



EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TEACHING FOR THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY

Project Discussion Paper

June 2004

Contents

Background.....	2
Why the AEU Should Engage.	2
Common Themes in the Future as Seen by Others.....	3
The emergence of a ‘knowledge based society’ or ‘information economy’	4
The increasing importance of education.	4
Schools become more important but are perceived as needing major changes.. ..	4
Leadership.....	5
Emphasis on teacher quality	5
Curriculum and assessment	7
ICT	8
Discussion.....	8
The Future of Society.....	9
The Organisation of Schools.....	10
School Leadership.....	11
Teacher Quality.....	12
Curriculum	15
Educational decision making	15
Appendix A – The Future as Seen by Others	17
1. The OECD	17
2. The Six OECD Scenarios.....	17
3. The Commonwealth Government and the Department of Education Science and Training (DEST	18
4. Australian Council of Deans (ACDE.....	20
5. United Mind Workers	21
References.....	22

Background

This paper arises from a Conference 2003 resolution which states:

In 2003 the AEU will continue to engage with the consultations, inquiries, reference groups and other meetings on issues of the quality of teaching and the teaching profession, and pursue the positions outlined in this recommendation and related documents.

It should also seek to build on its position through an examination of relevant literature, such as that from the OECD, the Australian Council of Deans of Education, and the DEST paper by Peter Cuttance and the preparation of a discussion and/or position paper.

Behind this resolution is a recognition that there have been a number of documents in recent years seeking to describe, and in many cases, determine the shape of teaching in the future.¹

The OECD has a major project underway, involving a considerable number of publications, seminars, consultancies and several pilots, for instance in the UK and NZ. (See “Teaching, Learning and Schools for the Future”²).

The Commonwealth has taken a number of initiatives impinging on the future of teaching. During the latter part of 2002 and through 2003 there has been a Review of Teaching and Teacher Education initiated by the Commonwealth Minister, Brendan Nelson and chaired by Kwong Lee Dow. (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2000a, b and c)

A National Reference Group of professional associations and other educators recently developed a National Statement on Standards for the Teaching Profession (2003) and MCEETYA has endorsed a National Framework for Teaching Standards³ which will influence the intended development of nationally consistent teaching standards.

The future is defined in the OECD terms as 15 to 20 years- a period that can be contemplated without going off into science fiction. It is also interesting to note that placing this time period against the current teaching workforce leads to a realisation that many will not still be teaching by the end of that time period. Therefore teachers new to the profession will have as much responsibility in effecting the changes as those already practising, and the AEU needs to consider the continuity and successions aspects.

Why the AEU Should Engage

There are many obvious reasons why a union that represents teachers should develop a position on where that profession may go in a time that looks set for radical change. Who better than teachers to articulate a view of where teaching should be headed?

One good reason for the AEU to engage in the debate is to ensure that more socially and educationally acceptable scenarios are included, and that change is driven by the best of considerations in the interests of both the profession and students.

It would also strengthen the arguments that the AEU, as the largest union representing teachers, has a fundamental right to be involved in the major forums making decisions about teaching and schools. It would facilitate its working towards restoration of better processes of consultation and consensus building, rather than the confrontational style that has become the norm with, in particular, the Commonwealth government.

¹ Whilst the focus here is on teaching and teachers, this clearly cannot be separated from the future of schools and schooling, or students and learning.

² web address http://www.oecd.org/topic/0,2686,en_2649_34521_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

³ Available at http://www.curriculum.edu.au/mctyapdf/national_framework.pdf

In making submissions to the Teacher and Teacher Education Inquiry and working on the National Reference Group on Professional Teaching Standards, the AEU drew on policy already prepared and began the process of further developing it to respond to the emerging issues. This activity highlighted the need for the AEU to develop a more comprehensive vision of where teaching should go in the future.

There is an understandable temptation for the AEU and its members, and teachers generally to turn their back on the debate, or to respond in a defensive and derogatory manner. Many of the propositions are easily rejected and their credibility questioned.

Throughout the 1990s, many similar agendas were pursued by employers and right wing advocates in a situation where cost cutting and anti-public sector ideologies were the clear motivators. Much of this continues today, and is evident in each bruising enterprise bargaining round. They are frequently expressed by bureaucrats who can only thinly disguise their uncomplimentary views on teachers.

However, such a reaction presents a very real danger that it will simply ensure that the debate continues without the AEU playing a decisive role in it. Left on their own, many of the current forces seem quite capable of building a momentum which, if nothing else, will become a major irritant to teachers. There are several organisations keen to assume the mantle of “voice of the profession” and engage in the debate.

Common Themes in the Future as Seen By Others

This paper is intended to facilitate a discussion about the issues and play a part in the process. This part of the paper considers the views of others rather than an AEU perspective. This is done because there is a quite considerable agenda being developed by officials at the international level and taken up nationally. These views are becoming pervasive because of a lack of alternative views. It is not being suggested that the AEU endorses these views but that there is a need to become familiar with these as a background to developing an AEU perspective.

In reading the literature around the future of teaching that emanates from, in particular, official governmental sources such as the OECD and the Commonwealth, a number of common themes emerge. These appear also to have been picked up in many other sources.⁴ The following is an attempt to cluster the themes that are presented as “the future” by such sources.

1. The emergence of a ‘knowledge based society’ or ‘information economy’

Knowledge is seen as one of the key determinants in individual and national wealth creation. The emphasis, however, is on knowledge creation and what is done with knowledge, not just knowing. It is being able to create new knowledge and use knowledge that is important. As a result there must be increased investment in skills, organisations and people.

⁴ Appendix A looks at four sets of work around the theme of teaching and the future. Clearly, this is a small selection from a wide variety of possibilities. However, the selection is intended to present a range of views which are typical of what is being said in key forums and by key bureaucrats where the topic is discussed. The first two represent the key international and national agencies of the OECD and the Commonwealth government. The third is the publication by the Australian Council of Deans, which is widely cited in debates and was considered influential in the deliberations of the Teacher and Teacher Education Review. The fourth, a book called “United Mind Workers” is perhaps more unusual in that it is intended to be influential on unions. It has certainly had considerable impact on the education unions in the USA, and is worth consideration for that reason.

