COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

Official Committee Hansard

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Reference: Teacher education

THURSDAY, 7 JULY 2005

BRISBANE

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INTERNET

The Proof and Official Hansard transcripts of Senate committee hearings, some House of Representatives committee hearings and some joint committee hearings are available on the Internet. Some House of Representatives committees and some joint committees make available only Official Hansard transcripts.

The Internet address is: **http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard**

To search the parliamentary database, go to:
http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Thursday, 7 July 2005

Members: Mr Hartsuyker *(Chair)*, Mr Sawford *(Deputy Chair)*, Mr Bartlett, Ms Bird, Ms Corcoran, Mr Fawcett, Mr Michael Ferguson, Mr Henry, Ms Livermore, and Mrs Markus

Members in attendance: Ms Bird, Ms Corcoran, Mr Michael Ferguson, Mr Hartsuyker, Mr Henry and Mr Sawford

Terms of reference for the inquiry:

To inquire into and report on:

The scope, suitability, organisation, resourcing and delivery of teacher training courses in Australia's public and private universities. To examine the preparedness of graduates to meet the current and future demands of teaching in Australia's schools.

Specifically, the Inquiry should:

1. Examine and assess the criteria for selecting students for teacher training courses.
2. Examine the extent to which teacher training courses can attract high quality students, including students from diverse backgrounds and experiences.
3. Examine attrition rates from teaching courses and reasons for that attrition.
4. Examine and assess the criteria for selecting and rewarding education faculty members.
5. Examine the educational philosophy underpinning the teacher training courses (including the teaching methods used, course structure and materials, and methods for assessment and evaluation) and assess the extent to which it is informed by research.
6. Examine the interaction and relationships between teacher training courses and other university faculty disciplines.
7. Examine the preparation of primary and secondary teaching graduates to:
   - (i) teach literacy and numeracy;
   - (ii) teach vocational education courses;
   - (iii) effectively manage classrooms;
   - (iv) successfully use information technology;
   - (v) deal with bullying and disruptive students and dysfunctional families;
   - (vi) deal with children with special needs and/or disabilities;
   - (vii) achieve accreditation; and
   - (viii) deal with senior staff, fellow teachers, school boards, education authorities, parents, community groups and other related government departments.
8. Examine the role and input of schools and their staff to the preparation of trainee teachers.
9. Investigate the appropriateness of the current split between primary and secondary education training.
10. Examine the construction, delivery and resourcing of ongoing professional learning for teachers already in the workforce.
11. Examine the adequacy of the funding of teacher training courses by university administrations.

The Inquiry should make reference to current research, to developments and practices from other countries as well as to the practices of other professions in preparing and training people to enter their profession.

WITNESSES

BAHR, Dr Nanette Margaret, Director of Teacher Education, School of Education, University of Queensland 43

CROWTHER, Professor Francis Allan, Dean, Faculty of Education and Pro Vice Chancellor, Regional Engagement and Social Justice, University of Southern Queensland 30

DAWSON, Mr Mark Kenneth, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Southern Queensland 30

DOOLEY, Dr Karen Teresa, Secretary, Queensland Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages 11

DOSSEL, Dr Stephen John, President, Attention Deficit Disorder Association Queensland 1

DOSSEL, Mrs Helen Phyllis, Secretary, Attention Deficit Disorder Association Queensland 1

MADDEN, Ms Letitia Maree, Preservice Teacher Education Administrator, School of Education, University of Queensland 43

McAULEY-JONES, Ms Lesley Joyce, Faculty of Education, University of Southern Queensland 30

McFARLANE, Ms Lesley, Research Officer, Queensland Teachers' Union 18

MONI, Dr Karen Bradshaw, Lecturer, English Curriculum and Literacy Education, School of Education, University of Queensland 43

Committee met at 9.02 am

DOSSEL, Dr Stephen John, President, Attention Deficit Disorder Association Queensland

DOSSEL, Mrs Helen Phyllis, Secretary, Attention Deficit Disorder Association Queensland

CHAIR—I declare open this public hearing of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Education and Vocational Training into teacher education. I now call representatives from the ADD Association of Queensland. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that the hearings are legal proceedings of the parliament and warrant the same respect as proceedings of the House itself. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of the parliament. Are there any corrections or amendments you would like to make to your submission?

Dr Dossel—No.

CHAIR—If not, I invite you to make some introductory remarks.

Dr Dossel—I have prepared a handout with a few things, like something about the ADD Association Queensland. Our major commitment for the last three years has been running major conferences for teachers. From our point of view, teachers are the professionals that have the most influence on ADHD children, either for good or for ill. The more teachers that we can make conversant with the learning difficulties as well as the behavioural difficulties that ADHD children have—and the two are intertwined—the better it is from our point of view. Obviously, the number of teachers that we can reach with our conferences is a very small drop in the bucket. That is why we are particularly keen to be able to talk to you this morning.

In the handout there is an additional submission. There is some information about the ADD Association. There are two letters from other members of the management committee who would have liked to be here this morning but, unfortunately, they were both committed to work. One is from a teacher who finished her training in the middle of last year. The only worthwhile training that she got in the teaching of ADHD students was a seminar she put on for her classmates at the end of her course that went for 20 minutes. Her qualifications for doing that are that she is married to an ADHD sufferer and her daughter has ADHD. I am sure she did a good job, but there needs to be a lot more done than that.

The other letter is from a paediatrician here in Brisbane. It has observations he makes from feedback that he gets from parents. I have also included a brochure for the conference that we are running in Townsville. If you have a look at that you will see that what we are doing is a sincere attempt to really get to teachers and to provide some worthwhile in-service. We are bringing out Professor Tannock from Canada, who is a world expert in the teaching of children with ADHD.

Teachers need to be able to teach children with ADHD—and that applies to all teachers—because the generally accepted incidence of ADHD is five per cent, which is one in 20. So on average you are looking at one ADHD child in every classroom. It does not always work out that way: there are some classrooms where you might have four ADHDs and there might be three

other classes that do not have any, but next year the whole situation could reverse. So it is important that teachers know about ADHD, know what the characteristics are, know the learning characteristics of these children and know what behavioural strategies are likely to work with them.

We have the situation at present where many ADHD children are being suspended very regularly from school—in fact, some of them spend more time out of school than they do in—simply because teachers are unable to cope and do not understand what they need to do. A lot of that comes back to deficits in teacher training. We are not here to bash teachers—we are both registered teachers—and we can understand where teachers are coming from. They have not had the experience in their training courses and they do not understand just what is involved in teaching ADHD children.

The way ADHDs function is that a lot of their behaviour is thoughtless and impulsive. So behaviour management strategies where you have a list of rules and they are supposed to remember the rules do not always work. They can remember the rules all right, but they forget to think about them when something comes up in the playground or in the classroom. I had a 14-year-old fellow a week or two ago who got himself into trouble. Playing behind the science block at school is out of bounds, but his mates went running past, he went running with them and they suddenly ended up behind the science block. The punishment for that was to be sent off to the responsible thinking centre for 50 minutes. He had to write out a couple of things about what he had done wrong and what he should do next time. Because he was there for his 50 minutes, he missed out on football training and because of that he missed out on the big match between his school and another school, which is the highlight of the year. That arouses a lot of resentment and you are likely to have a kid who is offside and you get oppositional behaviour.

In many cases it is teacher attitudes toward children and parents. It is not uncommon to hear teachers make a comment, 'If only that stupid mother would put her kid on medication.' I have actually heard those words. You can understand where the mother is coming from when she is exposed to the sort of stuff you see on television about how dangerous the medication for ADHD is and how you are going to perhaps be giving your kid something lethal or you are going to turn him into a zombie. A lot of responsible parents are frightened of that. To refer to the parent as 'stupid' again shows where some teachers are coming from—it is their lack of knowledge and their lack of understanding. That is what we have to do something about.

The general expectation of children with ADHD until fairly recently—the last five years or so—was that it was a behavioural disorder. Now you have people like Professor Tannock, who is saying that it is more of a cognitive and learning disorder than it is a behavioural disorder. The emphasis is going back to looking at just how these kids learn and the particular deficits they have. The main deficit is in working memory, which comes into all sorts of things like comprehension. They have to remember what you said until you get to the end of what you are saying so they can put that together to make sense. Reading comprehension is affected. Quite often they only get part of the message. Things like copying things from the blackboard, writing stories and writing essays are affected. I had a 19-year-old from the local university who wanted a certificate to say that she was dyslexic. She was not dyslexic; she just could not concentrate on what she was writing long enough to write something that made sense, so the lecturer is saying, 'I don't know what on earth you are talking about.' Again, she is going to be affected by that. One of the fortunate things is that at university level student services provide services for

students with disabilities and ADD and ADHD are included amongst those disabilities. I think that is a federal government initiative and it is a good one.

The specialist teachers that are available within the schools in recent years have been getting less and less training. Many of them now have had no specific training to be a specialist teacher. They are taken straight from the classroom and the following year they become a specialist teacher, and they lack the background and the knowledge to support other teachers in the school. That is an unfortunate thing as well. I have briefly touched on parent-teacher relationships and they are an important issue. Parents and teachers have to be able to work comfortably together as a team rather than one blaming the other. Teachers have to feel confident in their own skills and their own role in order to be able to initiate that contact with parents. That is basically what I wanted to say in my introductory remarks.

CHAIR—What are the traits of a teacher who deals well with ADHD?

Dr Dossel—I think it is having an understanding that the kids are not out to get you. They are still learning how to behave, and ADHD children have more difficulty in learning how to behave. Professor Russell Barclay, who is one of the world gurus in ADHD, talks about the 30 per cent rule. He said take 30 per cent off their age and that is the sort of age that they will be acting like, so rather than having a 12-year-old sitting in front of you, you have something like an eight- or nine-year-old. If you put it in that sort of light, these children are not being deliberately naughty and then you need to have the understanding and flexibility to say, ‘Do I need to do something about this?’ ADHD children have a lot of difficulty in sitting up like little tin soldiers in the way the traditional classroom used to be organised. They tend to make noises with their mouths; with some of them their mouths never stop. They whistle, click, hum and make all sorts of noises. They are restless, they sit on their feet, they do not sit up straight—some of them quite often will stand. If you have a teacher who sees that as bad behaviour and something that cannot be tolerated in the classroom then you are heading for problems. If you have a teacher who says, ‘So what, he’s working,’ then that is an issue that does not come up. It comes back to teacher understanding of what ADHD is about. Because of that understanding, rather than say it is naughty behaviour and we have to deal with it as though it is naughty, they view ADHD by saying, ‘Okay this is just how they operate and we’ve got to tolerate that.’

Mrs Dossel—I feel that the teachers who deal really well with ADHD children have a variety of strategies that they can put in place. They do not just rely on chalk and talk to teach. They will have a diverse range of teaching methods. If the child does not understand it one way, they will attempt to do it another way and this benefits all children in the classroom. If the ADHD children learn effectively then the rest of the class can get on and learn effectively as well. I find, in my observations, that generally the teachers just try one or two teaching or learning styles, they do not know of others. I think this really reflects poorly on the outcomes.

Ms CORCORAN—In the letter from the paediatrician he or she has used a couple of acronyms, SEDUs and STLDs. Do you know what they stand for?

Dr Dossel—Yes, an STLD is a support teacher—learning difficulties. They used to be called remedial teachers.

Ms CORCORAN—What are SEDUs?

Dr Dossel—That stands for special education developmental units. They basically handle children with severe learning disabilities—the intellectually impaired and so on.

Ms CORCORAN—In your submission you talk about the selection of teachers as having to be based on more than just entry scores. You need to find teachers with what you say are 'favourable attitudes' towards children. Am I correct in thinking that what you are really getting around to saying is that we need to interview teacher applicants? The selection process is more than just looking at a score. Would you be suggesting that we need to interview school students who want to go into teacher training? How do we find out which ones have these favourable attitudes?

Dr Dossel—That is a useful thing to do. It is similar to what some of the universities are doing now with medical students—talking to them and getting an idea of whether they can relate to people. In the early part of a teacher course they need to be talking to the students and finding out just what their attitude is to kids who have problems and then, maybe, advising them that teaching is not really for them. I would not leave it until the end of the course, because they have a lot of money and effort tied up in it by that stage. If you go into teaching with the idea that every child is going to sit there like a little angel all day, you are in for some terrible shocks. The evidence is that the difficulties in the classroom are getting worse because of all sorts of societal factors and so on. Teachers need that certain personality and approach to the job.

Ms CORCORAN—We have heard a lot about practicums and the advisability of student teachers having lots of experience in the classroom. Your statistics suggest that there is one ADD child in every class. We both know that is not always going to be the case; you made that point yourself this morning. I do not know how you do this but do you think there is value in making sure that each teacher, when they go into a school for their practical work, is exposed to a class where there is a child with ADD? Would there be value in that or is that somehow disadvantaging the child?

Dr Dossel—It would be valuable particularly if the teacher who has that child has positive attitudes. If you get a teacher with negative attitudes then they are likely to transmit negative attitudes and we do not want that. If you have a teacher who has positive attitudes and can talk about this child with ADHD then you can do something about changing those attitudes. That is important.

Mrs Dossel—The universities are finding it very difficult to find what they call 'master teachers'. I was approached by a university to come and talk and give very specific practical examples of how I would handle certain children. When the student teachers came out to the school I always spoke to them. I think your idea is an excellent one. What we are facing is that we have a large number of classroom teachers who have very little training in specific strategies for learning disability children. Support teachers in learning difficulties used to be highly trained. They still do have university courses but they do not seem to be as highly trained as we used to be at the Schonell Centre and places like that. I am finding that a lot of the support teachers in learning difficulties have little training.

Dr Dossel—One of the points Denise makes in that letter I have given you a copy of is that, although they did one semester on children with special needs, to most people it was an esoteric sort of exercise. When she got up and talked for 20 minutes about her husband and her daughter

and she could tell some stories that made these people living and real, she said it was must more effective. I think that would apply with all of the disabilities, whether it is ADHD, Asperger's or any of the others. People need to see them as real people and as potentially nice kids.

Mr SAWFORD—There is an enormous debate about ADHD. I looked at a mapping exercise three or four years ago—and I cannot remember it all—and there are certain areas in Australia that have huge numbers of children diagnosed with ADHD. There are other areas that have almost zero.

I spent 25 years as a teacher and school principal. I can remember one child who I think genuinely had ADHD. I take Helen's point that good teachers can deal with anything that is put in front of them because they have a variety of strategies and they have an active learning program. The debate hinders dealing with these children, but I find I just cannot believe the numbers. When you look at areas of Western Australia, for example, in some particular towns where they have mapped the writing of the prescriptions back to certain GPs, you start to think about it. I know you made the point that parents get blamed for all of this, but often parents are at fault and so, sometimes, are teachers and society. The children are not dealt with consistently. Helen, you have given us some examples of how we deal with difficult children. I think they are very sensible examples and that all good teachers will employ them. If they have passive learning in their classrooms, teachers are deluding themselves—even with very able kids—that they are running a successful program. But the debate must harm what you are trying to do, because there are people like me. I am just being honest; I am not convinced of the numeracy of the diagnosis. It does not make sense.

If you compare similar areas in South Australia to those in Western Australia and they have 6,000 in one pocket and two in another, that does not add up. Then you look at parts of Queensland and compare that with parts of regional Victoria and regional New South Wales. You must have this information. How do you deal with that? It is very difficult for us to look at that without thinking, 'This is the GPs trying to get rid of a problem.' No-one teaches you to be a parent, and if you do not treat children consistently, you are asking for trouble. It is very hard to be a parent; it is not easy these days. How do you deal with the accusation that it is poor parenting, and how do you deal with the allegations—and the figures back it up—of why there are so many in this area but not in that area?

