Teaching as a Profession

A disciplined group of individuals who adhere to ethical standards. This group positions itself as possessing special knowledge and skills in a widely recognised body of learning derived from research, education and training at a high level, and is recognised by the public as such. A profession is also prepared to apply this knowledge and exercise these skills in the interest of others (Professional Standards Council)
Professional Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>Q’land</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Victoria</th>
<th>Tasmania</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 hrs</td>
<td>100 hrs</td>
<td>100 hrs</td>
<td>100 hrs</td>
<td>100 hrs</td>
<td>20 hrs</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>60 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Other Professions

### Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Hours/Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>50 hours pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse/Midwife</td>
<td>20-40 hours every 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>- Minimum 20 hours pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Must accumulate 120 hours every 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Counsellor</td>
<td>20 points pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>40 points pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartered Engineer</td>
<td>Minimum of 150 hours over 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review or audit is usually part of this CPD process!
“I think this is a very good thing overall because it brings us in to line with other professions and in many ways raises the respect for the profession for which we are members!”

“It’s really important that our professional judgement of what we need is actually recognised. The way we teach children is individualised, so why shouldn’t it be individualised for us?”

But not all teachers were equally as positive!
1. Review **professional learning** undertaken by teachers as part of the **renewal process** including links with APST, impact on their professional growth, and the challenges in meeting this requirement.

2. Provide **feedback** to the Board about the processes used and how these might be **enhanced** to ensure that the **standards** attained by the profession are meeting the **expectations** of the Board.
Research Questions

1. What is the **nature** of the professional learning experiences undertaken by the teachers sampled?
2. What **impact** did teachers perceive these learning experiences had on their professional growth?
3. To what degree did the **APSTs align** with the professional learning experiences reported?
4. How did teachers record and provide **evidence** of their professional learning?
5. What are the **key challenges** experienced in meeting professional learning requirements?

6. What areas **of interest and need** are identified by teachers in supporting their professional learning?

7. What was the **response to the TRB’s communications strategy** in disseminating information to teachers in SA around professional learning requirements?
Research Design

9,210 teachers renewed in 2015-2016 with 25% selected randomly (*n=2,254*)

**Phase 1**
- PL summaries
  - Viewed
  - Coded
  - Tallied
  *n=2,092*

**Phase 2**
- Online survey
  - Coded
  - Tallied
  *n=1,980*

**Phase 3**
- Focus group interviews
  - 13 groups
  *n=116*

*NB: 162 summaries not included in the evaluation*
## Research Sample

### Age range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Percentage of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Employment setting**

- Long Day Care: 6%
- Pre-school: 8%
- Primary school: 49%
- Middle school: 8%
- Secondary school: 29%
- Not currently teaching: 1%

n = 150

**Included so % vary to ES**

**Employment status**

- Permanent full time (over 90% load): 49%
- Permanent part time (51-90%): 14%
- Permanent part time (less than 50%): 7%
- Full time contract: 17%
- Part time contract: 8%
- Short term contract: 3%
- TRT: 2%

n = 149
Geographical location x Years of teaching

- Metropolitan SA: 73%
- Country SA: 24%
- Remote SA: 1%
- Interstate: 1%
- Overseas: 1%

Teachers Registration Board of South Australia
Data Analysis - Central Tendency

Mean = Average

Add all numbers and divide by how many numbers there are

Eg., 100, 1, 2, 3, 1
=21.4

Mode

Find the number that occurs most often

=1

Median - midpoint

Middle or midpoint in a set of numbers. Place in numerical order from highest to lowest. Count the number of data points and divide by 2.

=2
Two questions guided the analyses:

1. Are there **differences in the medians** for groups of the sample for a given variable?

2. Is there **an association between pairs of variables?** (e.g., employment status x mode of learning)

   **Significance set at 5% probability, \( p<0.05 \)**
Audit of PL Summaries

1. Confusion between what constitutes professional learning compared to professional practice – i.e., core business of teachers.

2. Due in part to confusion around differing expectations between TRB and employer requirements at system or local level (i.e., within a particular school).
Issues identified:

• Inclusion of inappropriate activities (e.g., P/T interviews);
• Inclusion of teachers’ interests or hobbies that did not actually align to the APSTs;
• Provision of vague mention of the activities undertaken including acronyms that were not easily recognisable;
• Lack of clarity regarding the dates and time commitments for activities;
• Unclear reference to the standards with a lack of annotation as to how the activities helped meet the standards; and
• Lack of appropriate evidence identified in the summaries.
RQ 1: Modes of Learning

Proportion of all activities coded in TRB 5 modes of learning

Surprising!

Total activities = 38,479
Total hours = 239,946

Face-to-face: 82%
Study: 1%
Research: 4%
Online learning: 8%
Communities of practice: 5%
Employment status

Lower median for TRTs than permanent and LT contracts \( p=0.00 \)

Median higher for permanent (51-90%) and TRTs than permanent >90% \( p=0.001 \)

Median higher for TRTs and ST contracts

No differences

Higher median for permanent than TRTs \( p=0.002 \)
Employment setting

Lower median for Not currently teaching (NCT) than most other groups

Median higher for Pre school and Primary and Secondary than NCT

Median higher for NCT than other groups

Median higher for LD care than most other groups

Lower median for NCT than other groups

All $p=0.000$
Geographical location

Higher median in Metro areas than Country $p=0.01$

Median lower in Metro areas than Country $p=0.001$
• Even though F-to-F is difficult for some cohorts to access, still a priority even across geographical location (more later!)