There is a particular emphasis on particular scientific areas. This situation is summed up by the Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education:

Australia, like many nations seeking to position its citizens to participate in the emerging global economy, is increasingly having to base its future on the emerging new science and industry fields such as bioinformatics, biotechnology, genomics, laser science, nanotechnology, micro-electronics – which derive from the enabling sciences of physics, chemistry and mathematics. (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003a, p.1)

2. The increasing importance of education

Within this context, education becomes far more important. There is an emphasis on extended participation and lifelong learning, and the places where learning takes place become broader. Despite this, or in fact because of it, “front-end” or early education becomes even more important for laying the foundations for what is to follow. Whilst on the one hand education is to move from individuals to networks, from knowledge transmission to knowledge creation, there are also more individualised pathways through education.

3. Schools become more important but are perceived as needing major changes

Our present education system is simply not prepared to meet these demands of the new economy, and requires substantial qualitative changes on top of greater public investment (ACDE, p.1).

There is much talk of schools currently being based on a “factory model”, (or even a cottage industry). They are portrayed as being inflexible, hampered by over centralised and over bureaucratic processes. The need to be adaptable at the school level, to tailor programs to local circumstances and the needs of individuals, and particularly to appoint the staff to meet local needs, leads to calls for greater self-management. Indeed, the paper by Cuttance on school innovation (2001) can be read on one level as little more than a treatise for school based management.

Schools, it is said, need to become “learning organisations” themselves, with the capacity to be continuously adapting and changing to new circumstances and ideas. “Enterprise education” and “innovation” have become buzz words.

Whilst they are set to become more important, there is also predicted to be a ‘declining educational monopoly’. The places from which students can learn are said to become broader, especially through the internet and other ICT applications, but also through both life and work experience.

Within the literature examined, the focus is entirely on the individual school and what takes place within it. There is an assumption that self managing schools are better and an advocacy of this as an essential reform. There is virtually no discussion of system quality or obligations, or of how the individual school fits into the education of the nation as a whole. As Beare (cited in Cuttance, 2001b, p. 224) remarks:

We will be thinking in terms of individual schools, not systems of schools. That is indeed the rub, for to keep putting schooling into the straightjacket of what we have come to regard as schools is inhibiting. It approaches planning from the

wrong end of the spectrum, and it closes the mind to the most exciting of prospects for the twenty-first century... (we need to transform schools) away from a tightly meshed control-oriented institution and into a professionally liberated network bounded by the mission of serving a population of learners...

Even where there is some concern with the need for more equitable outcomes in order to utilise everyone's full potential, the responsibility is put back onto individual schools. For instance Cuttance asserts:

...the differences between classrooms and programmes within individual schools are much greater than the differences in effectiveness between most schools (2001a, p.207).

A theme he develops more fully in *The Impact of Teaching on Student Learning* (Cuttance 2001b).

Similarly, the growing tendency to compare and contrast "like schools" is used to suggest that the problems of inequity are due to in school factors.

(Brennan (2001) has an excellent critique of the flaws of comparing "like schools". She notes it leads to lists of desirable characteristics and legitimises outside intervention (p.67), to standardising curriculum frameworks so that there can be standardised accountability mechanisms, (p. 68), and observes that the initiatives are changed too rapidly for them to be effective (p. 68).)

4. Leadership

In a decentralised system in which schools are to be innovative and flexible to local need, leadership is stressed as very important. The approach to the definition and meaning of "leadership", however, is sometimes ambivalent, at times focussing on the hierarchical positions and others taking a more broad view. This is discussed further below.

5. Emphasis on teacher quality

A huge emphasis is placed on teacher quality. Ensuring high quality and high performing teachers is continually portrayed as the single, almost exclusive factor, in improving student outcomes.

This is contrasted with the current quality, which it is suggested is of considerable concern, particularly in what are seen as the key areas of science, mathematics and technology. Teachers are portrayed as not being up to date and too traditional in their approach and use of knowledge. They are, it is said, concerned with knowledge content rather than knowledge creation.

Teacher education at all levels is also perceived as in need of radical reform in order to provide the teachers that are needed. Also under scrutiny is the process of induction and mentoring, and the term "internship" is becoming popular. Ramsey for instance, asserts:

No teacher should receive initial teacher certification to teach who has not demonstrated the attainment of essential standards of professional practice. (2000, p.8)

Professional development is acknowledged as currently inadequate.

...educators require more time for professional development and reskilling, for national and international exchanges, and for secondments to other community organisations as schools become better integrated with local communities (ACDE, 2001, p. 3)

Certified standards, at all levels from beginning to ‘accomplished’, are seen as important, and the role of the newly emerging institutes of teachers (and similar statutory bodies) is seen as being enforcing, maintaining and raising quality through registration and applying mechanisms to de-register the less competent. Compulsory renewal of certification based on evidence of professional learning is advocated.

Whilst teachers are set to become more important and higher status, there are also new roles in schools for other adults and “experts”. This ranges from greater use of support staff to relieve teachers of administrative work, to “teaching teams” of qualified teachers leading teams of less qualified personnel. There is also a desire to find a role for outside expertise, to bring business persons, practising scientists, and those with ‘real work’ experience into the teaching process.

The OECD poses the question of “How to open professional school roles for adults with different forms of expertise” (2001, p. 66). The Teaching and Teacher Education Review suggests that “A range of roles for support staff, teaching assistants, non-teaching experts and community members within teaching and learning merits further consideration”. (2003 a, p.33)

For teachers the changes are seen as dramatic:

With a complex mix of teachers and paraprofessionals, paid and voluntary community support, the use of sophisticated learning technologies (every child has a computer, for school and at home), and institutional boundaries that have been blurred, the role of the teacher will inevitably change. Indeed, there may well be fewer and much (sic) highly paid teachers in future places of learning – now perhaps more appropriately named ‘learning coordinators’ – than were required in the inefficient mass-production classrooms of old teaching and old learning. (ACDE, 2001, p.113)

Within this scenario, unions are generally portrayed as barriers to progress, supporting and protecting the status quo, which includes centralised staffing, transfer and promotion systems, and automatic incremental salary scales.

... appointment of teachers from a waiting list prevents the principal and school community from creating the best possible mix of teachers (Ramsey, 2000, p.11).

Teaching is no longer seen as a life time career. There is an acceptance that many will leave having taught for less than a decade, and that people will come into teaching “mid-career” (i.e. after experience in another form of work). This is seen as placing challenges on the “normal” qualification pathways and used to question the nature of those qualifications.

6. Curriculum and assessment

Curriculum changes are typified by the “new basics” concept. Knowledge is seen as more integrated. Traditional subjects are seen as creating undesirable boundaries which hinder integrated thinking.

New learning will be general in focus, rather than specialised on the particular needs of the day. It will be about creating a kind of person, with kinds of dispositions and orientations to the world, rather than simply commanding a body of knowledge... The new basics are about promoting capability sets, reflexive thinking and autonomous learning, collaboration, communication, and broadly knowledgeable persons (ACDE, 2002, p. 3).

