993). Contents page, and, Introduction by Rod Chadbourne, Guest editor. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 18(2).  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1993v18n2.1>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.  
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol18/iss2/1>

# THE AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Special Issue: School-Based Initial Teacher Education

---

Volume 18, No. 2

1993

---

*Introduction*

Rod Chadbourne, Guest Editor

1

SECTION ONE: OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENTS

*Back to the Future: The De-professionalisation of  
Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales*

Peter Gilroy (University of Sheffield)

5

*School-Based Teacher Education in the United States:  
An Uneven Evolution*

Mary Kluender Ducharme and Edward R Ducharme  
(Drake University)

15

*Partners in Teacher Education: A Programme in Alberta*

Glenda Campbell-Evans (Edith Cowan University)

23

SECTION TWO: AUSTRALIAN CASE STUDIES

*School Experience: A Collaborative Partnership*

William Young

(University of New England - Northern Rivers)

28

*End-On Innovation: A School-Based Approach to  
Secondary Teacher Education*

Kym L Adey and Graeme Speedy  
(University of South Australia)

34

*A School-Based Initiative: An Opportunity to Better Understand the Practicum*  
Jeff Northfield (Monash University) 40

*Preservice Intern Teaching: A P-12 Approach in the University of Melbourne Bachelor of Teaching Degree for Graduates*  
Jocelyn Grant (University of Melbourne) 46

## REVIEW ARTICLE

*Learning to Teach, Teaching to Learn*  
William Loudon (Edith Cowan University) 51

## INTRODUCTION

Rod Chadbourne  
Edith Cowan University

In 1992, the Commonwealth Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) released a policy document titled *Teacher education: A discussion paper*. Among other thought provoking points, it presented Australian teacher educators as relatively old and lacking current teaching experience in schools. According to the discussion paper, 81% of teacher educators are over 38 years old, 37% are over 48, only 20% taught in schools during the 1980's, and more than 50% were school teachers before 1973 (pp 11-12). Further, consistent with their "obsolescent teaching experience" (p.12), teacher educators "simply pass on the theory of teaching" (p.17) and many of them "are out of touch with contemporary practice and the most recent educational research" (p.17).

The discussion paper also expressed concern that "faculty teaching experience has not kept pace with changes in schools" (p.12) and it questioned "the quality and relevance of (university) education programs" (p.16). Part of the problem is a tendency among teacher educators "to emphasise the academic content of studies frequently at the expense of a more professional and practical pedagogical orientation" (p.16)

One way to address these critical issues, suggested the discussion paper, would be to consider transferring a lot of teacher education from universities to schools. More specifically, it stated (pp.17-18) that: "The Commonwealth's concern about strengthening teaching skills is shared by governments overseas. For instance, in January 1992, the UK Government announced proposals for the reform of initial teacher training for secondary student teachers who are undertaking the Postgraduate Certificate in Education. By 1994, all such students will be required to spend at least two thirds of their training time in schools ..... Proposals for changes to primary education courses are to follow. The British approach immerses student teachers in a whole-school environment where they can interact with experienced teachers for a sustained period and makes the school rather than the university the focus of the pedagogical component of teacher education. These proposals may have some applicability in this country."

Apart from their applicability, "these proposals" are not entirely new. For example, in 1990 the Ebbeck Report (Australian Education Council Working Party) advocated an associateship model involving a long period of internship as part of preservice training. Nor are "these proposals" likely to constitute the final call to make schools rather than universities the major site for initial teacher education. The rapidly changing context in which schools operate will continue to place university based programs under pressure to adapt.

Given the complex issues surrounding the introduction of school based teacher education, ongoing policy development could benefit from a constant review of initiatives overseas and within Australia. The articles in this special edition of the AJTE are a contribution to that end.

In the first article, Peter Gilroy reviews the campaign in England and Wales to transfer initial teacher education from universities to schools. He documents how the proposed reforms have failed to gain broad support within the education community and how the government, in the face of resistance, has had to proceed on the basis of power rather than legitimacy. As a result, claims Gilroy, the government has strengthened its control over all aspects of teacher education, de-professionised teachers, and led the profession "back to the future by effectively re-introducing the way in which teachers were trained in the nineteenth century." Gilroy's paper raises a number of interrelated questions for people in Australia, such as:

- Do the circumstances that Australia currently finds itself in warrant the implementation of school based teacher education across all states or should such an innovation be left as an option for individual universities to adopt at their own discretion?
- If the Australian Commonwealth government is held accountable for the social and economic development of the country, does this give it the right and responsibility to determine how teacher education should take place?

- At what stage does any such government involvement threaten the academic freedom of universities and the independence of the teaching profession?
- In the final analysis, who should have the overriding say in determining the purposes and processes of teacher education?
- If consensus could be reached on outcomes of training programs, can a case be made to show that school based teacher education is the best way for student teachers to attain these outcomes?