Dr Dossel—I have seen figures on the prescription rates across the different federal electorates. As you say, there are tremendous differences. I did hear of one small town in which 38 per cent of the year 2s in the school have been diagnosed with ADHD, so obviously you have a GP who is not doing his job very well. That does happen. There are even cases where people go to a paediatrician and they are out of the paediatrician's office in five minutes with a diagnosis.

I am a psychologist and I do a lot of diagnostic work with ADHD children. I spend three hours with the child and I gather information from the teacher and the parents. It probably takes me four or five hours to put all of that together. So I am taking that amount of time and somebody else is doing a diagnosis in five minutes. I do not think that they are that much smarter than I am. I do not think they are doing a very good diagnosis. That is one of the problems: the faulty diagnosis.

It would be interesting to mount a major research study into finding out the explanation for it. We can hypothesise a whole lot of things. For example, ADHD adults who tend to have difficulty in holding jobs may be overrepresented in the lower socioeconomic classes. So maybe if you are looking at an area that is populated by lower socioeconomic—

Mr SAWFORD—The mapping of prescriptions is more likely to be in middle class, not working class, areas.

Dr Dossel—Yes.

Mr SAWFORD—That says something too.

Dr Dossel—Yes. There are a whole lot of hypotheses we can come up with up but that is all that they are—hypotheses. Certainly the diagnosis in some cases is not done as carefully as it needs to be. Sometimes it works the other way: there are kids who should be diagnosed as ADHDs and are not, particularly the inattentive kind. The inattentive kind of ADHD child is lovely to have in your classroom, provided you do not expect them to do any work. They will sit there all day and not bother anybody. They will go off into fantasyland and that is it. They often do get missed, particularly the girls. It is the hyperactive, impulsive kind of ADHD child who tends to get noticed most often.

There are some naughty children—and that is the only way you can describe them—who have been diagnosed as having ADHD when really they do not. One mother came back to me and said, ‘Please, can’t you change your mind and say he has ADHD’? I said: ‘No, he just has a behaviour problem. The treatment is different.’ But somebody who has not done a very careful diagnosis in the first place is likely to stick to their poor diagnosis and say, ‘Yes, he has ADHD, end of story.’ So all of those things are going on. There are no definite guidelines as to how a diagnosis should be made. The DSM4 lays out criteria, and they are fairly sloppy as well. DSM4 uses terminology such as ‘often does this’ and ‘often does that’. Someone wrote an article in one of the psych journals and asked how many instances make an ‘often’. Obviously it depends on how driven up the wall you are. If you have had a lovely day, the kid might do something 100 times and that does not bother you but, if you are having a terrible day, he may do something twice and you think that is ‘often’. So there are all of those problems with diagnoses.

Mr SAWFORD—Just one last thing: deficit models in education never work. If, for example, you are dealing with a low socioeconomic area or an ethnic area and you use that as an excuse for poor teaching, it never works.

Mrs Dossel—No.

Mr SAWFORD—If you go back to what Helen said, the most successful teaching, whatever the circumstances, is a variety of learning strategies, consistency and active learning. There is a debate about ADHD which I think is sometimes unfortunate because in the process the teacher, the parent and the child get sidelined. Would it be more successful for your organisation to promote what Helen said at the beginning—if you concentrated far more on promoting a variety of teaching approaches, it would help the people you are trying to represent better than getting into the debate about whether it is there or it is not there? How do you reconcile those two things?

Mrs Dossel—That is exactly what we have done. In the three conferences that we have organised, the major thrust has been on providing teaching styles and teaching strategies for these children. All children with learning difficulties will benefit. We know that the ADHDs will have a deficit in working memory.

Mr SAWFORD—I do not want to be rude, but that would put me off if I were a teacher. If you were teaching me a range of strategies that I could use in any circumstance, I would be there. But if you are teaching me a range of strategies for a group of kids, I do not think I would be very attracted to that, to be quite honest.

Dr Dossel—They are strategies that you can apply to a lot of children who have learning difficulties.

Mr SAWFORD—The point I am trying to make is that promoting the strategies would be a more successful way of doing it.

Mrs Dossel—It is, but you still have to have some theoretical knowledge. You know that this child will have real problems in following a number of directions given in an auditory manner. 'How can I change that?' The ADHD child will not be the only kind of child in the room with that problem; therefore, we say that a more effective way of handling that is to give them visual cues. When I was a support teacher in learning difficulties, that is exactly what I would do: 'These are the children that are having problems with following this. I think this is a way to get around it.' It usually worked, and the teachers were very grateful.

Dr Dossel—One of the points about diagnosis is that, unless medication is being considered, a formal diagnosis is not terribly important. If you look at the child and you say: 'He has a difficulty with this. He cannot do that, and he has a problem with that, and this sort of teaching strategy is not effective for that,' then you do not really need a diagnosis. There are some of those grey area type 1s where the parent has indicated that they are not interested in medication anyway. Although their child may or may not have ADHD, these are the sorts of behaviours that the teacher is reporting and these are things that we need to do something about in the classroom. So we focus on those.

Mr SAWFORD—That is a big statement you are making—about not having to use medication.

Dr Dossel—The thing about ADHD is that it is on a continuum, and we are all on the same continuum. So you get people at one end who can concentrate beautifully, never do anything impulsive and can sit still for hours—who tend to be rather boring people—and you get people at the other end who are like the butterflies; they flit around all over the place. Most people are somewhere in the middle. You can get an ADHD who is very mild. Some I have seen did not justify a diagnosis according to DSM4 but still have significant problems in the classroom. You get others who are more severe, and you then have to look at a whole range of strategies, including medication. For mild ADHDs, I would not talk to parents about medication; I would talk about management strategies. This, of course, is what teachers need to know. They need to look at the child sitting in front of them and ask: 'This is what he is doing. How do I get around it?' rather than saying: 'This is a child who is sitting in front of me. He is a naughty child, so I'm going to use all of the naughty child strategies.' They do not work.

Ms BIRD—I am really appreciative of your submission. One of the consistent themes that we get—and term of reference No. 7 reflects this—is the crowded curriculum. If we continue to add and add to teacher training, it will be 10 years before they get into a classroom. You made a very telling statement about teaching strategies that are appropriate to young people and children with ADHD being appropriate for young people without it, whereas the reverse does not operate. I think that is the sort of thing that Rod was getting at: that it would be useful to look at integrating it into an existing curriculum for teacher training. It seems to me that you are also saying that there needs to be some sort of theoretical understanding of conditions that affect learning, such as working memory disability. I do not have a background in it, but I imagine there would be a range of others that are exacerbated by our living in a fast paced internet based society. Most kids find it difficult these days to spend 40 minutes or 80 minutes, particularly in the secondary school system, locked into concentration. There is some very useful theory in what you are talking about, as well as in practice. Where would you see that sitting in existing curriculums?

Dr Dossel—I think that, to develop the understanding, a lot of it has to be hands on. I do not think people learn too much from textbooks or from lectures because, by the time they get out in the field, they have forgotten a lot of it. A lot of it is overlaid by their memories of what their teachers did when they went to school. A professor of the education faculty at one university said to me, ‘If we turn out students as teachers who do exactly the same as their teachers did, we have failed.’ I think that is what is happening to a great extent. They need to be able to tie the theory into the real life and say: ‘This is a strategy for teaching these sorts of learning difficulties. Let’s go out and look at some children for whom this is necessary and practise those skills.’ So it is targeted at building up experiences.

Ms BIRD—Where do you see that happening in the existing curriculum in universities? I see where the practical happens, and we have certainly heard a lot about there needing to be more practicum. Do you see a discrete subject on working with students with learning difficulties, or do you see it spread across different subject areas?

Mrs Dossel—I think so for the exceptionalities such as intellectual impairment and ADHD. The more common ones, such as autism, will be there but not very commonly. If I were a student, I would be looking for those children I would be more likely to deal with. It will be a wee bit of a challenge for the universities to find master teachers who can say, ‘This is what I am doing because of such and such.’ I know some university lecturers have approached some that they consider to be ‘master teachers’, and they have videoed those classrooms and got the teacher to say: ‘This is what I am doing with this child for this reason. This is what I am doing with this child.’ You are right: a fast-paced classroom, meaning frequent changes of activity, is what the ADHDs thrive on provided you give very clear instructions and make your teaching explicit. You cannot expect an ADHD child or other children with deficits in memory to play the game ‘Guess what’s in the teacher’s mind’. They cannot. Or, if they do guess, they will come up with the wrong things.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—What impact would the strategies you have been talking about have if a teacher used them to teach a child with ADD in the classroom? What impact would there be on the other children in the class? I will flesh that out by referring to what I consider to be your fairly extreme example of a child with ADD whose parent has chosen not to use medication. Your submission seems to put a lot of responsibility onto the teacher.

Dr Dossel—I am not putting all the responsibility onto the teacher but there is negative publicity about medication. Not a week goes by that shows such *Today Tonight* or *Behind the News* come up with this sort of nonsense about medication being so terrible. So we can understand where parents are coming from, and I think we just have to respect that. But there is a pay-off for teachers: if they cater to the child's needs then they will have fewer problems with that child than they would if the child is faced with failure because he did not understand what the teacher wanted.

I can tell you all sorts of stories. I will give you one about an art teacher and a student—a girl of about 14 or 15. The teacher said, 'You need to do a drawing of this and show it to me before you take it to the lino block and start to carve it.' Notice what she said: 'You need to do a drawing of this.' The inference was, 'You will do a drawing and bring it to me.' The child took the teacher quite literally and disagreed with that, 'I do not need to.' She went straight to the lino block and then she was in trouble, not because she deliberately chose to do the wrong thing but because she misunderstood. ADHD children have a lot of difficulty with inferential language. They take things very literally. They speak very literally as well. They can be quite tactless, not because they are deliberately rude but simply because they do not think of the inferences. So teachers need to be aware of that, and they need to make sure the child has actually got the right message.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—What is the impact on other children in the classroom who do not have those needs?

Dr Dossel—The other children in the classroom will not be impacted adversely. Some of the children in the classroom may have similar needs for all sorts of reasons. So they will be advantaged by it. Other children in the classroom who find that the classroom is a less disruptive place because the ADHD children are working more effectively will also be able to work more effectively.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—But a child who stands while working and maybe whistles while they work, to use your own case study suggestion, would be enormously disruptive for other children.

Dr Dossel—Yes. If you tell that child that he is not allowed to make those noises and you make a big thing out of it, you are asking him to use some of his limited attention to focus on his mouth. So he has even less attention to focus on the task that you are asking him to do. My suggestion to teachers in that scenario is that you surround that child with other children who are not bothered too much by it. That might be a bit of a disadvantage to them, and you would have to monitor that, but I think that is a more effective way than making a big scene about it.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—I think it is somewhat a disadvantage. Just very quickly, my final question is on your 'choice theory'—I cannot tell you the page number—and teachers relying too much on that. I know we do not have a lot of time, but can you quickly respond to my suggestion that, if teachers do not rely significantly on encouraging or even confronting children with the notion that in the real world—when they leave school and that protective, nurturing environment—and, if they have not been taught and become familiar with a world in which they are responsible for their choices, teachers will do them a great disservice. At the end of their schooling, children will go out into the real world where the police, employers and their

neighbours will not wrap them in cotton wool and they will face serious consequences for, let us be frank, bad behaviour.

Dr Dossel—I think teachers have to be aware. Louise Porter, who is a psychologist in Adelaide, makes the point that children are learning how to behave. Some children have more difficulty with learning how to behave just as some children have more difficulty with learning how to read. Punishing them is not necessarily the way to go.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—I was not advocating punishment; I was advocating routines and good discipline—not strong discipline but good discipline.

Dr Dossel—If you use discipline in the traditional sense, a disciple is a follower. What you are saying, and the direction that you want the children to head in, is right. They do have to go out into society, but we do have to understand that some kids have more difficulty in doing that. Assuming that we have 100 per cent choice of our behaviours is not real. If you want to check that one out, talk to a person who is grossly overweight—I hope I am not insulting anybody here—and they will know more about diet and unhealthy food and fat content of food than probably any of us. Why don't they do it? They have the choice as to what they eat. What is stopping them from doing it? You will find that a lot of them are attending psychologists and counselling to try to do something about it, because something is preventing them from having those choices. Similarly with children in school: something is stopping them from making the choices that teachers would like them to make. ADHD is one of the things that gets in the way. So we need to have that understanding and that empathy and compassion, but I do agree with you that the ultimate point is that we are trying to get children who can fit into society, who can drive down the street and do the right thing, because saying to a policeman: 'Sorry, Officer. I am an ADHD, you know,' is not going to get them anywhere except into court.

CHAIR—Thank you for appearing before the committee today. We will contact you if we need further information. The secretariat will provide you with a proof copy of the *Hansard* for your information, and a copy of that will be posted on the web site.

Is it the wish of the committee that this submission from the ADD Association of Queensland and attachments be accepted as evidence and authorised for publication? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

[9.44 am]

DOOLEY, Dr Karen Teresa, Secretary, Queensland Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

CHAIR—Welcome. Do you have any comments to make on the capacity in which you appear?

Dr Dooley—I have held the executive position of Secretary of the Queensland Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages since 2004. I have also been the tertiary representative on the management committee since 2003, and I have been a member since 2001.

CHAIR—Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that the hearings are legal proceedings of the parliament and warrant the same respect as proceedings of the House itself. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of the parliament. Are there any corrections or amendments you would like to make to your submission?

Dr Dooley—There is one. On the fifth page of our submission, the last one, under item 10, it says that a major part of our mission is to conduct four professional development workshops annually—that is correct—and a biannual conference. What we should have said was 'two conferences'. We have state conferences and we either conduct or are involved in the national conference. So 'biannual' meant two levels. It was an inaccuracy.

CHAIR—Would you care to make some introductory remarks?

Dr Dooley—Yes. The Queensland Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages has 215 members from across educational sectors—from private and public schools, from TAFE, from the tertiary level and from private language colleges. Our membership is open to any person over 17 years of age who subscribes to the objects of the association. We have a management committee of 20, whom I represent, and five executive members.

As stated in the rules of the association, QATESOL was established as an incorporated association for a number of objects. These include: to foster the professional development of teachers of English to speakers of other language; to provide leadership on issues relevant to a culturally diverse community; and to advocate on behalf of linguistically and culturally diverse learners and their teachers. Our submission to the inquiry was motivated by and is within the parameters of these objects.

The three key points that we hope to make in our submission are as follows. Firstly, given what is known about second language learning in our field of English as a second language, we believe that it is essential for all teachers to undertake initial teacher education that prepares them to address the specificity of the educational needs of learners of English as a second dialect or language. That does not necessarily mean that we are advocating separate programs—we are certainly not; we are talking about mainstream teachers. But it involves understanding, when you work with an ESL student, how you take the strategies that you might use with other children

and specify them for the needs of ESL students. That is part of our mission. Some of our members are also specialist ESL teachers who work in withdrawal modes and are concerned about ESL-specific issues. We cover the whole range. Our belief is that we need specialist ESL teachers but that every teacher also needs to know how to work with the ESL children, who ultimately spend most of their time with a mainstream teacher. Some of the details of our submission address that. That is the main point we wanted to make.

Secondly, we are very supportive of what seems to be an ethos—from reading the documents of this inquiry—of recognising that teacher education is ongoing, lifelong professional learning that begins with initial teacher education and, as it continues through a teacher's career, is facilitated by providers of professional development such as us. Thirdly, we support robust and disciplined research that generates valid and reliable findings as an evidential base for tackling the challenge of attracting and retaining high-quality teacher education students. We are not an education provider in universities but, being at the nitty-gritty level of classrooms and professional development, as an association we are very aware of all the talk in the media of assumptions, beliefs and suppositions about why people are or are not attracted to teaching.