Paradoxically, however, there is considerable emphasis on science, mathematics and technology which are seen as the key knowledge areas. There is an emphasis on entrepreneurship, inventiveness, and innovation, and these subjects are seen as being closely linked to this.

Assessment operates in two potentially contradictory ways. On the one hand, if control of schools is devolved there is perceived to be a need for “quality control” – basic skills tests to ensure that the school is delivering to the ‘benchmarks’, and to produce performance indicators if there is market choice and competition. On the other, it is recognised that to achieve the curriculum outcomes desired there must be authentic assessment integrated into the learning process, based on rich tasks rather than examination of knowledge memorisation.

This is summed up by the OECD:

How adequate this (evaluation and assessment) information is depends largely on how comprehensively it covers the key dimensions of system and institutional performance rather than just a selection of the most readily measurable. (2001, p. 69)

Tertiary entrance requirements are generally perceived as re-enforcing the old type of examination and not being conducive to a more progressive curriculum;

The question arises of whether the traditional examination system that still dominates in many countries exercises an altogether excessive influence, diverting massive volumes of energy into the credentialing rather than learning process. (OECD, 2001, p. 69)

There is also an emerging emphasis on the curriculum being about creating the right attitudes and character in students, the “kind of person” referred to by the ACDE above. This is epitomised in the BCA’s “Employability Skills (DEST, 2002).

7. ICT

There is a view that ICT should and will become pervasive, both as a tool for new learning through the individualisation of learning, and as a “new basic”. There is some criticism of education for not grasping technology and integrating it into pedagogy sufficiently. However, there are few indicators of how it is expected this will occur.

It is seen as spreading learning beyond the classroom, even at its extremes as an alternative to schools – if schools do not “keep up”, it is said, they will be by-passed by students using the Internet.

One such view of technology, along with other changes such as blurring the boundaries, or even de-schooling” is expressed by Spender:

Then there is the issue of convergence. With schools teaching VET subjects and school students enrolling in university courses, the boundaries between educational institutions are already blurring. Online the convergence may be even greater. Will it matter where the digital material originates? Will it be learning style rather than content which distinguishes the different institutions? What will this mean for the school and the public profile of the teacher in the twenty-first century? (2002, p. 10)

Technology is also given a key role in professional learning and curriculum dissemination.

Discussion

Writing about the future seems to induce a style that is hyperbolic and based on polarisations. The likely changes are frequently exaggerated, with the future portrayed as needing a seismic shift and complete revolution in practice. There is a polarisation between an “old” which is headed for a disaster and a “new” which is given as the only rational course. As such, there is a fair amount that can be traced to an evangelical style in much of the writing.

There are few who would disagree that there will be big changes over the coming two decades. However, the extent to which these are revolutionary and require wholesale change to current practice and processes is more debatable. Many would argue that institutions like schools are and always have been in a state of flux, and that much of the adaptation is already taking place.

There is also considerable room to question the pathways that are charted as the “only solution”.

An approach which recognises the past and builds on the experiences of the present, which is accompanied by open and honest recognition of what is already occurring, can offer a more viable alternative to agendas based on pre-determined ideological objectives. At the same time, if it is to be effective and credible, it needs to be genuinely forward looking and adaptive, and not simply a defence of the status quo.

Nor should the “futures agenda” of others as summarised above be viewed as necessarily wholly hostile. There are many elements to be welcomed, and many opportunities offered. This is not to deny that interpretations of how to implement some ideas in practice will differ and that some have possible stings in their tail, but there is a need to confront and work through some hard issues.

Essentially, the AEU needs to consider how its policies and aspirations relate to these contexts, and how it can create a future which best meets its perspectives.

What follows is intended to open that discussion by considering some of the major themes above and what the AEU needs to consider.

1. The future of society

Many of those advocating change speak with a sense of inevitability and pre-determinism without any reference to the capacity for individuals and society to have input into how the future might look. There also seems to be a fair amount of using the “inevitable” directions as a way of arguing that we must move towards certain politically loaded agendas. Much of the future, as portrayed by others, appears to be anti-worker, anti-union, inequitable, and individualistic.

Within this context, it is important to first ask what is desirable and undesirable, and to what extent a better future can be created. In considering the agendas of others, it is necessary to distinguish

what is really inevitable, what is realistic, what may possibly happen, and what can be avoided. Additionally, current achievements should be recognised and the means found to build on them.

It is not the case that accepting the future must mean shifting the balance of the employer/employee relationship toward the employer and leaving workers with no collective rights or capacity. The social implications of what might happen, and how we can ensure that there are not victims as well as beneficiaries of progress, must be a major part of the discussion

It is also important to emphasise that the fundamental principles of society and of schooling are not to be changed. The transformative aspects of education, creating social cohesion, and supporting basic human rights, for instance, are immutable, not matters to be pushed aside because of some new age. Work such as that by Richard Teese (2003) and the evidence of the PISA Report (Lokan, Green and Cresswell, 2001) point to the importance of giving policy priority to ameliorating the inequities in Australian society reflected in schooling. Such priorities must be incorporated in any developments, not be swept aside in a rush to new forms of schooling.

In its response to the Teaching and Teacher Education Review, the AEU stated:

... that it engages in the “futures debate” from a position which acknowledges change will happen, but which also asserts that human rights and worker rights will continue to be important, and that nations and societies have some capacity to determine the shape of the future, and must do so in a socially responsible way. The primary responsibility of teachers to their students will remain. Their responsibility is to educate and prepare those students for life. Whilst this includes the vocational aspects, (including their industrial rights and the role of unions), it must not ignore the social, political, cultural and environmental aspects. (AEU, 2002, p. 4)

There must also be an assertion that schools have been perpetually evolving since their inception and that much of what is talked about as necessary in the future is already taking place in many schools, and that schools are grappling with the issues of change.

Nor can what is happening in schools be separated from what is happening in society. Growing up today takes place in a considerably different environment to past generations. Greater expectations and academic pressures are resulting in more tutoring; more structured extra curricular activities and less free time. More students live in cities, with greater noise levels and less secure environments. There is much more commercial pressure on children through the media and computer games, which regards children primarily as consumers. There are increasing concerns with sex abuse, mental health problems, and factors such as exposure to lead contamination. Increased access to junk food and fewer opportunities for exercise are leading to increased obesity.

All these issues affect the ability of children to learn and make the task of teaching more difficult.