In the second article, Mary Kluender Ducharme and Edward Ducharme describe how, in the United States, a pluralistic rather than uniform approach has evolved with respect to the school based component of teacher education. Instead of requiring all teacher education students to spend at least 60% of their time in schools, as proposed in England and Wales, the United States permits a variety of patterns ranging from relatively limited school experience within the traditional university based model to alternative certification programs that involve extensive on site training. Ducharme and Ducharme then outline a likely scenario for the future of school based teacher education in the United States. It involves making improvements within existing arrangements rather than the radical restructuring adopted in England and Wales.

In one form or another Australia offers some of the different types of teacher education courses outlined by Ducharme and Ducharme, though we have not gone very far down the campus/laboratory school, professional development school and alternative certification tracks. Also, within the diversity of our programs the traditional university based model remains dominant. Arguably, this dominance has complicated attempts over the past five years to develop a more national approach to teacher education, as canvassed by the Schools Council (1989), DEET (1989, 1992), Australian Education Council (1990), and Beazley (1993). Some pertinent questions can be asked here:

- Would a more national approach to teacher education better serve Australia's economic and social justice goals?
- Is it necessary to break the hegemony of the traditional university based model in order to establish a more national approach?

- How can this dominance be broken - by enhancing pluralism and reforms from within as in the US, or by going the UK route, dismantling the traditional system and radically restructuring teacher education?

Glenda Campbell-Evans begins her article by commenting on the diversity of teacher education courses in Canada, thereby indicating that the overall situation there parallels that of the US rather than the recently proposed system in the UK. The main focus of her article, though, is upon a school based teacher education program launched in September 1993 in Alberta for 25 students training to be teachers. Campbell-Evans explains that within this program the university does not assume its traditional dominant role; instead, it acts in partnership with the Edmonton Public School Board, the participating schools and the Alberta Teachers Association. At present, says Campbell-Evans, the program is viewed as "an optional mode of delivery of undergraduate teacher education"; it is not to be seen as a prototype that, after further research and development, might eventually replace the university based model.

Given the growing number of school based teacher education projects being planned and launched in Australia the issues covered by Campbell-Evans are worth further exploration within this country. For example:

- In any partnership between universities and schools how should resources and power be shared? For instance, if 60% of student teachers' time is spent in schools, should 60% of the funds allocated for teacher education be given to the schools?
- Should school staff participate in assessing student teacher performances in educational and professional studies as well as participating in the planning and teaching of them?
- Should school staff participate in interviewing and selecting students for entry to school based courses?
- How can teachers and academics be encouraged to participate and maintain their involvement in school based programs that make extra demands upon their time?

Section Two contains four case studies of school based teacher education in Australia. The first article, by William Young, describes a three year

concurrent undergraduate program at the University of New England. The next three deal with 'end on' courses. Kim Adey, Graeme Speedy and Jeff Northfield's papers review the one year Graduate Diploma of Education programs in their universities (South Australia and Monash) while Jocelyn Grant outlines the two year Bachelor of Teaching degree for graduates at the University of Melbourne. Some of the school based programs are only for a limited number of student teachers. As such they constitute small scale alternatives to the traditional courses. Others are for virtually all students: that is, the school based program is the mainstream course; the mainstream course is school based.

These four programs are not the only ones of their kind in Australia. They do provide, however, a useful indication of school based innovations currently operating or being planned throughout the country. They also give cause to reflect upon a variety of issues and address questions such as:

- How widespread are these type of school based programs across the country? Can they be expected to take root, expand and replace traditional university based courses? Or, are they likely to remain on the margins and eventually wither on the vine?
- If these type of school based programs are as good as the authors of the four case studies suggest, then should all student teachers throughout the country be required, or at least given an opportunity, to participate in them?
- If these type of school based programs did replace traditional university based courses, would that allay the concerns documented in the DEET discussion paper?
- Do these type of programs help confirm or refute Knight and Lingard's (1993) worry that school based teacher education may be part of a broader and determined federal push "for a new teacher education settlement more appropriate to Australia's changed economic circumstances" (p.2); a push to "move away from a conception of the teacher as educated professional to that of competent practitioner?" (p.3)

The closing article, by William Loudon, provides a valuable set of observations and insights to take into account when considering these questions. Loudon reviews two books with the same title (*Learning to teach, teaching to learn*) written by different people in different eras in different countries (Dow 1979 and Clandinin et al 1993). In doing so he draws together many of the issues

raised by the articles in this volume and lays a foundation for further innovations in school based teacher education.

In addition to the case studies presented in Section Two, other models of school based programs have been proposed in various parts of the world. One such proposal, formulated by Toni Beardon, Martin Booth, David Hargreaves and Michael Reiss (1992) from the University of Cambridge contains the following features. A General Teaching Council would take overall responsibility for teacher education, set the competences to be achieved by trainees and award National Teaching Certificates (that is, a licence to teach without supervision). Most of the training would take place in designated training schools and be placed under the responsibility of practising teachers. Higher education staff would become involved only at the invitation of the training schools. The length of training would vary according to the prior learning of trainees and how quickly they could develop the set competences. The training schools would interview and select their own trainees and receive the money currently paid to universities for each trainee (£3820 in 1992). In short, teacher education would be not only *school based*, but, perhaps more importantly, *school led*.