It is of particular interest to us because ESL is an area where diverse backgrounds are a real asset for a teacher to understand the diverse experiences of students in the classroom. So the issue of attracting and retaining high-quality teachers from diverse backgrounds is really important to us. Our members are aware of a lot of the talk that is often reported in the media but our concern is that mere assertions and exhortations are an insufficient basis for decisions on attracting and retaining teachers. We support any efforts to get valid and reliable research findings. That is not an area that we can provide information on, but we would like to lend the weight of our support.

Mr SAWFORD—I agree with you about the idea of attracting high-quality, diverse teachers. I think one of the great unfortunate truths about teaching in the current time is that it is about conforming, constraining and having too much to say. How do you get that diversity into the teaching profession? What sort of diversity are you talking about?

Dr Dooley—I will address the first part of the question on the sort of diversity. For the ESL field, multilingualism, bilingualism, experience of speaking another language or living in the country of another language and learning another language is crucial. It is not essential—it is certainly possible for teachers who are monolingual but are very aware to be effective teachers of ESL—but there are insights and knowledge that multilingual speakers bring that are an asset to the profession. Another is the experience of living in contexts where you are not in the mainstream.

An interesting thing about QATESOL is that so many of our members who have ended up as specialist ESL teachers are themselves experienced in other settings, either as teachers overseas or as ESL students in Australian settings. They bring a deep understanding of all the tiny things that can go wrong in a classroom and can affect students. To take one example, often full eye contact is an expectation of mainstream Western teachers, particularly if they are having a serious conversation with a child: 'Look at me when I'm talking to you.' It is really common to hear that in a classroom, but it creates enormous difficulties for students who come from cultures where you show respect for the adult by looking away. I have been a teacher in China, and I had to bite my tongue all the time to not say, 'Look at me,' when I was really serious or disciplining

a child, because they were showing respect by looking further and further away. That is just one small example, but it is a really common one.

Teachers need to have those sorts of understandings or at least know why an interaction with a child might be going wrong. They need to know, 'Maybe this child is not just being naughty; maybe there is something in the way that I'm interacting with this child.' That sort of knowledge is found in teachers who have had the experience of being in the minority—of being the odd one out and breaking the rules—and who have experienced people not understanding what they are doing with the best of intent. That is why it is very important to encourage diversity in teachers, but obviously that is learnable by all teachers. That is the 'what'.

How do we get it? We do not have access to the appropriate university statistics on the diversity of students and the attrition rates, which was why we said in our submission that there is a need to know, to have the facts and figures there. As members in the field, we hear things such as migrant students being disinclined to take teaching as a career because the financial rewards are not commensurate with expectations of families who are hoping to do well as a result of migrating here. But that is hearsay and we do not know the truth of that.

There is also talk about the English language level required to be a teacher. It takes an enormous amount of confidence and courage to teach native speakers of a language in which you are a second language speaker. Is that a disincentive? On the ground we hear that anecdotally, but we are unaware of any statistics. So we want to draw those issues to the attention of the committee and say that, if there is an intent to undertake research on some of these issues, these are some of the things we think would be worth looking at to provide an evidential basis for making informed decisions.

Mr SAWFORD—You talked about the 'what'. In a state like Queensland, where you are very decentralised, would you go out of your way to make sure that you get people from remote, regional and provincial areas, people from different backgrounds—Indigenous people and Torres Strait Islanders—and people from tough areas and different walks of life? I would have thought you would say that they are the 'whats' in trying to get that diversity. Do you agree or disagree with me?

Dr Dooley—I do agree.

Mr SAWFORD—Then the next question I want to ask is: how do you get those sorts of people into teacher education? What is coming across is that we are getting a very similar sort of group in teacher education, which I think is a weakness not a strength. How do you get people from regional areas? When you live in a remote area, it is not easy to access teacher education. If you come from a disadvantaged background, the HECS fees can be a big barrier. You might want to be a teacher but you simply cannot get in there. If you come from some Indigenous backgrounds, there are barriers there. Do you have any ideas about how you would overcome those barriers and make the diversity in teacher education real rather than just talked about?

Dr Dooley—The first thing is the need to know very precisely and rigorously what the barriers are, and the strategies will come from that.

Mr SAWFORD—They are quite obviously the barriers, so I am asking how you deal with them. How would you deal with getting more young people, and even mature age people, from regional areas into teacher education? Does your organisation have any ideas about that?

Dr Dooley—I cannot speak on behalf of the association on that. That is not an issue on which we have a position.

Ms BIRD—It is interesting to hear your comments, following the evidence we have just had from the representatives of the Attention Deficit Disorder Association. You get the feeling that people are trying to build a super teacher. Everybody is saying, 'We have this particular thing and we really feel that a teacher would need this.' It all starts to add up and, as I said to the previous group, it then creates a really crowded curriculum. Yet your submission is saying that there seem to be some really basic building blocks that can be the foundation for producing an effective teacher and, as I understand it, professional development can expand on them during a teaching career. So I think it is important that professional organisations like yours continue to exist, and I am interested in knowing how viable it is for you to continue to exist. How easy is it for you to provide input and access? Are there barriers that, from a government perspective, we could look at in order to ensure a flourishing professional development movement in Australia?

Dr Dooley—When I was sitting outside listening to the previous presentation I thought, 'Oh my goodness, if we replace ADD with ESL I am saying the same thing.' I thought, as you did, that that was very interesting and so I started to think about it while I was sitting there. That said, I will go back to a point that I started to make when I was talking about mainstream teachers, not setting up a separate program.

There is a basis of activities that you can use commonly across all students. To take one example, my particular interest is in the area of literacy. There is work that all children need. For example, there has been a lot of talk in literacy about the importance of phonological awareness, of children understanding the sound system of the English language—the 42 to 44 sounds of the language and how they map across 26 letters. That is not an ESL-specific issue. All children need to know that, and there are strategies and programs for teaching that. The way we see it is that the important thing is we do not set up a separate program in that for the ESL kids but implement that type of program with the whole class.

You need to know your learner and think, 'Why is it that this ESL child is struggling with those phonological awareness activities?' The first thing to think is that perhaps there is some interference from the first language. Does the first language have that sound or a similar sound that they are transferring across? Are they not actually hearing the English sound but hearing the sound from German and bringing it across? It may be that they cannot discriminate the difference between the sounds in the two languages yet. It is possible that the second language does not have a sound that English has and so they are not transferring anything across and they have just got something they are not recognising at all. Or has their pronunciation development fossilised—the technical term in our field—and got stuck at a level and not continued to develop for whatever reason? Fossilisation tends to happen during second language development. You get phases of development reaching a plateau and then there has to be a push or jump to the next phase. They could be fossilised for a while.

The teacher, while doing the same program with the mainstream class, needs to think about how the ESL child is performing. Maybe the reasons they could not do the activity are different from those of the native speaker of English. The native speaker of English might have a speech language impairment; the ESL child might be fossilised or they might have those transference issues. So it is more a case of knowing your learner than having separate activities. This is an issue that we face all the time with beginning teachers. They ask, 'How can I fit it all in?' The advice that I always give is: 'You are doing a lot of activities that are appropriate, especially in literacy'—in fact, a lot of literacy activities came from the ESL field; they have migrated over—'and so you just need to know how to use them strategically for this kid at this moment for their needs.'

Ms BIRD—The second part of my question was about professional associations, because I am still not convinced that a teacher in the classroom is functional enough to recognise that there is a fossilisation process going on with an ESL kid or a memory retention problem going on with an ADD kid. To get them committed to asking what is going wrong and who the experts are they can go to for support is important. That is why I am interested in organisations like yours and how viable you remain and what the challenges are.

Dr Dooley—Going back to your point: the mainstream teacher, if they have at least just got the awareness, may go and talk to the ESL specialist and get them in to assess. I agree with you about that. Secondly, viability is a really serious issue and it is one that we have faced recently. It is minuted in our most recent committee meeting from a few weeks ago. We are running a conference this year. It is a state wide conference, called 'The Business of TESOL'. The president, Sue Handyside, was delighted to announce to the management committee that she had secured funding from Education Queensland, and we are using that funding to provide scholarships for ESL teachers from regional and rural Queensland.

There are considerable numbers of English as a second dialect speakers in Indigenous communities, so we have teachers from North Queensland, Mount Isa and those sorts of places, who want to come to a state wide conference. They are looking at many hundreds of dollars of airfare plus accommodation. That is a very large imposition on individual teachers or a family budget. With the funding we are getting from Education Queensland, we are able to provide scholarships for 10 teachers to cover travel and accommodation costs. They will be responsible for registration, because you pay that yourself anyway. It is an issue and we are very grateful for the funding that we have received to deal with it this time.

Ms BIRD—Is this the first time that sort of thing has happened?

Dr Dooley—I would have to get you information. I know it has happened in the past, but it was before my time.

Ms BIRD—It is a useful perspective for government to look at perhaps funding teachers through those sorts of participations.

Dr Dooley—Yes. And it is likely to be teachers who make that effort to give up a weekend to travel across the state that are likely to go back, take the ideas and say, 'This is what I have learned; let's try it out,' and make connections. That is why we view it as a really valuable investment.

Ms CORCORAN—You might want to take this question on notice. It is a bit similar to one that Rod asked you before and it is to do with the selection of students to go into teaching in the first place. There are two points I want to make. Firstly, in your submission you mention reports that say that some of the teaching cohorts have some of the lowest entry level scores. That is contrary to other evidence we have received—some universities say how high the teaching scores are—so you might want to have a look at that. If your association is interested and has the time to come back to this committee at some stage with suggestions of how we could select students to go into teaching other than by or in addition to scores, that would be useful to us.

Secondly, we are hearing over and again that teachers do not regard themselves as professionals or that teachers think that others do not regard them as professionals. That is a bit of a surprise to me, but maybe I am out of the mainstream. Do you have a view on what the public perception of teachers is and on what teachers think of themselves? If they do not think they are professionals, what is missing? What needs to happen?

Dr Dooley—That is a particularly serious issue in the field of English as a second language, because there has been the perception internationally that anyone who is a native speaker of English can be a teacher of English. Certainly after my experience in China, my Queensland registered teacher roots would shake and quiver when I saw the lack of qualifications and the reasons for which people had got into the field. Reading the literature in *TESOL Quarterly*, which is the most prestigious international journal in our field, there is considerable complaint overseas about that perception.

So we suffer particularly from this perception that anyone can teach English. It is most dramatic in overseas contexts; it is less dramatic here. The TESOL profession has been addressing it by insisting upon qualifications. There are efforts through international bodies and PR campaigns. It is a serious issue and it comes through to ESL. Specialist ESL teachers suffer from being viewed as extra to the main work of the school. They are marginalised within the marginalised profession of teaching. In terms of answers, as an association it is a case of educating people from the ground up.

Mr SAWFORD—If you want to be a successful ESL teacher are you going to teach more explicitly or implicitly?

Dr Dooley—Explicitly.

Mr SAWFORD—It is interesting that you say that because most teachers probably teach implicitly.

Dr Dooley—Yes. And that is the agenda behind our emphasis in our submission on all teachers requiring an understanding of ESL and cultural and linguistic diversity. What comes through very strongly again and again from many angles in our field is the absolute necessity of explicit teaching.

Mr SAWFORD—How do you tie that back to teacher education and the way in which universities frame courses?

Dr Dooley—Where it ties in is in curriculum studies. This goes back to some points I made before about there being a lot of overlap between literacy education and ESL. Literacy education is about learning through language. I said before that some of the ESL techniques have come across to mainstream education, and I will cite a specific example. There is an approach to teaching writing called genre teaching, which was a response to the progressive teaching of the sixties and seventies. Genre theorists predicted and then observed that the move to implicit pedagogies would advantage children who had probably already been taught from home, were closer to the language of the school and had rich resources—both social and material at home. The children who would be disadvantaged would be speakers of English as a second language and poor children from materially or socially deprived circumstances where they did not have intensive language interaction.

A genre approach was developed in the ESL field in Australia to teach children the structures of text—how you organise a report and how you organise a poster presentation; there are rules for what goes into that type of text and specific grammatical structures that are appropriate and conventional. That explicit teaching, which started in ESL, has shifted across to mainstream literacy. It has occurred to me—and I am speaking personally, not on behalf of the association—that those points of explicit teaching need to be pointed out to beginning teachers to say, 'This is what you know in literacy; it is absolutely crucial for your ESL students that you do this and you do it well.' They need to understand the absolute necessity of explicit teaching.

There is also substantial evidence of the importance of explicit teaching of vocabulary. Again, for the last two years there has been some research reported in *TESOL Quarterly*, our highest level international journal, on the outcomes of students learning vocabulary through immersion or through explicit teaching, and explicit teaching was essential. I have not seen research to the contrary there. As I said before, the same applies to metalinguistic awareness, understanding the phonological structure of the English language and how it maps across those 26 letters. Again, explicit teaching was essential. That can be infused into literacy. I think what we are seeing, certainly in the literacy field, is an upping of the urgency for explicit teaching. I would hope that ESL could ride on that.

CHAIR—Thank you for appearing before the committee today. We may contact you if we need further information. I would ask you to get for us those materials that were requested as promptly as possible. The secretariat will provide you with a proof copy of your evidence and a transcript will be placed on the web site.

Dr Dooley—Thank you very much.

[10.13 am]

McFARLANE, Ms Lesley, Research Officer, Queensland Teachers' Union

CHAIR—Welcome. Would you care to elaborate on the capacity in which you appear today?

Ms McFarlane—I have been the policy adviser on teacher education and curriculum for the Queensland Teachers' Union for 21 years.

CHAIR—You are aware that evidence constitutes proceedings of the parliament, so I invite you to make any introductory remarks.

Ms McFarlane—Thank you. I would like to talk about half-a-dozen issues today. Most of them are to do with preservice education and a couple are to do with in-service education. I would also like to submit the Queensland Teachers' Union professional development policy, which covers both preservice and in-service education. The first issue that I would like to talk about that I think is important is the integration of theory and practice. The balance of theory and practice has received some attention during the course of this inquiry. I would like to address the committee on this issue.

In Queensland, the Board of Teacher Registration stipulates that preservice courses contain 100 days of practicum with 80 of them to be supervised in schools. We are happy with this quantum. However, we would like to see more integration of theory and practice. For example, when students are studying aspects of the teaching of literacy and the diagnosis of difficulties that children have, the practicum task would be to apply the theory in the school and then to reflect on this application in their studies at university. That does not occur in that way at the moment. It tends to be that they do courses and then they go out into a school and have a period of practice. There is not that direct correlation between when they study something and when they go out to apply it. Sometimes it is difficult to arrange that sort of practicum because of the timetables at university and that sort of thing but I think it should be attempted.

I think I am right in saying that originally this inquiry was called an inquiry into teacher training. Training denotes a simple set of skills to be learned and applied in the workplace. We feel this denies the complexity of teaching. I know you have heard all that before.

CHAIR—Rod will have a comment on that.

Ms McFarlane—The QTU does not approve of apprenticeship models of teacher education where the majority of the time of the course is spent in schools. Beginning teachers need a thorough grounding in the research and philosophy that underpin curriculum and pedagogy in order to understand its application in teaching, to analyse their own practice and to provide a foundation for further learning as a teacher. I am aware that you have visited the Sunshine Coast campus of the Central Queensland University. We have received feedback from our principal members on the Sunshine Coast regarding the graduates of the Bachelor of Learning Management. They say that these graduates are indeed well prepared to hit the ground running when they first graduate but the reports are that their bag of tricks is empty after a short time.