Poverty is increasingly undermining the quality of life and the opportunities and outcomes of too many children. The pressures on families brought about by economic hardship, unemployment and underemployment on the one hand, and the huge number of working hours being forced upon parents to economically survive on the other is eroding the life chances of children in our community.

The growing gap between the “haves” and the “have nots” in society at large is increasingly reflected in the provision of schooling. There is increasing government funding to private schools thus increasing pressure on those who can afford it to attend them, whilst the more difficult

students are becoming distilled in the public system. Even within the public system, the growth of voluntary fees and user pays is undermining the concept of free and equitable provision.

Discussions on the future of teaching cannot be separated from considerations about how to address these issues.

- 1.1 What are possible and likely scenarios for the future of society?**
- 1.2 Which are desirable and attainable**
- 1.3 How can they be achieved?**
- 1.4 How can we create a stronger social system and reassert the role of social society?**
- 1.5 What role will knowledge and new technologies play in that society and economy?**
- 1.6 How will the way education and schooling is delivered be affected by and need to adapt to this?**

2. The organisation of schools

As noted above, it is suggested both that there will be a renewed emphasis on the importance of school as a key foundation to life and at the same time a move to reform schools.

Much emphasis is placed on the capacity of the school to be “flexible” and adapt to local requirements, to be “innovative” and “enterprising”. The notion of school autonomy and self-managing schools looms large, with the goal of school based staff appointment one of the prizes. Schools need to be “risk-taking”.

There is virtually no talk of systems except in the context of someone for the schools to be accountable to. There is a paradox in that this accountability is through such things as standardised tests which encourage more conservative approaches, and are shown to produce uniformity rather than flexibility and risk taking.

The impression is that schools should compete with each other rather than collaborate and work as part of a system or in networks and clusters.

The AEU, on the other hand, must emphasise that quality starts with system quality. Schools are not self standing, but interact with each other, and the framework and context for this interaction is set by the way the system is organised and framed. To achieve quality outcomes, it must encourage cooperation and take clear responsibility for equity and minorities. The challenge to public education created by government policies favouring private schools must be addressed by governments themselves.

The emphasis on the quality of individual teachers which is so obvious in the resources considered would be better placed on quality teaching and learning. This would focus not on blaming individuals but on creating the best possible and most workable system. It would include issues to do with the attraction and retention of teachers, including the quality of teachers in isolated areas.

From an AEU perspective the issue of decentralisation of management to the school level has become associated with the devolution of financial management, has taken the senior administrators away from educational leadership, and created competition and inequity between schools. The AEU has stood out against its implementation for this reason. Consequently it is now portrayed as being in favour of the “massive rule-bound, hierarchical public bureaucracy” that United Mind Workers (Kerchener, Koppich and Weeres, p.14) refers to. However, some of the better arguments for decentralisation now put an emphasis on the application of professional

judgement, the right of teachers to be collegially involved in school decision making, to work together in teams to solve the problems that are real for them, and do not focus on the Principal as an all powerful line manager. Such models may enhance teacher professionalism, and are reminiscent of the workplace democracy movements of earlier times. Within a framework of strong public systems, consideration of where various decisions can be made and to what extent is it desirable to embrace and shape decentralisation are potentially more constructive.

There are both historical and geographic differences in the extent to which Branches and Associated Bodies accept school based appointment. Perhaps it is time to review what does and does not work in relation to this, and whether it can be made compatible with a set of system-wide principles including equity and collaboration.

In its submission to the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, the AEU noted:

The characteristics of schools with an innovative climate are likely to include:

- schools as learning organisations with many opportunities for ongoing professional learning;
- high levels of professional empowerment in which the teacher and teachers collectively feel they have a real say in what and how things are taught, the way funds are spent, and other matters of school policy;
- therefore a high level of industrial democracy;
- a shared vision clearly articulated, developed collegially and in consultation with the students, parents and community;
- opportunities for both individual and collective reflection;
- an environment that encourages risk taking and supports and builds on failure as well as success;
- allocation of time and resources to build entrepreneurial and community links.
(AEU, 2003, p.7)

Such schools would be highly desirable workplaces, within which members could exercise their professionalism.

Flexibility also needs to be redefined. Too often it is about cost cutting not the increased support necessary to achieve equitable outcomes. It is applied to structures rather than delivery. For instance, it could and should apply to flexible delivery of schooling to remote Indigenous communities or the flexibility to engage less enthusiastic students through varied curriculum and pathways.

It should also be recognised that some of the best examples of innovative practice have occurred where schools have worked and planned together in clusters. Therefore the creation of cooperative relationships between schools offers a constructive alternative to choice and diversity models which encourage competition and deregulation.

Another feature of more recent developments is the blurring of boundaries between schools and TAFE, and some would argue elsewhere, such as through the use of on-line learning (see above). The effects of this on the boundaries of schooling are yet to become clear. However, they can be clearly seen in, for instance, the VET area. There is a need to work out the most appropriate partner relationship with TAFE in particular.

- 2.1 What are the characteristics of a quality system?**
- 2.2 Within such a quality system, what should be the structural characteristics of schools in terms of the location of decision making?**
- 2.3 What will be a desirable mix of school autonomy and accountability, system responsibility and support, and network and cluster arrangements?**
- 2.4 Within this, what are the necessary conditions to ensure teacher professionalism and decision making?**
- 2.5 To what extent and in which ways should schools be “flexible”, and how can this flexibility best be obtained within equitable and collaborative schooling systems?**
- 2.6 How might teacher appointment, transfer, and promotion best be organised to fit with this?**
- 2.7 How are the boundaries of schooling blurring, and what partnerships therefore need to be developed?**

3. School leadership

School leadership is becoming an area of increasing emphasis. There are a number of reasons for this. It becomes more important at a time when schooling is considered to need to undergo more change. There is pressure for greater school self management which requires more from school based leadership. A third factor relates to the changing profile of the teaching force as it moves from a situation of large numbers of highly experienced teachers to one where there will be increasing numbers of newer teachers.

However, the tendency noted above to focus only on the school level in regard to school organisation is repeated in regard to leadership. There is no acknowledgement that the need for quality leadership is system wide and applies just as importantly to those beyond schools. The growing tendency for Ministers of Education to be a pawn of treasury departments has seriously undermined the teaching profession. Increasingly Directors General are perceived and perceive themselves as government hatchet persons rather than leaders of the profession. This is increasingly extending down through the bureaucracy and within the formal leadership in schools. Quality systems must move back from this politicisation.