A recent editorial in the Times Educational Supplement (12 November 1993, p.16) commented that, "If ever there was an idea whose time had come it is the General Teaching Council. The more the focus on training is switched to a school base - and that movement is bound to continue - the more we need such a national body to accredit, monitor, coordinate and validate. Now more than ever teachers are prepared to assert their right to control entry and standards in their own profession, and are receiving powerful support on all sides."

To what extent can and should the recently established Australian Teaching Council be made to anticipate this TES editorial comment? The answer has serious implications for initiatives to introduce a school-based, school-centred, school-provided, school-led system of teacher education in Australia. It also has profound significance for attempts to raise the status and quality of teaching in this country.

## REFERENCES

- Australian Education Council Working Party (1990). *Teacher education in Australia*. A report to the Australian Education Council by an AEC working party. (Chair: F. Ebbeck). Canberra: AGPS.

Beardon, T., Booth, M., Hargreaves, D. and Reiss, M. (1992). *School-led initial teacher training: The way forward*. Department of Education: University of Cambridge.

Beazley, K. (1993). *Teaching counts*. Canberra: AGPS.

Department of Employment, Education and Training (1989). *Discipline review of teacher education in mathematics and science*. (Chair: G.W. Speedy). Canberra: AGPS.

Department of Employment, Education and Training (1992). *Teacher education: A discussion paper*. Canberra: DEET.

Knight, J. and Lingard, B. (1993). *Dis/counting teacher education: The Beazley papers*. Paper presented at the ATEA Conference, Fremantle, Western, 11-14 July, 1993.

Schools Council (1989). *Teacher quality: An issues paper*. Canberra: AGPS.

## BACK TO THE FUTURE: THE DE-PROFESSIONALISATION OF INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES

Peter Gilroy  
University of Sheffield

### INTRODUCTION

In many ways this paper reads like a report from an educational battlefield. From the 1980s those involved with initial teacher education in England and Wales can be seen as dealing with sporadic sniping at their work, followed by more substantial skirmishes, culminating in the 1990s with full-blooded assaults. This paper begins by describing the position being attacked, identifies the first intimations of aggression, then focuses upon the battering inflicted in the 1990s upon initial teacher education. The analysis which follows indicates that, savage though it has been, the attack on initial teacher education is in some ways only a feint to disguise an indirect assault on the concept of teacher professionalism and thus on education per se.

### THE DISTANT PAST: TEACHER EDUCATION 1848-1969

Until the middle of the nineteenth century initial teacher education in Britain was conspicuous by its absence. In fact at the primary level untrained and poorly educated pupil teachers were the norm, with pupils over the age of 12 being apprenticed to schools for periods of 5 years. A small minority of these pupil-teachers progressed to colleges, that were in the main denominational, to study for their teacher's certificate (which was introduced in 1848). However, the basic pattern of both primary and secondary teacher education was a form of apprenticeship, where teachers 'learned-on-the-job', an approach criticised as failing both children and teachers by the 1861 Newcastle Commission (see Patrick et al., 1982). Subsequently the 1888 Cross Committee recommended that universities should be involved with teacher training and so, as a result of the McNair report of 1944, university education departments began to be created to serve this need. By 1947 the way in which university departments were coming to influence college courses was recognised by the creation of Area Training Organisations (ATOs), which facilitated the universities' supervision of college-based initial teacher education courses. Working through the ATOs, universities and their colleges could recommend to the Ministry of Education

the award of Qualified Teacher Status to successful students. The colleges/universities link was such that it was possible to argue that it served a major role in initial teacher education, in that it "had the effect of both strengthening and broadening the professional and academic aspects of training" (Gosden 1989, p.2), a role that Her Majesty's Inspectorate itself identified as being "significant" (DES 1988a, p.1).

By 1960 the colleges' course had been increased from two to three years and subsequently, in 1963, to four years so as to allow colleges to offer the B.Ed. degree. By the end of the 1960s it was unusual for a teacher to enter the profession without a degree and thus without a substantial period of both the study and practice of education. The growth of the graduate profession can be seen from the Department of Education and Science's own figures (DES 1991, p.38), which show a six-fold increase in primary graduate teachers between 1972 and 1988 (from 5% to 30%) and almost a doubling of secondary graduate teachers in the same period (from 37% to 63%). The idea that teachers could be inducted into their profession by means of an apprenticeship scheme could be seen as a quaint, and flawed, relic of the Victorian past.

### THE RECENT PAST: TEACHER EDUCATION 1970-1984

Another way of describing the way in which initial teacher education had developed by the 1960s was that there was virtually no central control of provision, other than that provided by the universities and, for some institutions, the Council for National Academic Awards. The first hint of a reversal of this laissez-faire policy came in 1970 with the James Report. Only one of its recommendations was implemented by the Conservative government (the introduction of an induction programme for teachers in their probationary year), but this was doubly significant. First, it indicated that the central government was focusing its attention upon initial teacher education; second, that it felt competent to direct initial teacher education.