The reports say that they have quite a shallow theoretical base and this is needed as the foundation upon which to grow as teachers. A real university environment is necessary for them, for deep theoretical work, reflection, dialogue and debate.

The next issue I would like to talk about is partnerships between practicum teachers and universities, which is related to the first issue, I guess. There is a lot of rhetoric around the idea of partnerships. In some cases partnerships between schools and universities are working extremely well. However, the QTU gets feedback from members that in many cases teachers are not briefed before students arrive at the school and that they have little contact with academics. Ways of promoting better partnerships need to be examined and encouraged and academics need to be recognised for this work. Currently it is not the sort of thing they get DEST—Department of Education, Science and Training—points for. I am sure you know what I am referring to: they get DEST points for research and publications and that sort of thing but they do not get it for the sort of work I am talking about.

Teachers, too, need recognition for the work they put into supervising and mentoring preservice and beginning teachers. They need to feel they are true partners in the preparation of new teachers, not just supervisors of practice. We would like to see universities offering formal mentoring courses for experienced teachers. I am aware that some universities do some work in this area. Mentoring courses could be offered during internships when preservice students share the class load with the teacher so time is available for teachers to participate in such courses. The agreement we have with all the universities is that the students teach up to 50 per cent of the time and therefore the teacher is released. Universities could offer a formal mentoring course during this time.

Each year I have contact with the universities in Queensland regarding formal agreements for their internship programs. There are some excellent models of internship. These are usually undertaken in the final semester of the fourth year preservice course. I would like to tell you about a model which I think works extremely well. James Cook University has a project internship in which a project is negotiated between the student teacher and the school and organised by the university. The student teacher works as a project officer in the school, undertaking a curriculum project—something that is going to be of real benefit to the school and not just a practice thing. I feel this is an excellent introduction to professional work for the beginning teacher, who gets a real sense of agency as a professional educator.

The next issue I would like to address is the need for better induction and mentoring of beginning teachers. The induction of beginning teachers is extremely important for their ongoing learning and support in their first position as a classroom teacher. Teaching is a hard, complex job and beginning teachers need to be supported. We promote a mentoring model. However, there is no support in terms of time for either the beginning teacher or the mentor, and there is no formal recognition of such a role for the mentor or for the training of the mentor. I feel this is a waste of the expertise of experienced teachers.

There is much concern about the attrition of beginning teachers after three years of teaching, and the OECD has done a lot of work on this which you may be aware of. It is critical that better support measures be put in place for beginning teachers; currently it is very ad hoc. Support measures could include formal induction programs, formal mentoring programs with time and training, adequate planning time for beginning teachers, smaller class sizes for beginning

teachers, ensuring beginning teachers teach the subjects for which they were actually prepared in their university course, a supportive school environment and ongoing support from universities. In England, where they have some apprenticeship type models, they find that they must give that continuing support in the first year—the students going back one day a week; that sort of thing.

That leads me to the need for better liaison between universities and the major teacher employer groups. Graduating teachers can be lost from teaching altogether if they do not get a teaching position within a reasonable time. If they do not secure a teaching position they get other jobs, and the longer they are in these jobs the less likely they are to want to take up a teaching job. This is a waste of their four years of teacher education and a loss to the profession and society. In the middle of last year, when I had occasion to check up on this, there were 7,000 excess primary teachers in Queensland and even more early childhood teachers without jobs. To allow universities to continue to prepare students for jobs that do not exist is reprehensible. Better liaison between the employers and universities to address this issue and to ensure that teachers are prepared to teach in shortage areas is critical.

Another area I would like to mention is mandatory studies in preservice teacher education. The union strongly supports the inclusion of Indigenous studies for all preservice students. All educators have responsibility for the development of cultural understanding, civic knowledge and values of Australia’s multicultural society, and Indigenous studies in preservice courses at the moment are very patchy.

The last issue that I want to address is teachers’ ongoing professional learning. Yesterday I spoke about the needs surrounding the introduction of new syllabuses and how we see that more than awareness raising is needed: there is the development of teachers’ knowledge base, the translation of that into practice and the reflection of that in new work. What I would like to speak about now is the responsibility for building a culture of inquiry into practice and increasing the value placed on professional learning. This responsibility rests with many groups. Employers must provide the leadership for research and resources and must fund research by universities into pedagogy, as they did a few years ago with the School Reform Longitudinal Study in Queensland, which led to something called Productive Pedagogies and the New Basics curriculum. That was done well. Employers need to provide the funding for schools and teachers to participate in action research and professional inquiry in schools, and the time to plan together and to attend conferences and workshops. Good leadership in schools is critical for schools to be vibrant learning organisations. Teachers need supportive leadership, time and funding to support their inquiry into practice and ongoing learning. By good leadership I mean that from principals as well as other teacher leaders on the school staff; I do not mean just the formal leadership, but that formal leadership is essential.

Teacher educators need to be funded to do research into learning and pedagogy and to assist schools in their endeavours to become learning organisations. I know that at the moment teacher educators are struggling with funding matters. As we spoke about yesterday, professional associations play a vital role in the ongoing provision of learning opportunities for teachers, and often their role is overlooked in projects that provide funding. Being associations of members with the expertise that is needed to provide professional learning opportunities, they also know the issues of concern and can provide advice to employers and government. One of their major roles is to translate current theory into practice for their members.

CHAIR—Thank you very much, Ms McFarlane.

Mr HENRY—Ms McFarlane, thanks for that presentation. We have heard from the Board of Teacher Registration that they require 100 days of school setting for students. I would be interested in the QTU's view of that as a concept and an approach to a practicum. We have also heard, in earlier submissions, support for a practicum being earlier in a teaching course, preferably in the first semester of the first year. As for attrition, we have heard that in the first six years after graduation something like 30 per cent of graduates are lost to teaching. It is suggested that part of that is due to a lack of classroom management skills. I would be interested in your comments on those points.

Ms McFarlane—The first one was the quantum of the practicum. We are very happy with that. The BTR stipulates that 80 days be spent in schools. There are other sorts of things that student teachers can do related to practice that sometimes are valuable. Sometimes they work in other things—in volunteer capacities—and that can be counted in that extra 20 days. We are very happy with that. We do not want to see that cut.

Mr HENRY—One of the submissions suggested that the practicum should be in the first semester of the first year. Do you have a view on that?

Ms McFarlane—I do not think you can have any hard and fast rules on that. I think it depends on the structure of the course that the people are doing. I think people who are designing courses need the freedom to make that judgment of the particular group. There might be a difference between primary and secondary preparation courses. I think that is a professional judgment and there cannot be any hard and fast rules about it. Some people have their feelings about what works better, and it just depends.

Mr HENRY—The other point was the issue of attrition and classroom management and the potential impact that that has on graduating teachers and their ability to manage.

Ms McFarlane—I feel that their needs to be a lot more support for beginning teachers, as I said in my brief presentation. They are just thrown in to sink or swim and not given that support, particularly when they face things like being given classes for which they are not prepared. I took a call at work recently from a young woman in her first year, a secondary teacher. She had six different classes, two of those were teaching Japanese for which she had not been prepared. She said, 'I did Japanese myself at high school from years eight to 10 and I hated it, and I have been given two classes to teach. I want to stay in teaching, but this is creating too much stress for me.'

Mr HENRY—Earlier today we had a submission from ADDAQ wanting teachers with skills in managing students with ADHD in classes. What is your view on that? How do you see teachers managing those sorts of requirements?

Ms McFarlane—It is a complex job. You cannot learn everything in your preservice course. This is why you need ongoing support and mentoring. It is not an apprenticeship where you come out with a bag of tricks and you have it at the end; it is ongoing learning, and that support in those first few years is vital.

Mr HENRY—You mentioned in your presentation, as I understood it, that you did not necessarily see the practicum as being an important part; it was better to have the in-depth knowledge of the teaching and the functions of a teacher through the university training.

Ms McFarlane—I am sorry if I implied that. I said the balance is very important: both the balance and the integration of theory with practice.

Mr HENRY—You indicated that the mentoring process in the fourth year of the course was an important aspect of that whole process.

Ms McFarlane—After students have done their complete 80 days where it is more supervised, the internship program provides an in between stage where they only teach up to 50 per cent of the time and the teacher whose class they have is their mentor. So it is more a mentoring relationship than a supervisory relationship.

Mr HENRY—Is that internship after graduation?

Ms McFarlane—No, it is still part of their course, but it comes in the last year and it is usually the last semester.

Mr HENRY—Is that in addition to the 100 days?

Ms McFarlane—Yes.

Mr HENRY—Thanks, I just wanted that clarification.

Mr SAWFORD—Let's get the training question out of the way. I have spoken about this to a lot of GPs in the last month because there was a conference in my electorate and I asked my dentist and they all responded, 'We were trained at so-and-so.' Every one of them said that. They do not have a hang up about training. Why do some people in education have a hang up with training? What is wrong with this word?

Ms McFarlane—Language is our craft, and we know what certain words mean. That connotes an internship model where you are trained in certain skills and, when you come out at the other end, you know them and you can do them. Maybe being a doctor is a bit like that; I would say that being a teacher is more complex than being a medical practitioner.

Mr SAWFORD—We can agree or disagree on that. Should every university have a teacher education course? Is this a good thing?

Ms McFarlane—I am not sure. We have three universities in Brisbane. I suppose it depends on geographic needs.

Mr SAWFORD—I asked the question in response to what you were saying about the 7,000, I think, primary school teachers who are not employed. Do those 7,000 deliberately not want to be employed? Do you know how to break them down? Do they want to get a job or are they doing other things?

Ms McFarlane—Of that number a large number would be graduates. Some people would want to come back to teaching, and then there would be graduates who do not yet have a position. My point was that liaison between the universities and the employer groups needs to happen so that young people are not trained for four years of their lives, accumulate HECS debts and then find that it is very difficult to get a position; it is a real waste. At the same time, there are shortages in certain areas. I think the employer groups should be able to address ways around that. The other day the Queensland government announced they were going to give scholarships for medical trainees. If they have a shortage of people studying to become, say, maths teachers—there is always a chronic shortage of maths teachers because, if you are good at maths, you can get a better paying job elsewhere—and, particularly, paying HECS, that sort of scholarship is needed to encourage people. I am sure there are recruitment type things they can do to target the areas of shortage.

Mr SAWFORD—What is the union's view in terms of selection for teacher education courses? Do you have a view, particularly meeting some of those—

Ms McFarlane—Yes, we do. We think there should not be a narrow selection process—it should not be based on a narrow number of criteria—but we do approve of using the OP score. I think that what the person looks like at the other end of the course is more important than what they look like when they go into the course.

Mr SAWFORD—It seems to me that right across Australia, not just in Queensland, we are having difficulty in staffing provincial and remote area schools. It seems to me, using your mathematics scholarship example, that it would be logical to try to get more young people or mature age people from those areas into teacher education. There are barriers for those people in terms of costs, accommodation et cetera and maybe a scholarship for those people would help. We do not seem to have the same number of people from disadvantaged areas coming into teacher education as we used to.

Ms McFarlane—I had a scholarship at the end of year 10. As the eldest of seven children in a poor family, I would not even have continued in years 11 and 12 if I had not had a scholarship.

Mr SAWFORD—Should we resurrect some of those ideas?

Ms McFarlane—I think so.

Mr SAWFORD—Some ethnic groups are not very well represented in teacher education.

Ms McFarlane—Indigenous educators too.

Mr SAWFORD—Maybe the same thing needs to apply. Does the union have a positive view towards scholarships—

Ms McFarlane—Yes.

Mr SAWFORD—to encourage those people in teacher education? Have you done any research into that area? Do you have any written information? Is that in here?

Ms McFarlane—Yes.

Mr SAWFORD—It is?

Ms McFarlane—Yes. We have not done research ourselves into that area, but I think all of us who work in the union are teachers who were previously on a scholarship. We certainly did not pay for tertiary education; we were supported to do it.

Mr SAWFORD—Were you bonded as well?

Ms McFarlane—Yes.

Mr SAWFORD—What is your view of bonding?

Ms McFarlane—Working for four years.

Mr SAWFORD—No: what is your view in the current circumstances? Would you support bonding?

Ms McFarlane—Yes.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—Yesterday one of the universities explained how lots of, if you like, interest groups—and I do not mean that in a negative way, but interest groups all the same—are wanting to get various elements of their study of interest embedded into the compulsory part of teacher training. I would, as a comment on what you have said, suggest that your comment that Indigenous studies should be a mandatory part of teacher education would probably neatly fall into that category. Reflecting on that, I think that it would be rejected by universities and probably this committee as well, because there does not seem to be an impetus for that or a real rationale to back up your claim that it, over other areas, should be included as a mandatory component. Could you reflect in a moment as to what sort of real support there is for that amongst the people that you represent? Secondly, could you provide more detail on the basis of your criticism of the Bachelor of Learning Management? The reports about it from the first day of hearings, I understand, were very positive from the schools community, the university community and also from the graduates.

Ms McFarlane—There are not all that many graduates yet. I will address that first, if you like.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—You were very proactive in your criticism, so I am just asking you to back it up.

Ms McFarlane—I gave a balanced view. I said that the teachers say—these are our members who are principals—that they are very good practitioners when they first come out, but the theoretical base is not as strong as it should be. They are not in a proper university environment; it is more an apprenticeship model where you are learning a bag of tricks and learning to apply them. But, to become a true professional with an ability to inquire into their own practice, the theoretical base and the philosophical base of what they are doing has to be there. The feedback

that we are getting is saying that it is not there. Sure, they can come out and they can organise a sports day.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—It is good for the ADD kids.

Ms McFarlane—On the other issue about Indigenous studies, we feel very strongly—and our members do, too—supportive of reconciliation and about the responsibility of educators as part of the community to bring about a cultural understanding with all kids. This is not just studies about how to teach Indigenous children but an understanding of their culture by all the children we teach. You cannot do that unless you have done that sort of study yourself. We run cross-cultural courses ourselves as a union for teachers because we feel so strongly about this.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—Isn't that the appropriate way to develop that understanding amongst teachers who would be seeking it out?

Ms McFarlane—No, what we are saying is that it should be a foundation of everybody's understanding if they are to become a teacher.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—Reconciliation is very important, but so are lots of other cultural issues that require goodwill and understanding. It could equally be argued that all of those should be a mandatory part of teacher education around Australia. I am not quite sure as to why, unless there is a political agenda—

Ms McFarlane—It is a feeling of social responsibility to the first peoples of this nation who have been treated so badly. We feel that, as the teaching profession, it is one of our prime responsibilities.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—It does sound to me to be political, because you could equally argue religious tolerance should be a mandatory part—a separate unit—as part of teacher education, as should multicultural understanding. The list could go on.

Ms McFarlane—That is right.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—It is not a very constructive argument, but—

Ms McFarlane—This is what makes teaching complex. We are teaching people from different social groups with different needs, understandings and cultural backgrounds. For Indigenous people, we feel we have a special need to have the knowledge underpinning Indigenous culture because they are the Indigenous people of this land.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—We will agree to disagree on that as well then.

Ms BIRD—I want to take up on the quite extensive commentary you gave on support for new teachers post graduation or whatever it might be. In particular, I hear in the various submissions—they have all been from one state at the moment, and I am New South Wales teacher trained—that there are some old prejudices that have been built up over time in each state about what is reasonable training and what is not. I am a one-year DipEd graduate, and it appears the one common thing is that we are never going to find the perfect model in terms of

preparation. We can maximise what we achieve in a model, but the critical factor is what happens once those people hit schools. Some of the things that you were talking about had some very useful capacities within them to address some of this. I am not quite sure. I am just reflecting and I will have to take it away and think about it in terms of who funds that structurally, who has responsibility for that and whether it links to our inquiry directly, although it will inform us on what makes a maximum course.