As noted above, “leadership” is an ambivalent term. It is used to describe the formal hierarchy within a school – the principal and deputies and so on. The Commonwealth Minister of Education very much emphasises it as an accountability and responsibility mechanism linked to self managing schools:

Critically important is for principals to have power over staffing. Few boards or heads of any organisation ... could guarantee quality of their service without some control over who they employed. Schools are no different. (Nelson, 2003)

On the other hand, others stress that leadership is best viewed as dispersed leadership, that it does not automatically reside with those in positions of authority, (though it is even more imperative that those in authority exhibit the characteristics). The Teaching and Teacher Education Review, for instance, notes that:

There is also a ... dispersed or distributive form of leadership which could, in principle, extend to all members of staff and to students. Leadership does not depend on positional authority; nor is leadership the exclusive prerogative of the adults or the teacher professionals in the school. (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003c, p. 221)

However, there is sometimes a lack of clarity in discussions as to whether what is being advocated is greater principal authority and “line management” or greater professional involvement in school based decision making. For instance in *The Teaching and Teacher Education Review* (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003c), there is unequivocal support for greater principal autonomy;

...it would be highly beneficial to confer greater authority and responsibility for decision making on the school principal and to strengthen and make more effective many existing school governance arrangements”. (MR p.226)

but this support is conditioned, even ameliorated, by the section on school leadership which is very strong and progressive. It is supportive of democratic styles, and the involvement of all teachers (and the wider school community) in decision making. (See pp.220- 235). For instance:

It has been suggested that innovative organisations intuitively accept that ideas are non-hierarchical and require both individual and collective advocacy and engagement. (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003c, p. 221)

MacPherson and others (1999) look at the role of teachers in curriculum leadership.

Within this context, then, leadership can be democratic, enhance professional judgement, and be collective and collegial.

When talking about leadership, it is probably best to make a clear distinction between these two different, though related forms of leadership, as both should continue to exist. There are times when it is appropriate to talk about formal promotional positions, what should happen to them, the quality criteria and the development and rewards that are desirable. But is also desirable to talk about leadership in a broader and more dispersed context, and this has its own set of issues about enhancing quality and supporting as many as possible to show quality leadership.

Leadership also extends to activities beyond the school – for instance through professional associations and union activities.

Another issue in relation to leadership concerns succession. The age profile of the teaching force is reflected in the age profile of principals. In 2003, a survey indicated that over 82% of principals were over 45, (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003c, p. 107). This is exacerbated by comparatively small numbers of teachers in the mid-career cohort and an apparently increasing difficulty in recruiting people to promotion positions.

Formal promotion positions in teaching have also always shown considerable gender bias, and this needs to be addressed in the development of future leadership.

- | |
|---|
| <p>3.1 What distinctions need to be made concerning formal and dispersed leadership?</p> <p>3.2 What are the characteristics and responsibilities of good formal (positional) school leadership, and how is this best exercised?</p> <p>3.3 How is leadership, both formal and dispersed, best cultivated within schools and systems?</p> <p>3.4 How can salaries and conditions best be structured to ensure that leadership, both formal and dispersed, is rewarded?</p> <p>3.5 What must be done to ensure that there is a continuity of good and gender balanced formal leadership to the relevant positions within schools?</p> |
|---|

4. Teacher quality

The double edged sword of the emphasis placed on teacher quality is shown in statements such as this:

...the quality of teaching matters. Teachers really do make a difference... having a good teacher is the most important factor accounting for the quality of student learning... we have not focussed enough on how to improve and maintain teacher quality. It is more fundamental to student success than the quality of the curriculum or class size (Ramsey, 2000, p. 6).

The recognition that “teaching counts” offers considerable potential to raise the status of teachers. However, it brings with it inevitable cries for quality control mechanisms which need negotiation.

Certainly, the emphasis on schools and teachers as an alternative to resource provision is one area which must be contested, and the AEU would assert the importance of seeing them as complementary rather than alternatives.

There are a number of issues around entry to the profession and teacher education. These include the nature of teacher education courses, mid-career entrants, and the processes of induction and mentoring. In a context of looming teacher shortages, it is important that the profession maintains high entry standards. The complementary roles of the different partners (educators, teachers, etc.) in the preparation and induction of new teachers need to be made as productive as possible.

It should be recognised that much of this builds on a history of teacher and union involvement with increasing quality, including higher levels of qualification, over a considerable period of time. Quality is not a new concept, though some are seeking to give it a new direction and increased emphasis.

Traditionally, the AEU like most teacher unions has not taken direct responsibility for quality. Rather, it has taken a view that its role is to intervene in the quality issue by negotiation with the Departments, facilitating fair and admirable practices in agreements leading to the desired goal, and a role in overseeing the process.

However, in the USA the largest teacher union, The National Education Association (NEA), has become heavily involved in the issue of teacher and school quality. They have departments called “School System Capacity”, “Teacher Quality”, “Student Achievement” and “Educational Support - Professional Quality”, all of which are focused on improving quality in relevant areas. This includes union officials going into schools and working with the teachers.

Within the NEA there is a view that they - the union - must help schools improve. The idea that quality is union business includes an acceptance that some teachers and some schools need help to overcome problems. In the process they empower teachers and make schools more democratic and professional places.

One NEA initiative is the KEYS to Excellence program⁵. This encourages schools, with support from NEA locals and organizers to go through a process of self evaluation and select two or three areas to concentrate on for improvement. It has a number of desirable effects such as involving the whole community, creating considerable professional consultation and decision making within a democratic framework, and so on. Much of the discussion around this is reminiscent of the “Self critical school” work in the 1980s.

⁵ See http://www.wa.nea.org/Schl_Lnks/KEYS/keyshome.htm

NEA Officers believe that these initiatives are both useful for members, help the union to be seen as “professional” and that also they act as a recruiting tool.

It is important to note that other professional stakeholders are arguing strongly that the issue of quality must be owned by the profession rather than governments and employers. Some are seeking to take on this mantle, and the AEU therefore needs to determine where it locates responsibility for the issue of quality. To what extent should unions “Advocate, implement, and enforce standards for student learning and standards for teaching” as suggested in *United Mind Workers?* (Kerchner, Koppich and Weeres, 1997, p.11) Everyone can agree with its suggestion to “Back these up with adequate professional development” but the “strong peer review systems” may be more problematic.

Professional learning is also an area of considerable emphasis. Some are seeking to make teacher qualifications subject to renewal based on evidence of professional learning. There is no clear definition of what the desirable and possibly required elements of professional learning should be. Teachers must be encouraged to define their own professional learning needs, but that leaves concerns where people effectively opt out of any. Can the proven quality of collective and whole school professional learning be recognised, and possibly rewarded, in an individual way?