“I opted for online learning in some instances, however I felt the experience was not as rewarding as face-to-face and very lonely compared to being able to work with other teachers physically! (TRT)”

• TRTs and ‘Not currently teaching’ often consistently significantly different to the other cohorts of teachers.
RQ 2: Impact

For each mode of PL, please estimate the impact of the activity

Percentage of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of teachers</th>
<th>F-F learning opportunities</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Online learning</th>
<th>Communities of practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Impact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Impact</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Impact</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Impact</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More TRTs opted for HI \( p = 0.018 \)
More NCT opted for HI \( p = 0.001 \)

Most positive overall
• A difficult construct to collect detailed data around even with items provided on the online survey.

• Focus groups, teachers spoke about the immediate impact of vibrant presenters who captured the audience and broaden one’s thinking at the time.

• Many teachers were cognisant that impact might not actually be realised until much further down the track.

Teachers spoke about “poor quality” PL too and its negative impact!
RQ 3: Alignment to APST

Differences evident but no clear pattern except TRTs & NCT – median for each standard < other cohorts
Focus groups – clear teachers tried to align activities to as many standards as possible – not a TRB requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of standards in learning summaries</th>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ 4: Nature of evidence

12% of learning summaries had no evidence

Others - inappropriate evidence for activity

***Most problematic for ALL teachers – fear of not knowing WHAT to use as evidence

→ high preference for certificates provided with F-to-F PL!!
RQ 5: Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack prerequisites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No employer support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts with work schedule</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family responsibilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relevant PL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No incentives for participating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
Significant trends:

• TRTs most impacted along with NCT while teachers on Short-term contracts also affected.

• Issues included:
  
  o Payment, cost for PL
  
  o Lack of access to school support and networking (knowing what is available or possible)
  
  o Juggling work and family commitments and earning with the need to complete PL.

• Teachers in Country locations identified similar issues along with getting access to relevant PL.

• Years of teaching, 0-3 years with PL conflicting with work schedule.
Summary of challenges as frequencies from teacher open responses (n=726)
**RQ 6: Needs**

- K & U of relevant curriculum frameworks
- K & U of particular subject area(s)
- Pedagogical competencies in teaching particular subject areas
- Assessment practices and evaluation of individual learning
- Information communication technology skills for teaching
- Behaviour strategies to manage the learning environment
- Differentiating the curriculum for individuals with special needs
- Teaching individuals from diverse multicultural and/or multilingual backgrounds
- Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders
- Teaching cross-curricula skills – i.e., problem-solving, creativity
- Incorporating play in the learning environment
- Career guidance and/or counselling in centre/school setting
- Leadership and management skills
- Well-being of learners and teachers in an educational setting

**Percentage of teachers**

- High level of need
- Moderate level of need
- Low level of need
- No need at present
- Not Applicable

**High and Moderate need > 50%**

**Close with 46%**
Differences across cohorts?

No clear trends but differences for...

Consistency for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of teachers</th>
<th>K &amp; U of relevant curriculum frameworks</th>
<th>K &amp; U of particular subject area(s)</th>
<th>Pedagogical competencies in teaching particular subject areas</th>
<th>Assessment practices and evaluation of individual learning</th>
<th>Information communication technology skills for teaching</th>
<th>Behaviour strategies to manage the learning environment</th>
<th>Differencing the curriculum for individuals with special needs</th>
<th>Teaching individuals from diverse multicultural and/or multilingual backgrounds</th>
<th>Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders</th>
<th>Incorporating play in the learning environment</th>
<th>Teaching cross-curricula skills – i.e., problem-solving, creativity</th>
<th>Career guidance and/or counselling in centre/school setting</th>
<th>Leadership and management skills</th>
<th>Well-being of learners and teachers in an educational setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of need</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate level of need</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of need</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need at present</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences across cohorts?

Consistency for...
Summary of needs as frequencies from teacher open responses (n=468)
• Knowledge and understanding of relevant content in specific curriculum areas (APST 2):
  o Mathematics (not literacy and numeracy!)
  o Humanities and social sciences
  o Sciences
  o Arts, drama and dance
  o Languages including Greek, Italian, Japanese, German and Chinese
  o Music
  o Health and PE

• Fairly evenly split between secondary and primary school teachers.
Broader Findings

• Cohorts that require particular support around PL (e.g, TRTs, NCT, ST contracts).

• Funding for PL is ‘tight’ regardless of system – just as much variation within systems as across!

• Increased ownership means increased responsibility to engage with relevant PL – culture shift.

• Balance between what might be school-focused PL AND the needs of individual teachers - ownership for the individual is crucial here!
Building teacher ownership of PL

- Reflect on impact of PL
- Standard 6 focus areas to frame PL
- Lifelong learning as a professional
- Reflecting on own needs as a professional

Clarification of expectations

- Systems alignment through cooperation
- Supporting teachers through collaboration e.g., TRTs
- Induction and mentoring of teachers

TRB processes and communication

- Share evidence from evaluation to support teachers

Ensure integrity of the profession
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