One thing I wanted to take up with you was that you talked about there being no recognition for senior practising teachers in schools who often take on mentoring roles informally in schools. I remember in New South Wales they had a leading teacher category, which was a promotional position set up with that in mind. I do not think the model worked particularly well. Are you aware of other models? We have heard a little about some of the unis in Queensland sponsoring mentoring. I am looking for some guidance on how the university postgraduate type courses and so forth might feed into professional development commitments by staff. Sorry, that was a long way to get to that.

Ms McFarlane—I think that it would be quite possible. When I said ‘a formal mentoring course’ I meant one that can feed into, say, a Master of Education. The work that teachers actually do in schools is like the practice of the mentoring, so that could very well become a course they do with the theoretical knowledge to guide their mentoring practice. It could be accredited by the university. This could be done in the time that is made available during internships for fourth year students. If HECS were to be charged for that, it would provide a disincentive for teachers, because they are not going to get any extra salary for doing it. There is an opportunity for this because there is time for them to do it. Universities are very stretched places too.

Ms BIRD—The second question is a more pragmatic one in terms of picking up that state differences issue, the push for a much more nationally consistent approach to qualifications in all sorts of fields and transportability of qualifications across states. I was reflecting to the board yesterday that I probably would never have got registration to teach in this state on their existing position. I am wondering—I do not know what the level of your involvement with the national union is—whether you are aware of unions grappling with some of these issues, because it is going to be quite challenging for some of the state based unions to have to find some sort of national approach.

Ms McFarlane—I do not think so. The unions definitely support teacher registration in each state. We currently have mutual recognition processes in place. AFTRAA—and do not ask me what the acronym stands for; it is the coming together of all the teacher registration bodies—have that well in hand. The unions are quite supportive of their work and it makes it easier for our members to transfer from state to state.

Ms BIRD—Is that cross-recognition or are they attempting to develop a national registration, or are they going to leave them both in place—do you know?

Ms McFarlane—There is a little bit of suspicion between AFTRAA and NIQTSL. NIQTSL wants to do something nationally, but I do not really see the need for them to do it given that AFTRAA already mutually recognises each others’ registrants. A four-year course is common. I think there is one university in Wollongong that still has a three-year course, but they are moving

to a four-year course. As I said, all states and territories have been moving towards registration in the last few years. I think they are almost all there; maybe New South Wales is not. New South Wales is always last, but they are getting there too.

Ms BIRD—They may just have to set up a registration—

Ms McFarlane—I do not see that as a problem at all.

Ms BIRD—Okay.

Ms McFarlane—You said something about the relevance to this inquiry of support for beginning teachers. If you see the education of beginning teachers as not ending upon graduation but ending after the first couple of years, then it is relevant. I know the Board of Teacher Registration here, and I think in other states too, requires a demonstration of satisfactory practice before graduates are fully registered. I would see that it is very much—

Ms BIRD—Not that they were not relevant. My concern was about jurisdictional powers and that, at a federal level, we maybe stepping on areas of state responsibility.

Ms McFarlane—But not in the consideration of it. I imagine that you could certainly put things in your report that are to do with the support for beginning teachers.

Ms CORCORAN—My first question is also about new graduates and when they go into schools, and you have almost answered my question. I am pretty sure I am correct in my understanding of what happens in Victoria where new teachers—I think it is only in their first year, but it might be in their first two years—are, in fact, only allowed to have 80 per cent of a normal load.

Ms McFarlane—That is very good.

Ms CORCORAN—You have answered my question: it is not the case here, so obviously there is a difference around. You just need to test that; I think I am right there. We now have in Victoria a registration board that registers all teachers across all schools—independent, Catholic and government. In fact, their registration initially is only a provisional registration and they do not get full registration until they have submitted more work. I do not know over what period of time that is. I am just testing that it is different.

Ms McFarlane—Yes, it is exactly the same.

Ms CORCORAN—There is another point I want to make. You talked about your 7,000 teachers sitting out there without work. Griffith University yesterday made the point that education faculties are being asked to assist universities to balance up their institutional intake. I run the risk of not paraphrasing accurately, but it seems to be that if the university has not got enough students coming, they just whack a few more into education, which obviously is going to help—it will not assist—the balance between positions and graduates.

Ms McFarlane—I think there needs to be some honest discussion and research about future needs. Forty per cent of the profession will retire in the next 10 years, so we will need teachers.

My experience has been that employer groups will say, ‘There are all these teachers out there who are registered and we can call upon them to come back into teaching.’ They have got no intention of going back into the classroom. I have not been in the classroom for 21 years and I am still registered, but that is because I support the profession and I support what the Board of Teacher Registration does, it is not because I intend to go back into the classroom. So I am not available. And there are lots and lots of people for whom it assists them in their current jobs and maybe looking for future jobs to say, ‘I am a registered teacher.’ It does not mean they are available to go back into the classroom and teach. So I think there has to be some sort of research to find out how many people there are out there, and not count on the fact that you have got half the people or a third of the people who are registered with the BTR not practising teachers. They are not available.

CHAIR—A quick last question.

Mr SAWFORD—I will start off where we can agree, Lesley. Whatever the teacher education course, that needs to be taken into account for the first three or four years, particularly in terms of when they graduate and they are in the school. What I am trying to say is that people learn in different ways. I was very impressed with Central Queensland University, but I take the point you make that maybe there is a bit of unworldliness about it. I think that was a comment I made in the bus coming back, which sort of says what you are saying. But it seems to me that there is a need. You seem to favour an implicit model based on sound theory and then practicum and then mentoring. I do not see anything wrong with that. I think that is a valid model that has been used for a long time and it works. What I find a bit difficult is that I think there are young people and mature age people who are more attracted to an explicit model. That is the way they learn, and to have the Central Queensland University and the Victoria University approach suits them. I take the point that, just as the others need more practical skills in those first two or three years, these probably need more attention to theories. Aren’t both valid and wouldn’t we be stronger and have better teachers if both of those methods were used rather than just one? I learn explicitly and I teach explicitly. I would assume that you taught implicitly and you learn implicitly. That does not make me better or less effective than you. We learn in different ways.

Ms McFarlane—Yes. I did talk about the need for better integration of theory and practice, the direct application. When you are learning you go and directly apply it and see how it works and then go back and talk about it and that sort of thing. So I was saying that what you call an implicit model needs that sort of direct application to make it more explicit. Then I was saying that on the other hand I see that as an apprenticeship model: there are a limited number of skills that you learn and once you have got them you will be right. But to inquire into your own practice as a practising teacher—to analyse what you are doing, why you are doing it and whether it is working—you need a theoretical and philosophical basis.

Mr SAWFORD—If you have been taught implicitly, you will not analyse. That is just an idle dream that never happens. If you are an implicit learner you do not analyse, you synthesise. You do it in a different way. That does not make it less valid. What I am saying is that we are all different and we get to an end in a different way. Surely both ways—

Ms McFarlane—Yes, but I do not think there is something in the water on the Sunshine Coast to say the kids there are all explicit learners.

Mr SAWFORD—I can tell you that when they put the proposition to us you can identify up front the rationale, you can identify the processes used and you can identify the outcomes. In all the others other than Victoria University you have to dig for them, and in some of them you do not find them. Some of those points you have already made.

Ms McFarlane—I can see what you are saying, but I was saying that this is the feedback we are getting from our principal members up there to say, 'Sure, they are coming out as competent practitioners at first but they need a bit more theory.'

Mr SAWFORD—I would not disagree with that.

CHAIR—Okay. Thank you for appearing before the committee today. We may contact you if we need further information. The secretariat will send you a proof copy of your evidence as it appears in the *Hansard* and the transcript will be placed on the web site.

Ms McFarlane—Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you.

CHAIR—Is it the wish of the committee that the document tabled by the Queensland Teachers' Union be received by the committee as an exhibit and included in the records of the committee? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Proceedings suspended from 11.00 am to 11.22 am

CROWTHER, Professor Francis Allan, Dean, Faculty of Education and Pro Vice Chancellor, Regional Engagement and Social Justice, University of Southern Queensland

DAWSON, Mr Mark Kenneth, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Southern Queensland

McAULEY-JONES, Ms Lesley Joyce, Faculty of Education, University of Southern Queensland

CHAIR—Welcome. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that the hearings are legal proceedings of the parliament and warrant the same respect as proceedings of the House itself. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of the parliament. I note that you have distributed a submission. Would you care to make some introductory remarks?

Mr Dawson—Basically, our introductory remarks are summed up in the first page of the submission, but I would like to go through them. We see this as an opportunity to make a response and have an input into teacher education in the future. We have highlighted four main points on the first page of our submission. One of our major concerns is the fact that, as you are probably aware, recent changes in Queensland as a result of the review of the powers and functions of the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration have recommended that graduate entry programs, which are currently two years in length, be reduced to one year.

We know that preparing our graduates for the challenges of today's society and teaching in schools is a very significant challenge. In the past, we have had two years to do that. When someone has come to us with an undergraduate degree in another discipline area and has wanted to enter primary, secondary or early childhood education, we have had two years to give them the necessary curriculum pedagogical foundation knowledge and experience in schools. As of next year, we will have one year to do that. We are concerned that, with the increasing complexity of teaching, one year places a lot of limitations on us. Like most universities, we have responded to that challenge and we have developed a one-year program which is in the process of being accredited through the Queensland Board of Teacher Education.

We were very concerned that that change to one year was made without what we believe was adequate consultation with the universities and without strong research data to support that being an appropriate move. That is the first of our concerns. The second dot point on the first page there points out that, in terms of many of the universities, we are worried about the transparency of government funding for teacher education programs and faculties of education—that is, allocation of funds within the universities. Certainly, anecdotal evidence would indicate that a number of other universities have similar concerns. I notice that that was alluded to as well in some of the other submissions. As you would know, currently in Queensland the universities are in discussion with the Queensland Teachers' Union about increased or potentially increased professional supervision rates.

While our student teachers are out in their practicum doing the practical part of their programs, the mentor teachers are paid a supervision rate. That supervision rate has the potential

to increase significantly and universities are certainly strapped for resources. So we are concerned about the outcome of that. We certainly want to pursue very close relationships with schools and we acknowledge that both universities and the educational organisations and major employers have very important roles to play in the preparation of teachers. We want to keep that relationship sound and appropriate and highly professional, but we are concerned about the likely or possible increase in supervision costs to us, and that will obviously affect how we go about our business.

We have developed a number of programs in recent years, as most universities do as a normal part of their evaluation and development. The latest one we have developed is obviously the one-year program which is currently undergoing the accreditation process and which will be implemented for the first time in 2006. One of the things that we have struggled with is the fact that there is conflicting research—that is not surprising in any field—with respect to the balance of content and professional education studies in teacher preparation courses. So you can pick up some research papers that will indicate that there should be a very high focus or high level of content in such programs, whereas others will indicate that it is not really necessary. One of the things that we would hope is that universities have the capacity and funding to be able to pursue that from a research point of view so that it can inform not only our university but all universities so we can adequately prepare teachers in the best way possible. You will notice that in our submission we have addressed all the relevant terms of reference. That is my opening statement, and my colleagues will probably have something to add.

CHAIR—You raised a concern about reducing the time from two years down to one year. In the formulation of your new one-year course, what have you trimmed back and what have you cut out? What do you think the one-year course is lacking in comparison to the two-year course.

Ms McAuley-Jones—What we are lacking now is the understanding of the health and wellbeing of teachers and students. Because we have had to trim back we have had to put an emphasis on curriculum and obviously on the actual teaching methods—what you could say are the technicalities of teaching. We have had no choice but to cut out the actual underpinning of what I think is the human side of teaching. When I first started teaching—I know I can unfortunately speak for my colleagues too!—we were basically technicians. We were one-year trained. We were technicians and we could teach and we had a curriculum, but we did not have the human side—that approach to children and students. I know it is a very trite thing to say, but it was about the whole dimension of the student.

Unfortunately, because we have come back from two years to one year something had to go. We have to now pay lip-service to something which we had built into our two-year courses, which was the fact that our students were then not just people we taught. We were conscious that we were responsible for their wellbeing, not just educationally but also socially, because of the changing dynamics in families and in children's circumstances. When I started teaching people did not admit that they were in a one-parent family—they pretended they had a father because of the stigma. Now of course the whole dynamics have changed. Again, by going back to a one-year model, which did work in that society, we are not taking account of the changes in society that have happened in the last—and I would like to pretend it was 10 years—probably 30 years.

Ms BIRD—That is why they are postgraduate however, isn't it?

Ms McAuley-Jones—Yes. Students come with pure content. They do not come with any other social skills in that sense—no offence meant to any other discipline areas. They come with their content: maths, science, English or history. The one-year graduate diploma is of course the add-on to that.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—How much of that one-year course is practicum? It wouldn't be 100 days, would it?

Ms McAuley-Jones—Yes.

Mr Dawson—Certainly, in a normal four-year program, as you are probably aware by now, there is a requirement for accreditation in Queensland for students to do 100 days professional experience, 80 days of which must be in schools and under the supervision of a mentor who is paid for supervision. With the advent of the one-year program, part of the logic would be that we would halve that. That is certainly not the position we have taken. The position we have taken is that one of the very important parts of a teacher education program is that we need to give our students the capacity to develop—exactly the type of skills that Lesley referred to. They are the types of things that are developed at university and in schools.

In our program we have chosen to go for—and this will vary from university to university—60 paid professional supervision days in the schools. We are hoping that our students can then be eligible for an internship, where they can spend some more time in the schools as well. Our program is very unique in the fact that we have some intensive residential schools, some ongoing on-campus lectures, plus the capacity for people to also do part of it at a distance.

But the focus on the schools, the learning in context, is critical, as long as it is quality learning. Therefore the quality of that relationship between the school and the university is critical. We should never, I believe, judge it because of the fact it is going from 80 days back to 60. Our challenge now, given we have only 60 days practicum and only one year, is to focus clearly on the outcomes of that. While we do not believe that one year is the appropriate length of time, we have chosen to say: 'If we have got only one year we will have to have a different approach. We will do this as best we can within one year to get the students up to the professional level they are required to reach.'

Ms BIRD—Who has driven the requirement for a one-year course? Where has that come from?

Mr Dawson—The recent review of the powers and functions of the Queensland Board of Teacher Registration happened in late 2004. Currently, changes are being legislated. The Board of Teacher Registration has changed the bylaws from a minimum of two years to a minimum of one.

Prof. Crowther—Basically it was done to create consistency across the country, because most of the rest of the country has got the one-year course. It would seem to me that it would mean something to you as politicians that we find that certain groups of students in a faculty of education, after a certain length of time in teacher education, if they have time, start to take responsibility for a whole lot of things, which I have never seen happen in the first year or in a one-year program.

As an example, in the last several weeks I have been approached by a group of our students saying that they want to set up a mentoring program to help first-year students with socialisation issues and so forth. By the time individual students get to the point where they understand enough about who they are and what teaching is, they have been there for more than one year. I personally have never seen first-year students take that kind of responsibility. Similarly, through the faculty we run a project nationally called the IDEAS Project, which is a skill development process. We know that quite a number of our graduates after two years have the skills to understand school-wide development processes and are able to go straight into schools and work with processes like that in a leadership capacity. I have never seen, in Queensland or in the other states where we work, anybody who has gone through a one-year program who can handle that level of responsibility.

Ms BIRD—You are talking about one-year postgraduate students, aren't you?

Prof. Crowther—Yes—people with BAs or BScs who do just one year. The two semesters are simply not enough to give people that level of professionalism. If you go to other countries, and Canada is the classic example—

Ms BIRD—Or other states.