The recent spread of statutory bodies, such as Institutes of Teachers, to nearly all states and territories has been supported by the AEU. In one sense, these provide a “neutral” surrogate to the location of control. However, over time, it is possible to anticipate that issues will arise about how these bodies handle issues such as proposals to impose criteria around registration renewal, including evidence of professional learning.

This is further complicated by the creation of the National Institute for Quality Teaching and School Leadership and the MCEETYA agreement to move towards National Registration of Teachers through the state or territory bodies.

The AEU needs to elaborate its vision of the pertinent elements of maintaining quality teaching, and of the best ways to ensure ongoing teacher learning without creating teacher burnout and change fatigue.

Another key issue is the development and application of professional standards. The AEU participated in the development of a National Statement (2003). There is broad agreement about beginning teacher standards. However, there is also a considerable emphasis placed on “accomplished” standards by bureaucrats and others outside the classroom which is likely to see pressure for them to become much more important, possibly linked to the statutory bodies. Some perceive them as the quality control mechanism, and there are implications that they should be linked to salary and promotion. MCEETYA has now adopted a National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching.

Whilst there is much faith placed in the creation of standards as the future for the profession, the way in which the development and existence of standards will help teacher learning and quality is less well articulated, and there is a need to assert that standards are best owned by the profession for self reflection and personal development rather than something against which they are assessed by external authorities.

Recent developments, particularly in the UK, have raised issues about the way in which support from those not qualified as teachers (such as teacher assistants, paraprofessionals, and members of other professions) might blur the roles. It appears to leave open options of having other than teachers in teaching roles. There are ways in which non-teacher qualified personnel can effectively

enhance and support the role of the teacher, but these need to be worked through. The professional learning of these personnel also needs to be considered.

- 4.1 What are the teacher quality issues? To what extent will they be affected by changing knowledge, changing ideas, changing practice and what this means for teaching?**
- 4.2 What role should the AEU play in ensuring quality?**
- 4.3 What are the links between resourcing and the issues identified above?**
- 4.4 Are current processes for qualification and entry into the profession in need of changes? (Including initial preparation, length and structure, teaching practice, mentoring, induction and “mid-career” entrants).**
- 4.5 What are the implications of teaching becoming other than generally a life-long career?**
- 4.6 What are the essentials of professional learning?**
- 4.7 What are the appropriate mixes and roles of qualified teachers and non-qualified (or other qualified) staff in schools?**
- 4.8 What role do we see the various statutory bodies and the new National Institute playing in the maintenance of quality and professional learning in the future?**
- 4.9 How important are professional standards? At what levels should they be developed? What role should they play in a teacher’s career?**
- 4.10 What role do professional learning and standards have in pay scales?**
- 4.11 To what extent, and by what mechanisms, should “national consistency” of curriculum, standards, teaching qualifications, etc. be pursued?**

5. Curriculum

Many of the proposed directions in curriculum reforms are conducive to a progressive and desirable curriculum but they also need to be continually evaluated and reviewed. The concept of education being about “learning how to learn” and lateral thinking rather than learning facts, for instance, and the challenges to the domination of tertiary entrance are ideas which have had long term support within the AEU.

There is an opportunity to introduce a considered and open debate about what the really important elements of student learning in the context in which we now find ourselves are, in the twenty first century, with the new technology and so on.

Some aspects of the proposed changes also offer new opportunities to join in old debates. The role of testing and rote learning can be seen as paradoxical alongside the expressed desire for greater innovation and “risk taking” in schools and students. A better alternative would be to develop a pro-active stance which aligns the curriculum, assessment and reporting through authentic assessment integrated into the learning process in a way which meets the more reasonable external requirements, enhances professionalism, and avoids the deleterious impact of imposed standardised testing in the USA and UK. Changes to the dominating impact of tertiary entrance on the curriculum would be welcome.

Developments in the area of ICT continue, though its place within the education framework remains unresolved. How will it affect both the content and delivery of curriculum? What will the impact of on-line learning be?

To what extent is it the role of education to develop particular characteristics within students (as has been suggested in some places)? This is an ethical debate that must be joined. The vision of

schools as delivering compliant, uniform students for employers, inherent in some views of schooling, sits in contrast to the need for students prepared to question and find new ways.

The nature of the values taught in public schools has also been a feature of recent debates. It is important that the role of education in developing a critical citizenry able to participate in a vibrant democracy be included in curriculum discussions. This also raises the issue of the role of students in decision making within the school.

- 5.1 How should curriculum and schooling be structured to develop the capacities needed for citizens in the twenty first century?**
- 5.2 What are the essential learning's/new basics for the 21st Century, and to what extent do these constitute a "new learning"? Where do science, mathematics and technology, and concepts such as enterprise education, innovative students, and school to work transition pathways, etc. sit in this?**
- 5.3 What is the role of professional learning in facilitating curriculum change and development?**
- 5.4 What is the role of ICT and on-line curriculum both in what is learnt and how it is learnt and taught?**
- 5.5 How are curriculum, assessment and reporting best aligned, and how should this affect tertiary entrance examinations?**
- 5.6 What is the role of teachers in developing "a kind of person"?**

6. Educational decision making

Finally, the way in which decisions are made and directions set in the future is of obvious importance.

In its response to the Teaching and Teacher Education Review the AEU expressed concern about the way much decision making about teaching and schools is now made. In response to a question asking what do stakeholders need to be convinced of, it commented:

It is regrettable that governments, departments and bureaucrats seem to have lost the art of engaging teachers and of showing leadership rather than authority. It is not so much a case of convincing them as engaging them in discussions about their own profession and respecting their views and experiences. Much of the debate to date has had the characteristic of a core of committed, even converted, people outside teaching and certainly outside the classroom, telling (or preaching to) teachers about what they should be doing. At times, there seems to be little understanding of what they are actually doing at present and little attempt to work with them.

There seems to be a pervasive attitude amongst them that we have a lack lustre teaching force which must be by-passed in order to progress, rather than sincere attempts to engage them and help them to develop professionally.

Involvement of stakeholders in general in many consultative processes has become tokenistic, carefully managed, and not based on genuine respect for their views. Consultation is perfunctory and deliberately constrained by unworkable timelines.

Typically now inquiries are controlled by carefully selected committees of individuals rather than stakeholders. Stakeholders, if involved, are relegated to Reference Groups

where their inputs can be used or not as decided by those on the Committee. The AEU has complained about this in relation to this Inquiry into Teaching and Teacher Education. ...

...The relationship between industry and education is an important one, but it will not achieve its potential without stronger input from those with first hand and current experience in the field of education. This input should be at the level, for example, of the Board of ECEF and ANTA, and in the processes involved in the development of National Training Packages. The input is necessary for a number of reasons, not the least of which is developing a relationship of trust and respect between these sectors.

Teachers and educational stakeholders will not be convinced until they are encouraged to become involved in all aspects of the process, and are part of the process rather than being “done unto” in a top down fashion.

Similarly, much of the current research that emanates from DEST and other government departments does not resonate with teachers. It is generally commissioned work by researchers who are perceived as delivering what the government wants. Unfortunately, this is the case with the work on innovation. Research that has been developed to further a pre-determined agenda is not likely to convince anyone.

There is a clear and urgent need for a consultative body along the lines of the previous Schools Council or even Schools Commission, which has the capacity to listen to all voices in the education debate, seek genuine and objective research, and build consensus about how to progress. (AEU, 2003, pp. 15 - 16)

Within this context, the growing disillusionment with involvement in the processes of change and professional decision making must be noted and addressed. It is time to assert the right of the profession to be treated with respect and allowed to constructively and genuinely participate in the development of their own profession. This includes placing a greater emphasis on the valuative views of practitioners and less on the qualitative measures imposed by the economically driven bureaucrats and outside critics.

The role of the AEU in helping achieve this in the first place and participating in it as it develops is also an important part of the discussions. The key principles on which it should operate must be set down. It must involve and represent its members and also communicate effectively to them the outcomes from these considerations.

- 6.1 What are the appropriate and necessary consensus building mechanisms for planning for the future? Which stakeholders should be involved**
- 6.2 How could research, action research, pilot projects and the like be structured and conducted in such a way that they add to professional knowledge and enhance professional decision making rather than be used to “blame” teachers?**
- 6.3 What structures (e.g. a Schools Council) can facilitate the involvement of stakeholders in decision making and research?**
- 6.4 What role should the AEU play across all of the issues Raised in this paper and what are the key principles it should seek to implement?**

The Future as Seen By Others - Four examples

It is clearly not possible to consider all of the literature pertaining to the future of teaching here, and this is not intended as a definitive literature review. This appendix summarises four different perspectives on the topic through four key projects – the OECD’s “Teaching, Learning and Schools for the Future, a range of publications emanating from or sponsored by the Commonwealth, the Australian Council of Deans publication “New Learning: A Charter for Education in Australia” (ACDE, 2001), and a publication focussing specifically on teacher unions and the future, “United Mind Workers; Unions and Teaching in the Knowledge Society” (Kirchener , Koppich and Weeres, 1997). These, apart perhaps from the last, are documents which are regularly cited and feature in discussions. This is intended to provide a background framework for the discussion in the paper, without detailed and repetitive analysis of all relevant literature.

The OECD

The OECD is considering the topic under the heading “Teaching, Learning and Schools for the Future”⁶ and has published a number of substantial documents as part of this. The principal one considered here is “What Schools for the Future?” (OECD, 2001).

“What Schools for the Future” develops six possible scenarios (see Table 1 for a summary), intended to be viewed as a spectrum rather than polarised alternatives. In doing this, it sets them in a context of social and industrial change and discusses the way this may impact on schools. It also admits that there are tensions and contradictions over such matters as autonomy and control, conformity versus experimentation, diversity and equity, and so on. It then raises the questions “Which (scenario) is most likely?” and “Which is most desirable?” These scenarios are subject to ongoing discussion at Forums, and subject to action research in a number of countries.

The six OECD scenarios

In introducing these scenarios, the OECD observes:

Proposing several scenarios underlines that there is not one pathway into the future but many, and they should not be expected to emerge in “pure” form. Distilling the infinite range of possible futures into a limited number of polar “types”, however, stimulates consideration of the strategic choices to be confronted and the principle dimensions of change. The scenarios invite the questions: a) how probable and b) how desirable, each is. ... The task for policy thinking is to consider what might be done to bring the probable and desirable as closely as possible into alignment, making the more desirable futures more likely, and vice versa. (pp77-78)

The six scenarios fall into three groups of two scenarios each as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

The “status quo extrapolated”	
Scenario 1 “Robust bureaucratic school systems”	Scenario 2 “Extending the market model”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong bureaucracies and robust institutions • Vested interests resist fundamental change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widespread dissatisfaction leads to re-shaping public funding and school systems

⁶ web address http://www.oecd.org/topic/0,2686,en_2649_34521_1_1_1_1_1,1,00.html

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing problems of school image and resourcing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid growth of demand-driven “market currencies”, indicators and accreditation Greater diversity of providers and professionals, greater inequality
The “re-schooling” scenarios	
Scenario 3 “Schools as core social centres” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High levels of public trust and funding Schools as centres of community and social capital formation Greater organisational/professional diversity, greater social equity 	Scenario 4 “Schools as focused learning organisations” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High levels of public trust and funding Schools and teachers network widely in learning organisations Strong quality and equity features
The “de-schooling” scenarios	
Scenario 5 “Learner networks and the network society” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widespread dissatisfaction with/rejection of organised school systems Non-formal learning using ICT potential reflect the “network society” Communities of interest, potentially serious equity problems 	Scenario 6 Teacher exodus – The “meltdown scenario” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severe teacher shortages do not respond to policy action Retrenchment, conflict, and falling standards leading to areas of “meltdown, or Crisis provides spur to widespread innovation but future still uncertain.

The OECD does try to leave the questions open, and to both reflect and offer a range of pathways to the future, thereby stimulating discussion. There are some hints within the publication that a combination of Scenario 4 for younger students and Scenario 5 for older ones may be the desired direction. On the other hand, elsewhere (OECD, 2003b, p.4) the OECD notes that educators in general perceive a move from the bureaucratic to the re-schooling scenarios, and that the market and de-schooling scenarios are not considered desirable.

Other subsequent publications are included in the references.

The Commonwealth Government and the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST)

In February 2000 the Commonwealth Government, in conjunction with business held the National Innovation Summit. The report of this, titled “Innovation - Unlocking the Future”, (Commonwealth, 2000), includes sections on “Fostering an entrepreneurial culture through educational institutions” (pp.7- 10), “Online learning (pp., 10-12) and “The need for high quality teaching” (pp.12-13), and much of the government’s agenda can be traced back to this report.