Prof. Crowther—Yes; but as I am saying, even outside Australia. If you go to Canada, Ontario has this one year after degree program and other provinces have two years and you find the same thing. The perception is that people just do not have that level of professional preparation. So we do feel that this initiative in Queensland is a backward step, but we also recognise that it has been done to bring Queensland into line with what goes on across the rest of the country.

Ms CORCORAN—I have two questions; one you may have already answered in your submission, but I have not read it yet so forgive me if you have answered it. I am talking about the way in which we select students to go into teacher education. I understand from other universities that most universities simply rely on the OP score, as it is known in Queensland. For many practical reasons that is probably all you can do. But if you had your druthers, if you had the time and the money, what would your view be on the best way to select students for teacher education?

Prof. Crowther—There is no tool currently available that enables people to predict who will be a good teacher. Even within the university setting you cannot necessarily predict very clearly until people have had an opportunity to work in schools. There are some very complex dynamics that apply about who can teach and be a good teacher and who cannot. My personal view is that there are too many students coming to our university at the present time who are not sufficiently academically capable of dealing with a whole lot of basic needs in schools, something to do with literacy, numeracy and so forth. But, by and large, 50 per cent to 60 per cent of our students are in fact at the upper end of the academic achievement continuum, and that is probably a reasonable indicator for us as to who will be successful. Certainly the success rates and the attrition rates are much more satisfactory with that 50 per cent of high achievers than with the 50 per cent of low achievers, although there is not a direct correlation.

So my personal view is that we will never find an instrument that will enable us to predict who will be a good teacher, but we do need time. It seems to me that there has to be a better counselling system available in the first semester or the first two semesters than we have currently, because the attrition rates are too high, in both the third and fourth years and in the early years of teaching. But there is no indicator that I am familiar with that would answer that question.

Ms McAuley-Jones—A number of years ago we used to interview every candidate for the primary and secondary graduate diploma. We stopped doing it because we were finding that, for the students we had interviewed, there was no predictor we could use. It did not really matter. So we stopped doing it simply because of the time and expense. We used to keep the records and we found no predictors. In fact, probably one of the better candidates that we interviewed turned up to the first day of lectures with a machete strapped to his leg and a flagon of wine under his arm. He did not turn up for the interview with those things.

Ms CORCORAN—I trust he did not go on to teach!

Ms BIRD—Were the indicators for people who should not be teachers?

Mr Dawson—I would add that certainly the predictive validity of an OP score in terms of academic success is reasonable, but the predictive validity of an OP score in terms of whether you will be a successful and suitable teacher is not. I think that, while it would be nice to be able to be in a position to select the best, there is something very important about education. Education is about enabling people to become something more. When we select people on the basis of what they are now, as Lesley has alluded to, we may actually be making a very unjust decision because what people are when they enter, often at 17 or coming from another profession or something, and what they are when they leave should be two different things. The role of a program of education is to get people to experience that personal growth. That is why we mentioned the one-year issue. There is a lot more to teaching than knowing your stuff; it is about a maturity, an attitude, a professionalism and a confidence. They are the things that take time. That is why, as Frank said, we see our students in the latter years—the third years and so on—starting to come to us realising these things. But where students have a short time and it is focused largely on technical stuff, they do not develop that. So, when we are selecting people, we have to look at the purpose of an educational program. So it is a very complex thing. It is not an easy question to answer at all.

Ms CORCORAN—Thank you. My other question is about the transparency of government funding for practicums and also the cost of those practicums. They are two separate issues, of course. Do you have an idea of what sorts of recommendations you would like to see us put in our report on those two issues?

Prof. Crowther—In our university it is not a problem, by the way—the way we manage the budget internally is that whoever yells the loudest gets the most money. They have developed that into a fine art.

Ms CORCORAN—You are talking to an ex university administrator!

Prof. Crowther—The concern across the country, which we find at deans' meetings and so on and which you have probably been exposed to, is that in a significant number of universities at the present time the faculties of education believe that money is actually siphoned off. They believe that money the Commonwealth intended for teacher education does not end up in education faculties and education faculties have become poor cousins in a number of ways relative to what they think they should be. It would seem to me that some kind of decision simply needs to be made about just which cluster of the different categories of funding education fits into. The minister needs to indicate nationally that it is his expectation that funding will follow that particular formula and that universities that do not do so should at least get some kind of endorsement from him rather than just making arbitrary decisions, which is what happens a lot at the present time.

Mr SAWFORD—On the funding issue, a university yesterday gave us a quantum for their actual budget. Then we asked the next question, which was how much money was available. They could not answer that question and they believed that they should. I think you are saying the same thing, Professor. Do you know what your quantum is, obviously in terms of your budget, and what it should be or what it could be? How much of that money is subsidising something else?

Prof. Crowther—Yes, I do. In our university, we have been through a process of dramatically changing the formula for the distribution of funds to faculties over the last two years. At the point at which this change was made, to bring us into line with what we believe is the Commonwealth expectation, the difference for the faculty of education was $1.2 million. That is how much we had missed out on compared to what we actually then got. To avoid the faculty of science going broke, because they have been accustomed to living in surroundings that the rest of us only dream about and we did not want to deprive them of that all at once, we gave and are still giving them some money to get them through a couple of years while things settle down. But yes, I know how much, according to the formula, we should get and, in fact, our university is now operating on that basis.

Mr SAWFORD—Can you give us that information?

Prof. Crowther—Yes, I can send you that information if you wish.

Mr SAWFORD—I think you are right. I think a part of our recommendations in terms of funding will have to deal with that issue. If you have some ideas about a formula, they would be very welcome. The complexity question about teaching—40 years ago they said teaching was complex, 30 years ago it was very complex, 20 years, 10 years, now it is complex. What often happens in schools is that teachers do what they can do. I have heard that some kids have not had a physical education lesson in the last two years, they would not know what music was if they fell over it and there are no science lessons. I am sure the school feels pretty guilty about not being able to cater for all those curriculum needs.

That is not all; there are those other things that Mark mentioned. You cannot keep adding. Isn't it about time we started to peel some stuff off? It seems to me—and I think you are acknowledging it in another way—that the expectations on teachers are totally unrealistic and undeliverable. Isn't it time we stopped deluding ourselves and made expectations on teachers reasonable and then we may not have this morass? We have had a lot of universities tell us that

the morale among teacher educators around Australia is terrible, they are under stress and it is not a satisfactory situation et cetera, and we are also hearing that the morale of teachers is pretty ordinary. Would you like to comment on that complexity?

Ms McAuley-Jones—I agree entirely, but that problem cannot be taken away from schools until you actually fix the social fabric of Australia. Unfortunately, the schools and the teachers are really the last line of defence now against a crumbling social fabric. When you think about it, who is going to do it? I teach social justice—that is my area, ethics and social justice—and we are really fireproofing a number of our student teachers against the circumstances that they will see in schools on an everyday basis. If we do not do it, if the schools do not do it, if a teacher is not prepared to go into a classroom and take on some responsibility for something, who is going to do it? That is what we are asking, because the parents cannot do it. The local resources in the community are stretched to the limit with other important issues, so who is going to take on the responsibility of the child with no breakfast, the child with domestic violence in the family who has never been able to do their homework properly because of the situation at home?

I humbly disagree with you when you said that 30 or 40 years ago teaching was a complex business—it was not. We were curriculum experts and we were asked to teach. We were discouraged from having anything to do with social problems. That was for the school counsellor or the social worker to deal with, not for the teacher. It has become more and more a responsibility of the schools; as agencies in the community have fallen away because of expectations from other areas, the schools are the last line in the defence. When you go to a plumber, a dentist, a doctor or a painter you choose them very carefully, you do not just take the first one out of the Yellow Pages but, when you put your child into a school, you do not have any control over the person who is going to teach your child. So it is a blind leap of faith that most of us take when we take our child to school on the first day. That is why we are begging you to realise the important job that teacher educators do for Australia. We pay megabucks to our sports stars, we pay megabucks to lots of people, but teachers do it every day and we do it not because we get paid but because we feel we have a duty for the future of Australia. The teachers of Australia are the last line of defence against a crumbling society. I would stake my life on that. I am sorry, I get a bit passionate about education.

Mr SAWFORD—So do I, and I can tell you that the good schools that I see around, and there are many good schools around—

Ms McAuley-Jones—They are wonderful.

Mr SAWFORD—Hang on, let me finish. I can tell you they do delete. They take the propaganda and toss it.

Ms McAuley-Jones—Yes, I agree.

Mr SAWFORD—They take a lot of social justice issues and toss them. And they decide on a quality educational program that works in that room regardless of the children's socioeconomic background. When you go to those schools, you actually feel proud of those people—those principals and those teachers—because they run programs that meet the needs of those children. Where there are behavioural problems, and where the kids are in trouble, you do not see that.

Those teachers measure their success by the quality of their educational programs. That is a very different emphasis to the one you are putting.

Ms McAuley-Jones—No, I am sorry; it is the same emphasis. What I am saying is you cannot have that quality program unless you understand what those needs are. You cannot just say, 'I'm cutting them out'; they have not cut them out. What they have done is bring their students away from that to a quality outcome. Unless you understand where those students are coming from, you cannot do that. I am terribly sorry; I am disagreeing with you again. They have taken account of those—

Mr SAWFORD—We can agree to disagree.

Ms McAuley-Jones—No, they have taken account of the special needs. They have taken account of the children's circumstances and through education they are stopping the cycle. They are taking their students away from those things. That is what a good teacher does.

Mr SAWFORD—But they are not into propaganda.

Ms McAuley-Jones—I do not understand what you mean by the term 'propaganda', I am sorry. Teachers do not peddle propaganda. They teach students and they take the students' circumstances and understand how they can get the children over those barriers. A good quality education program does that. But it must know what the barriers are in order to help the children overcome them.

Mr SAWFORD—But surely that is just common sense.

Ms McAuley-Jones—No. If you have a child who comes to school and flops head down on the desk, you can have the best quality teaching program in the world—but if that child is asleep in your maths lesson, you have to find out why. Why is that child asleep?

Mr SAWFORD—Probably because you do not know how to teach maths properly.

Ms McAuley-Jones—No. I am sorry, this is exactly the attitude we are battling in teacher education. I humbly beg your pardon for saying that. That child could have been awake all night because mum and dad have been belting the hell out of each other. How can I teach that child who is asleep on my desk unless I understand why the child is asleep? You have said I have thrown that out and that I am not interested in social justice issues.

Mr SAWFORD—No, I am not suggesting that at all.

Ms McAuley-Jones—Maybe that is what you said. I am sorry.

Mr SAWFORD—It could be the reason. But it also could be the case that the methodology that is used in that classroom and the way the classroom is managed are faulty. It does not have to be a social problem.

Ms McAuley-Jones—But it can be. That is what I am trying to say.

Mr SAWFORD—And a good teacher recognises that.

Ms McAuley-Jones—You must recognise that; you cannot dispute it.

Ms BIRD—I think we need to move on. There are two ongoing themes arising as we speak to each university. Around one of them—the funding—we have been able to develop some fairly clear ideas about some things that might need to take place. The other—and I think Mark referred to it—is the conflict in the research on the theory-practice balance. You could probably find research to back up whichever model you wanted. I get a bit excited about this because I am a one-year trained postgraduate teacher. We all carry our baggage about with us and I take on board that the issue is multifaceted, as we all are. I am also a parent with teenage children who is pretty disappointed in the quality of their secondary education.

The passion, for all of us, comes from trying to work through the challenge: the fact that university education of teachers is being pushed towards covering so many things—that it is expanding. It is not that those things are not legitimate; it is about where they are best placed in the program. You cannot find a perfect applicant through a recruitment process, and you cannot guarantee a perfect graduate who at the end of the course is going to walk into a classroom and be a wonderful teacher. We are grappling with what we can do best along the way. I would like to hear some of your university's conclusions about that theory-practice balance, and what your commitment is to the way you are going to manage it.

Mr Dawson—Sometimes there is an advantage in having conflicting research in that you can choose one over another but, in the end, all it really does is create confusion. Certainly we would like to see more, I suppose, conclusive empirical data that would support that. That would be an ongoing research project that we certainly would encourage. I am certain most other universities would like to see the result of that. There is a very important thing, though, and it probably partly answers what Rod was asking prior to this. It is about the role of schools. Not only might we need to reconceptualise the role of teacher education programs and the relationship between schools and universities but we might have to reconceptualise, at the same time, the role of schools, the role of teachers and the purposes of education because our society is changing.

We also have to look at the continuum. We know that the purpose of a professional education program is to prepare teachers to enter the classroom and to be competent but, as a teacher or in any profession, you develop a lot of competence after you graduate in your first years in the profession. I am sure you have already seen in many of the submissions that most universities and most employing authorities are concerned about the high level of attrition in the first five or so years of the teaching profession. Not only do universities have to look at their program and not only do schools have to reconceptualise their purposes and maybe very well limit what they do and redefine what they do but we also need a continuum of learning that continues after university right throughout the life of the professional life of the teacher. The changes that are happening today are probably only going to accelerate and become more complex in the future. The idea that universities can prepare graduates to be competent teachers for the next 30 years is very naive.

I do not know whether I have actually answered your question but, with regard to isolating the role of universities without looking at the whole, I would just encourage looking at the whole as an outcome. It is a partnership and I do think most schools and universities really would like to

work together to enhance the quality. To do so, we may have to reconceptualise a whole lot of things. It is probably time we stepped back and looked at everything.

Ms BIRD—I would not disagree. We have had this discussion to some extent—that our schools are based on an industrial model that in itself is outdated.

Mr Dawson—Exactly.

Ms BIRD—I take it from what you are saying that perhaps a significant part of teacher preparation is getting them the skills to manage change, if you like. That is different from professional ongoing development per se.

Mr Dawson—Most definitely.

Ms BIRD—Is that a focus of current preparation courses? Is that perhaps something new? Could you give me an idea about whether that happens?

Mr Dawson—To be honest, it is in our programs, but I think we can improve on that. That is one of the things that we already know. Certainly we are aware of that and we have a commitment to it but then there is pressure on us to cover everything. At the same time, they have halved the length of our programs. There is always this complexity in the whole thing. The capacity to manage change is also critical for practising teachers. The nature of some of the professional development activities in which practising teachers are engaged is not focused on that area. Certainly one of the things that USQ is very proud of is what Frank alluded to before as the ideas project—the national consultancy project. That is contributing, we believe, very significantly to the capacity of educators and whole organisations to manage this change. We do it, but I think we can do it better.

Prof. Crowther—I think what Rod is referring to relates to this question. I believe a school is no different to the Senate or the House of Representatives: it does not matter how many prima donnas you have; if they get in each other’s way and do not work together, you end up with all kinds of proselytising and wasted effort and goodness knows what. In this day and age, a school is a place where a group of professionals actually work together. They may have differences; nevertheless, they have a common purpose and a shared understanding of what good teaching is and what good learning is.

There are a lot of schools that we work in now where we know that teacher morale has increased very significantly, as have student outcomes, as a result of the sort of thing that Mark is referring to. In those schools, the processes of change are managed by the principal and teachers working through parallel leadership—these concepts that we have created—and they do delete stuff out of the curriculum. They decide as a group what is important for those kids and then they say no. They are able to say no very effectively because of the results that they achieve. The frustration for us is that it is so incredibly difficult for us to get this kind of process working, because the system keeps changing. The attrition rate for teachers and their transfers in and out of schools, particularly in the state systems, make it virtually impossible, quite frankly, to manage change processes in any kind of effective way.

Secondly, we do not know of any situation across the country where a department of education, working with the university, has created an ongoing professional development program for teachers so that they are able to continue what they did in their pre-service training across a period of three, four or five years, to the point where they have a recognised credential. There are all kinds of terminology about leading teachers and ASTs but it is pretty meaningless stuff, quite frankly. The systems are not cooperating with this sort of thing.

While it is true that our beginning teachers now are pretty well paid—if you look at the scale of commencement salaries for teachers, there is nothing wrong with them—after five years, relative to other professions, there is no reward for those people who become what we call the teacher leaders, working with principals and creating this fantastic school. So they get to that point, realise how good they are and then they are gone, off into business somewhere.

So a conceptual framework for what constitutes a holistic teacher education program, as you have education programs in other professions, simply does not exist in this country. We have 840 students at our university in a master's degree program, but none of them uses their studies in that program to go back into a school and work to improve the school, to do the kind of thing that you are talking about and meet the expectations of the employer.

Ms BIRD—I am particularly interested in the professional development association and getting some support for them. Thanks for that.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—What is the name of the two-year course and what is the name of the one-year course?

Mr Dawson—We have several two-year courses. We have a graduate entry Bachelor of Early Childhood Education. We have a graduate entry Bachelor of Primary Education and we have a graduate entry Bachelor of Senior and Middle Schooling. So we have three programs that are graduate entry that align with our four-year programs. The one-year program that will be offered instead of those two-year graduate entry programs is called a Graduate Diploma in Teaching and Learning.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—I remember from my university studies that a lot of the year was not spent studying. First of all, semesters are quite short and two of them do not add up to much more than half of the calendar year. Second, it was the case that for so many students, not just those teaching but right across—except for those of us who did doubles—even the week was about half empty. With the new one-year offering that you virtually feel you have to make available, is it possible that you can make that denser than it is and so achieve what you may have wanted to achieve over the two-year programs?

Mr Dawson—I will answer that, and I know Lesley will want to add to it too.

Mr MICHAEL FERGUSON—I am sure that the chair would like a brief answer because we are running out of time.

Mr Dawson—Yes, no trouble at all. We could double the input but that does not mean that you get the same output, and it is the quality of the input that matters. One of the concerns that we would have at university would be the assumption that doubling the contact hours or

doubling anything else would double the output. That is not the case. It is the quality of the experience, the quality of the teaching and the quality of the learning that are important. We certainly have increased the number of contact hours, through compulsory residential skills and a combination of other things, and we have chosen not to halve the practice in schools. I would not agree that it is a simple exercise at all.

Prof. Crowther—These days you do not see students around universities, like you used to. We have students working 30 hours a week—lots of them; in fact most of them.

Ms McAuley-Jones—Most universities are bound by certain regulations as to what they are allowed to offer to a student as part of a course.

Mr HENRY—I am interested in examining with you the six initiatives that we have listed in term of reference (8) in terms of relationships with schools, how they work, what they are, what sort of an impact they have on the students and the course, and whether they are a part of the four-year bachelor program or whether they are a part of the one-year graduate entry program or if that all comes together as one.

Prof. Crowther—We have a very good relationship between the University of Southern Queensland and the schools in Toowoomba. It is a very close relationship. It is called the Toowoomba Education Coalition. It is something that was started by the high schools and it has the whole lot: independent schools, state schools and Catholic schools. It is basically there to help us do our job. It is an excellent relationship. Mark could probably talk about some of the detail.

Mr Dawson—Certainly we view the relationship with schools as beyond the traditional one of student, teacher and supervisor. We know that the quality of outcomes that we desire depends upon that relationship. It depends upon us developing in the schools a knowledge of what we want them to do. We do not just place people in them; we place them in them for certain purposes to do certain things and to gain certain skills, knowledge et cetera. We certainly do use appropriately qualified sessional staff from schools, and they contribute because they have the currency. That is very important.

Mr HENRY—So they actually address the students—is that how it operates?

Mr Dawson—Yes. In fact, and this is referred to in the fourth dot point, one of the things that we wanted to develop was a very close working relationship between the academics, who have the theoretical knowledge, and the teachers in the classroom, who have the currency. It is important that we work together very well and not be isolated from each other, which is very easy to do. We timetabled one of the very successful courses that we ran this year at the school and at the end of the school day the teachers, the academics and the students sat around together and discussed issues. That involved about 60 of our students, about 20 staff at five schools and about a dozen academics for one afternoon a week. That was a highly successful event. It was also highly resource intensive.

Frank referred to the education coalition in Toowoomba. Ours is a very lucky community given the fact that the government schools and the non-government schools all work together very well. Ours is a fairly cohesive community. We choose to work with each other because that

is the easiest way to do it and we get the best outcomes. We have 16 high schools, the TAFE college, some industry representatives and some university representatives all focusing on the transition that years 11 and 12 students make into either the work force or further education. That is strengthening it. It is a multidimensional partnership.

Mr HENRY—So that is part of that coalition?

Mr Dawson—Yes, it is.

CHAIR—Thank you for appearing before the committee today. We may contact you if we require further information. We would ask you to provide the material which you have offered us as quickly as possible. The secretariat will provide you with a proof copy of the evidence as soon as it is available and a transcript will be placed on the web site.

[12.14 pm]

BAHR, Dr Nanette Margaret, Director of Teacher Education, School of Education, University of Queensland

MADDEN, Ms Letitia Maree, Preservice Teacher Education Administrator, School of Education, University of Queensland

MONI, Dr Karen Bradshaw, Lecturer, English Curriculum and Literacy Education, School of Education, University of Queensland

CHAIR—Welcome. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that the hearings are legal proceedings of the parliament and warrant the same respect as proceedings of the House itself. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of the parliament. Do you wish to make any opening remarks?

Dr Bahr—I have a few points to make. I draw your attention to the document that we have tabled today. We have not made an earlier submission. This is a collaborative document that has been pulled together from a variety of interested parties across the University of Queensland and I think represents the university's position on the terms of reference. I am just a representative of that.

The University of Queensland focuses on the preparation of teachers for middle and secondary years of schooling. We have dual degrees, graduate entry degrees and, from next year, graduate diplomas in education of one year. We have a full suite of higher degrees through to PhD and professional doctorates, including EdDs. As a university we are well known for our innovations that have an impact on policies and practices in schools, and we pride ourselves on that. An overriding statement about us and the perspective we bring to teacher education is that we are a research intensive institution. We have not developed from a CAE, and that colours the way that we address our teacher education and the things that we value in what we do.

The key points from this written submission overall are basically that we react to the use of the term 'teacher training' and we consider ourselves teacher educators. That is a comment that has come through in some of the other submissions as well. The strengths of teacher education at UQ that we would like to draw to your attention are the diversity of the students that we have; the quality of our students, given that the University of Queensland attracts very high achievers in a variety of different fields of achievement; and the high quality of our faculty, the education academics. We have internationally recognised researchers and academics in the school with extensive school experience and previous school leadership positions—and we include master teachers at all levels of our teacher programs that are currently engaged in schools. A broad range of research and theoretical paradigms inform our teacher education programs and practices.

We have some challenges that I guess we need to mention today. First of all, we feel that the profile of the profession needs to be enhanced. We see that there should be a greater role for

employing authorities in teacher education processes and a greater recognition and reward for professional development for people once they have graduated, are employed and are out in the world teaching our kids. We need to work towards the development of stronger partnerships between schools and universities, and we would like to see schools having a more proactive role with us in the practicum.

Within the tertiary sector, we particularly have concerns with the availability of research funding for education. We note in the working paper that only nine of the ARCs nationally were rewarded to education based issues in the research catchment last year. We would like to see greater recognition of school based experience and prior experience and knowledge for academics in the school. You may not be aware that, as an academic in the school of education, sometimes the fact that I have been a teacher in the school for a decade is seen as an added bonus rather than a foundation requirement. They are more interested in my academic standing. We would also like to see a recognition that within the tertiary sector there is a tendency for there to be higher workloads in teacher education because of the nature of supervision of practicum in the variety of work that we do with large student cohorts.

I will go through the key points that I would like to draw to your attention in each of the terms of reference. Term of reference 1 refers to selection. We consider ourselves to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Obviously, we set a baseline for quality in our students, but we try to draw the net as widely as possible and let the program itself be rigorous enough to select and allow students to self-select out as well as us negatively counselling. Term of reference 2 refers to getting higher qualified and more diverse students. I guess I have already addressed that a little in the other term of reference. The key point here is that we feel that academic performance is not necessarily a reliable indicator for teaching. There are many other attributes to a teacher that make the difference between a fine teacher and an adequate one. We also have limited time with graduate entry students, and there will be even less time next year with the one-year programs, to hone and mould people in these qualities that take time to develop.

Term of reference 3 refers to attrition rates. We are particularly concerned with the exodus from the profession that occurs after students have left their initial teacher training. That is an issue for us. There is research to show that there is a large exodus at the five-year mark. We see that as being a particular issue. Term of reference 4 refers to how we select and reward our faculty. Basically, there is nothing special in place to reward people in the field of education. There are awards across the university sector for teaching excellence in which education academics feature quite highly and do very well at the local, national and international levels, but there is nothing special in place for education academics. In relation to the types of rewards we get, for career progression within the university we are required to demonstrate capacities and skills across the three sectors of our employment—teaching, research, and service to the community and the university. It is a challenge to maintain those with the sorts of workloads that we have working with the students in the teacher education programs.

Term of reference 5 asks about our educational philosophy and research. The key point that we make is that we have no one single philosophy at the University of Queensland—and that that is actually a good thing. The University of Queensland draws on people who have extensive experience and understandings across a range of philosophies that feed into education practices and policy development. One thing that we do share across all of our staff and in our programs is the firm belief that research informs practice and that, when our students graduate as beginning

teachers, they have a firm commitment to researching their own practice and to valuing research in their own practice.

Term of reference 5 referred to our relationships with other faculties. We feel that we are somewhat unique at the University of Queensland in that the School of Education is not a faculty in its own right. We are part of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. We are embedded there. As a result, we benefit from synergies across the faculty in research, practice, policy development at a whole range of levels. In addition, there is the nature of the structural position of education at the University of Queensland. We have dual degrees that have cross-faculty input into our programs and, over the last couple of years, we have initiated some shared appointments, where we have employed people to teach for half of their time in the faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, particularly the School of Education, and, for the other half, to teach in other faculties, such as BACS—biological and chemical sciences—and human movement studies, which is part of the health faculty.

Term of reference 7 asks about how we prepare people in a variety of specific areas. We have included our responses in the working document, and I do not intend to go through each of those in detail unless you have particular questions. One overriding concern that we have relating to that is the sense that that term of reference seems to assume a reductionist approach regarding the issues and assumptions about those issues, and targeting them independently does not necessarily give the appropriate scope for us to explain how we deal with the variety of issues that arise in classrooms.

Term of reference 8 is about the input of schools to teacher education. They have a significant role, of course. Schools have a variety of places where they must contribute and share with us in the development, implementation and conduct of our programs and in working with students. They work with us on reference committees and they work with us as we have students on practicum. We work with them on research ventures and so forth. However, the partnerships can still be stronger. We feel that in some areas, particularly in practicum, the university unreasonably bears the cost of relationships with schools.

Term of reference 9 looks at the primary-secondary divide. There are a couple of points that I will draw your attention to. First of all, in Queensland there is no distinction in employment. You are registered as a teacher in Queensland and there is no little flag on your file to say that that is the only place where you will ever work. Having said that, we do provide secondary and middle years of schooling programs. We have been at the forefront of developing the middle years of schooling area. The University of Queensland was the first tertiary institution to implement this as a specialised degree, not just as an option within a degree program. It is a developing movement. Having said that, in the secondary program also, we tend to prepare teachers to teach across all three of those sectors because we focus on how adolescents and children mature, and on the learner and learning.

Term of reference 10 is about ongoing professional learning. The University of Queensland offers higher degrees. We have a large number of higher degree students drawn from the schools sector as well as from other sectors of the community. Our staff at the University of Queensland hold leadership positions in almost every professional association nationally. Our research includes working with schools and teachers. Once teachers are out in the classrooms, though, there is limited incentive for teachers from their employing authorities to pursue professional

development in terms of rewards, promotions or anything. There is also limited funding, so it is very hard. Teachers often pursue professional development out of a sense of vocation rather than necessarily out of a sense that it is going to be valued by the employer.

The last term of reference is about funding. I am here today, but I am not an expert on finances. In the paper that you have there we have drawn some comments from the financial managers in our school and in the faculty. If you have any focus questions, I would welcome them. We will put in a submission after today from those people. They were not available to come today. I can say, however, that funding is tight. Practicum is very expensive. UQ has seen fit to take steps to ensure that the flow-on effects of the changes to HECS and so forth have not unduly disadvantaged education within the scheme of things. Having said that, we still do not have the sorts of resources that faculties and schools of other universities enjoy. Unless my colleagues here have some points to add that I have missed or if they want to correct me on fundamental errors, please go ahead.

Ms CORCORAN—Thank you very much for that. I have a number of questions. I know that we are a bit short of time so I will be very fast. First of all, I am from Victoria, so I do not know what you mean by ‘middle years’.

Dr Bahr—The middle years of schooling are for students from nine years of age through to about 14 years of age. In Queensland, Education Queensland also has an initiative called the Middle Phase of Learning that targets particular year levels rather than ages and that goes a little younger. In our program, we look at students from the ages of nine through to 14 or 15.

I will tell you a bit about the nature of the students and the research. There has been significant research—particularly through the Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study, the DEST study *Beyond the middle* and a recent MCEETYA study—that shows that these years at the transition point between primary and secondary school are the very point when students tend to go backwards in their learning, when rigour in their studies can disappear and when students are dealing with a whole range of personal issues to do with their developing identity, changing sense of self and, of course, their physical capacities. The research shows that the traditional primary-secondary structure of our schooling creates such a disjunction that students are not well prepared, and we lose students. They become at risk.

Ms CORCORAN—You talked about UQ having a wide diversity of students. What do you mean by diversity in that sense?

Dr Bahr—We have students from every sector of the community. We are talking about multicultural students and students from a variety of different socioeconomic levels. We have students from a variety of backgrounds, particularly in the graduate entry programs, where they have taken a change of career and have, perhaps, a business, nursing or plumbing background. We can certainly say that, when you look at the students at UQ, they are not of a mould. They are not of a similar socioeconomic group or of a particular age group or of a predominant gender bias. That is what I meant.

Ms CORCORAN—This is my final question for the moment. You talked about the need to enhance the role of the profession. Are there particular recommendations you would like to see coming out of our report that would address that?

Dr Bahr—Yes. It would be wonderful if we did not have to beg for practicum places in the first instance. We do have to beg. We have students who find places in our programs who tap their toes and wait and worry about whether they are going to find a placement in a school for the practicum components of the program. This year we actually had students who could not go out on prac on the first days of prac because we did not have a placement. I know that schools have work intensification issues. There is a whole range of things that make it difficult for them to provide places.

Ms CORCORAN—Is that difficulty you are experiencing related to the professionalism of teaching or is it related to other issues in individual schools?

Dr Bahr—It is both. It is related to the professionalism of teachers. Teachers say: ‘Why would I take on a student? It is an extra workload for me and there is no recognition, or limited recognition, for me in my career progression.’ It would be nice if we were in a situation where the profession rewarded them so that they could feel—as people in other professions may—that it is a part of their professional responsibility at all levels. I am not talking about individual teachers here so much but about the systemic level. There needs to be a feeling that it is part of the professional responsibility to provide pathways through the induction process for teachers. Do you have anything to say about that, Karen?

Dr Moni—Yes, I would like to add to that. In general, the morale of teachers as I see it is quite low at the moment in the community. This is partly to do with the significant changes, particularly in my area of literacy. There have been significant attacks on teachers through the media and the community and by the government as well. One of the issues I see is the work intensification. Increasingly, people say of societal wrongs—if they do not say they are the fault of teachers—‘Our schools can fix it,’ so that, while the research is saying our curriculum needs to become less crowded, it is actually becoming more crowded. Teachers are being asked to take on more and more and to make changes to their practices without adequate support for making those changes. The changes and the professional training that teachers are asked to do seem to be outside of school hours. Teachers volunteer to do professional development without the support of the employment authorities to undertake training within schools. I am speaking both as president of one of the professional associations and in my role as a teacher educator.

I think that part of the issue facing the profession is an emphasis on more research needing to be done. There need to be closer links to research and practice at the level of the tertiary institutions, yet there is increasingly limited funding available for that research. That puts a lot of pressure on us as researchers to try to do both jobs in terms of applying for money, writing grants and participating in ARCs, as well as having to devote most of our time to teacher education programs.

CHAIR—On the issue of the placement for practicum, we are getting evidence from, probably, two groups: one group of tertiary institutions who are experiencing significant difficulty in placing their students in schools and another group who have focused on creating some partnerships with schools, as I am sure you do. You mentioned the cost of practicum and the lack of rewards for teachers in participating. What are your views on having a bit of a two-way street where the prac students provide support to the teacher as well as being a burden on the teacher—or that the university provides perhaps more advanced students to provide support to teachers as a bit of a quid pro quo rather than just the salary element itself?

Dr Bahr—It is a two-way street. The universities are providing significant support to schools. As an example, in the middle years program the students go out on prac. A team of academics go to the schools and say, 'What is an issue you would like to work on with us?' An example is the literature futures project at Ipswich State High School. We provided a PD for the school. We got the students, our preservice teachers, involved and they rolled out as an infiltration into the school a literate future initiative. Their practicum was almost a project based on a partnership between the University of Queensland and the school. That happens quite often. It does not make sense when we say that we will pay individual teachers to supervise students, because it is not the way it always works. We try to develop partnerships with schools that feed into our programs at all levels. For example, we have MYSTAs—middle years of school teaching associates—come out and form part of our teaching team. We work in with their schools and they work with us on the development of our research grants and so forth. I think that there is a two-way street and that the universities are doing their bit. But we still have to go begging for places in secondary programs. Let us say your subject area is underwater basket weaving and it is only taught at Oodna Woop Woop. If that place is already filled by somebody from another university, you are not going to get that teaching experience, yet we know that we need to be training up people in that area. It is difficult.

CHAIR—How many students—and it may be in the submission—are you trying to place in practicum each year?

Ms Madden—We would have about 250 this year in our professional year. They are in the final year. They need two practicums of seven weeks each time. So they need a seven-week block in the first semester and a seven-week block in the second semester. That is in our secondary program. We also have a middle years of schooling program.

Dr Bahr—In the first year or the middle years, professional year, at the moment we have 70 students and in the second year, around 50. They have two block placements each year with that focus on education.

Ms Madden—So, overall, I guess we are looking at close to 700 placements in one year.

Mr SAWFORD—First of all, congratulations on the presentation, Nan; I think you did very well in such a short period of time. I think we all regret that we have not had an opportunity to read through this thoroughly to be able to respond effectively. I will start at the end, at reference 11. Is there any idea that you would put forward that the practicum costs, the payment of supervising teachers, not just be a university responsibility but that they ought to be shared with the employing authority?

Dr Bahr—Yes.

Mr SAWFORD—Some of the very good schools in my electorate—and taking the point that Karen made about the additions and the basically overcrowded school program—have decided among themselves to remove streaks of the stuff. They have also done some other things which are against the orthodoxy of the day. They have increased their class sizes—because you have a choice in schools—in order to have one day a week when everybody does professional learning. In other words, they have embedded that in their school program, and to do that they have had to embed partial specialisation as well.

In the current circumstances, for example, of a primary schoolteacher with a class of 30 kids—I know your work involves the middle years, and often the circumstances are the same in the middle or secondary year schools—the opportunity within the orthodoxy to do professional learning, to have a positive relationship with a university on a research basis, is just not there. And no matter how much you might wish it, it is not going to happen unless the orthodoxy of how the school and the university operate changes. Have the schools that you contact dramatically changed the way that they operate?

Dr Bahr—Yes, indeed.

Mr SAWFORD—Could you give us examples of what they did?

Dr Bahr—Woodcrest College and Calamvale Community College are both state schools that have a P-12 brief. In their middle years, for example, they have what would normally be the equivalent of, say, three classes, and a team of teachers working with that class. The synergies that they get from that particular arrangement allows them to release teachers to do shared preparation and to focus on particular areas of specialisation rather than to try to be a jack-of-all-trades across the whole curriculum. It frees them up and improves the quality of the learning for the students, which is a very interesting outcome. It is based on research into the middle years of schooling that talks about signifying practices being collegiate teaching—the vertical arrangement of ages and multi-age classrooms—and about pastoral care, changing systemic practices, addressing the orthodoxy that you mentioned and working in the kids' favour, as well improving the sorts of circumstances and the range of expertise that we expect of teachers in classrooms. Does that answer your question?

Mr SAWFORD—That is fine. Is it your experience that that sort of example is the exception rather than the rule?

Dr Bahr—It is sort of the beginning rather than the exception: it is the beginning of a movement. Those schools are pretty special. They have been on the middle years of schooling bandwagon since the idea was seen to arrive in Australia. But other schools have also come on board now. Schools are working within their traditional structures to change the way that they are working with students in the middle years of schooling framework. The Education Queensland document entitled *Middle phase of learning state school action plan* pushes schools to make changes and to report back on how they are changing and what the efficacy of the practices is for student outcomes. There has been a significant drive to change the way that the students are being managed and organised in the middle years of schooling. I think in a very short period of time we will find that the 'one classroom, one teacher' model is perhaps not going to be as predominant as it has been in the past.

Mr SAWFORD—I have one last question. Most universities said—and I think you did as well—that teacher education was research based. Out of that comes a set of beliefs. We went to Central Queensland University and right up front, there it was: a whole set of belief systems and statements straight at you. At Victoria University it was the same thing. I am not saying that that is necessarily the be-all and end-all, but when you relate to that and you are talking about the issues of teacher education, there seems to be a very lucid logical sequence in which people from a teaching or a non-teaching background are included. Other universities do not seem to have that clear set of statements. Is there a reason for that?

Dr Bahr—I will ask my colleagues to assist me on this too, I guess. First of all, the University of Queensland is research intensive; I have mentioned that. We have people at the cutting edge of research. We find that research pushes us in the particular direction of understanding how people learn and what sort of teaching and teachers improve and enhance learning and systems in schools. In terms of our set of beliefs, we believe that this research is fundamental to improving the practice of teacher education, but we also know that the sorts of statements that you could make out of research refine themselves and their focus over time. If you put all of your eggs in one basket and say, 'We believe this about education,' you might find yourself in two years time saying, 'Okay, now we believe this slightly different thing.' By saying—

Mr SAWFORD—There is nothing wrong with that, is there?

Dr Bahr—No. I am just saying that this is where we sit as a research intensive institution that values research and its influence on the way teachers teach and practise in classrooms, and on our partnerships with schools in this research. That is our belief, our fundamental position. Can you add to that, Karen?

Dr Moni—I would like to come to the point where we feel that we are in the business of education and not training. A training model such as is suggested by some of the terms of reference seems to suggest a 'one size fits all' approach to teacher education, which does not sit comfortably with some of the other terms of reference, which address diversity and multiple pathways. From a research perspective, in terms of informing what we do, I think some of the basic premises of research are questioning, evidence and testing of hypotheses. Those are the kinds of skills that we want to instil in our teachers in that we would like them—as we do, as researchers—to interrogate their own practices. They are actually autonomous in the classroom. I think the evidence for that is the fact that other countries snap up Australian teachers very quickly. Many of our students go overseas because they are recognised as being highly professional and autonomous individuals.

I also think that the nexus between research and practice, from our perspective, is not really black and white, because we are not only working towards ensuring that our graduates are employable but also working within a university system which has its own set of attributes. We are also working with the statutory bodies: the Board of Teacher Registration, which also demands that we address certain attributes and that our graduates emerge with certain attributes. I think that, as Nan was saying, there is a danger in trying to come up with a set of statements to address all of these needs. I do not think that that is possible to do, because they overlap and use different terminologies. Our aim is to produce critical, reflective practitioners, and for that we certainly need to draw on the range of both theory and research that our university is strong in.

Mr SAWFORD—I could go on, but my colleagues would get mad at me.

Mr HENRY—I would just like to explore with you this issue of attrition following graduation. Your figures confirm other submissions that we have had that as many as 30 per cent are lost in six years. Earlier submissions suggested that it was largely as a result of classroom management skills or challenges, and perhaps that extends to behaviour management as part of it. Does that mean a lack of teaching skills in that equation? Following on from that, the BTR have 100 days as a figure of time spent in a school setting. In those circumstances is that enough?

Dr Bahr—First of all, people are leaving the profession and we do not know where they are going. The teaching programs that we prepare them for actually develop a whole range of skills, including communication skills, human resource management—there is a whole host of things. I think there is even a degree in the country that is not called a bachelor of education; it is called 'learning management'. That recognises, I guess, that there are a whole range of sectors in our community that wish to employ people who have teaching qualifications and experience. Some people move into education with a view to moving out, I guess, into other sectors.

Mr HENRY—They are just using the course as a pathway to other outcomes.

Dr Bahr—That is right. We do not have data on where they go. We know that that many people leave our classrooms, but where are they going? Are they going overseas to still teach? Maybe they are. Are they going into the corporate world and being employed as trainers and therefore still working as educators?

Mr HENRY—Is that something that we should be picking up on?

Dr Bahr—I think we should. It would really help if we had some data on that area. I am a little frightened to say that they are running away from teaching. They are running away from classrooms into other things, but I would not be comfortable in saying that that was not necessarily their plan in the long run from the start. Why would they plan not to stay in the classroom? I think you are right. People do not stay in the classroom because of some issues to do with behaviour management, and that is not necessarily teaching skills; it is also structural. Let's face it: the hardest classes to teach are years 8 and 9. We are saying to kids who are trying to use their energy and explore themselves and get around the place, 'No, our structures are that you will sit for 42 minutes in this sort of environment and then you will change your mind and talk about some other arbitrary selected discipline.' It is not the teacher's fault; that is a structural thing. That is one of them.

Mr HENRY—Suggestions about that structural process have come forward from industrial revolution days, more or less.

Dr Bahr—I guess my suggestions for change would be to have a look at our research about how students learn at the various ages and design our classrooms so there is a focus on their needs, the way they learn and the sorts of realities that they are experiencing. If you do that, then you will not have so many behaviour management problems. You will still have some because there are kids who bring baggage with them—I guess that is the nicest way to put it—and, again, they are a teaching and learning challenge. Getting back to your question about whether we are actually skilling teachers up: we are. We are giving them tools to research their classrooms to figure out what the learning needs of their students are. What we are not saying is, 'If you do this, this and this practice, then you will reach all students,' because that would be silly.

Mr HENRY—That comes back to the next part of the question: is 100 days of school placement appropriate?

Dr Bahr—That is a mystery to me. I think somebody plucked the number of days out of their left nostril, to be quite frank. There is no research to suggest that any given number of days relates to the development of teachers.

CHAIR—The evidence that we have received indicated that that is probably where it came from.

Dr Bahr—I do not understand it. We look to competency based assessment because some people are very competent up front, some people take a while and some take longer than 100 days to actually become competent. Fundamentally, I do not understand the 100-day rule, the 80-day rule or any day setting.

Mr HENRY—It should be a flexible time.

Dr Bahr—It should be related to the people whom we are actually looking at and we should be saying: ‘Have you jumped over the bar? Can you think in the way we would like you to think to improve the learning for our kids?’ The bottom line for me when I look at them is, ‘Do I want you teaching my child?’ If they say to me, ‘I can teach your child; I have spent 100 days in schools,’ it does not cut it for me.

Mr HENRY—Thanks, I appreciate your response.

Mr SAWFORD—Do you have any research as to why people are exiting at the five-year mark?

Dr Bahr—That is what I was saying. I think there is a dearth of research. We do not know where they are going.

Mr SAWFORD—There will probably be positive and negative answers.

Dr Bahr—There are people who talk about the disillusionment of the profession and there are people disillusioned with the profession for the variety of reasons that are outlined in the document. There are people who talk about the difficulties of teaching. It is not an easy row to hoe. Maybe that is part of the nature of the profession too. But what we do not know is where exactly these people are going when they get out. They may not be leaving education. They may be doing other things that are still education based. We do not know whether that was always their intention. That certainly is an area that needs focused attention, I think.

Mr SAWFORD—You mentioned the inclusiveness of the entry into the teacher education courses. How do you do that in as brief a way as possible?

Dr Bahr—We take anybody who has gained entry to the University of Queensland and the undergraduate courses. If they can show us that they have got on board and have an offer for the science degree or whatever, they can then choose a pathway towards a dual degree. By the time they get to us, though, they will have demonstrated their track record. They spend a little bit of time, obviously, developing their disciplinary expertise before they can hit a classroom. Actually, they do not ‘hit’ a classroom. That is an unfortunate word! Certainly they spend some time doing some other things before we get them in the professional years. We ask that they need to have passed.

Ms Madden—They need to meet the prerequisites for either their KLAs or their teaching areas in that undergraduate program.

Mr SAWFORD—Are you getting undergraduates from remote and country areas?

Dr Bahr—We are, in as much as they can attend the University of Queensland at St Lucia or Ipswich. I know that sounds awful but we are not a distance education provider. That is one issue. We do, though, provide a range of scholarships for people to go out and pursue as much of their program as possible in remote and rural areas for their practicum placement, for example.

Mr SAWFORD—What are those scholarships worth?

Dr Bahr—Not much.

Ms Madden—They are $60 per week for the period of their practicum. It is to assist with travel and accommodation expenses. We also do what we can to liaise with the schools to organise accommodation, sometimes free of charge for the students or sometimes at a reduced rate, in those rural areas.

Dr Bahr—It is not much but it is better than nothing. The difficulty that we have though is that, even if they are from a remote area, if they have come down to study with us at UQ then they might have picked up a part-time job. They might have a flat that they are living in. In fact, they probably will. What will they do while they go away for seven weeks? They do not have their part-time job anymore if they are out in a rural area. They probably still have to cover their flat payments while covering accommodation in the remote area. If they have got children they are damned. What will they do with them? It makes it very difficult. These may well be people who want to teach in rural areas who could, at the end of their degree, shift their whole being out into a community and make positive contributions.

Mr SAWFORD—These scholarships should be based around, perhaps, income support.

Dr Bahr—That would not hurt.

Ms Madden—We have about 21 of those scholarships for the secondary program. We normally have about that same number apply, interestingly. If we have a few extra, we are willing to make exceptional appeal for extra money in order to furnish them with the scholarship. In our experience, we have found that those people who take up the rural scholarships are very serious about going back to rural areas. Once they graduate, they often nominate to receive teaching positions in rural areas.

CHAIR—Thank you for appearing before the committee today. We may contact you if we need further information. A proof copy of your evidence will be provided to you by the secretariat and a copy of the *Hansard* will be posted on the web site.

Resolved (on motion by **Mr Henry**):

That the submission from the University of the Queensland, together with any attachments not previously published, be accepted as evidence and authorised for publication.

Resolved (on motion by **Mr Ferguson**):

That this committee authorises publication of the transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day, including the publication on the electronic parliamentary database of the proof transcript.

Committee adjourned at 1.00 pm