The report notes that “Our education system has a vital role to play”. It goes on to say:

To prepare lifelong, adaptable and flexible learners, schools, vocational education and training (VET) institutions and universities need to be learning, innovative organisations in their own right. Specifically, they need to be open to new methods of teaching and learning; to be willing to take well-based risks; to engage strategically with business and industry and regional communities; and to capitalise on the benefits offered by information and communications technology to the delivery of education and training. (p.8)

The themes that emerge from this – the need for more enterprise education and VET in schools, closer relations with business, the development of on-line curriculum, greater use of ICT, improvements in teacher quality, and the need for schools to be innovative have emerged in many forms since.

They have been taken up in publications, such as “The Enterprising School” (DEST/Curriculum Corporation, 2002)⁷ and “School Innovation: Pathway to the Knowledge Society”. (Cuttance, 2001a). The latter sets the context for the agenda:

If schooling is to be the engine of the emerging knowledge- society then, innovation has to be a central plank of schooling. (p.207)

The Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003a) chaired by Kwong Lee Dow has been charged to set an agenda to take these themes forward. The aspects it has focussed on have been the attraction, retention and quality of science, mathematics and technology teachers, and the development of an action plan for innovation in schools. The AEU is currently working on its response to the final report which was released in November (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003c). However, an initial response is that it covers many of the issues raised in this paper, but generally treads a careful line between suggesting the need for changes to future directions, outlining desirable developments and painting a reasonably healthy picture of the current situation. There is no doubt that the scene had been set for a report which could have been alarmist and derogatory, and Dow is to be congratulated for responding to the submissions and feelings of the education community and reflecting these in a more reasoned and rational way than might have been.

On the other hand, the Minister of Education, Brendan Nelson, has indicated a considerably more aggressive line on a number of issues in “A National Education Framework for Schools”. (Nelson 2003b). Included in this ten point plan are a determination to achieve performance based pay, more autonomy to school principals, and ‘intolerance of poorly performing schools’. It seems to indicate that the Commonwealth will be using its funding, most of which goes to private schools, as a means of enforcing an agenda ,much of which is educationally undesirable upon public school systems.

⁷ see also <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/enterprise/>

Australian Council of Deans (ACDE)

The ACDE publication “New Learning: A Charter for Education in Australia” (ACDE, 2001) contends that eight propositions will shape the future environment of education. They are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2

The Eight propositions of “New Learning”	
1	<p>Education has a much larger role to play in creating socially productive persons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharp increase in knowledge intensive industries • Traditional areas such as manufacturing being transformed • Need for greater collaboration, interpersonal and problem solving skills
2	<p>Learning will be lifelong and life wide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid change needs autonomous learning (learning to learn) • Flexibility and diversity of educational experiences (outside as well as inside traditional institutions) • Learning opportunities available to those from all backgrounds, all ages, at all stages of life.
3	<p>Opportunity and Diversity: education is one of the main ways to deliver on the promises of democracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education promises individuals greater social mobility • But education can only deliver its democratic mission by dedicated programs that address inequality
4	<p>A ‘new basics’ is emerging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General in its focus (rather than specialised) • About creating a kind of person (rather than simply commanding a body of knowledge) • Persons who can navigate change and diversity, learn-as-they-go, solve problems, collaborate and be flexible and creative • About promoting capability sets, reflexive and autonomous learning, communication, and broadly knowledgeable persons.
5	<p>Technology will become central to all learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to transform learning • Need to learn through, but also about technology (not just a tool)
6	<p>The work of educators will be transformed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of educators will broaden considerably • Classrooms where there is individualised learning and customised programs • Attenuated to individual needs and more broadly knowledgeable • Need for more time for professional development and reskilling, national and international exchanges, secondments to other community organisations; • Better integrated with local communities
7	<p>The place of the ‘public’ and the ‘private’ in education will be redefined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education as a public obligation and new economy demands that all have access to quality learning • Clear commitment from all governments to provide quality education for all, not simply those born into privilege or wealth
8	<p>The focus of education policy must change from public cost to public investment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term benefits of education to the nation • Education leads to higher employment, higher earnings, lower imprisonment and more reskilling

'New Learning' is contrasted with 'old learning'. Old learning is characterised as fixating on content knowledge, taking place in educational institutions, and being limited in the age spanned. It is inequitable and dominated by textbooks. Teachers are vocationally driven and not well rewarded, mainly women except in promotion positions. The model is of one teacher in front of thirty students.

This will (should?) be replaced with the development of flexible learners, capable of taking charge of their own learning. Learning will take place everywhere, and ICT will play an important part.

United Mind Workers

"United Mind Workers: Unions and Teaching in the Knowledge Society" (Kerchner and others, 1997) from the USA has been influential in discussions and developments within the National Education Association (NEA), the larger of the two American teachers unions. (The other, American Federation of Teachers, takes a similar view on this). It is worth considering for this reason.

Its opening chapter "Organising the other half of teaching" argues that in the past teacher unions have looked after the economic rights of teachers, but it is now time to "organize them as educators" (p.3). In the 'knowledge society' "the largest implication is not for how schools are governed and run, but for how people teach and learn and what they should know" (p.7).

Its arguments that teacher unionism needs to fit to a new institution of education are based on a view that there will be:

- Fundamental changes in the organisation of society and the economy
- These changes will cause fundamental reorganisation of education as an institution
- At their core these changes are about reorganisation of learning: What is learning, who is capable of learning, and what is the responsibility of teachers in creating learning?
- Institutional change will cause major dislocations to the way schools are organised and governed. These changes will alter the power and influence relationships of teacher unions, vastly diminishing conventional sources of power and influence and opening new terrain for union organisation. (p.16).

It suggests three core ideas for school and union organisation (p.11). Firstly, and most pertinent in the Australian context, that teacher unions must organise around quality: They should advocate, implement, and enforce standards for student learning and standards for teaching and back these up with adequate professional development and strong peer review systems;

"...defining and measuring quality – for students, for teachers, for schools – is central to what unions need to do." (p.9)

Also of some relevance is its proposition that teacher unions should put more emphasis on organising around schools, rather than districts (in the US context). It suggests a slim "district contract" and the creation of individual school compacts covering resource allocation, hiring, quality assurance, and how teachers take joint responsibility for reforms. In the Australian context this might mean less in a centralised EBA, but writing in procedures to ensure union involvement in school based decision making.

The third proposition is to organise around an external labour market that allows teachers to switch jobs more easily through making pensions and benefits portable. Whilst this relates more specifically to the US context, it is possibly relevant to discussions about the creation of national consistency.

The other part of this proposition, to allow people to enter teaching as classroom aides and advance through education and experience to teaching is something which should be part of discussions.

It argues that teacher unionism is highly vulnerable because it is utterly dependent on the existing structure and power alignments within public education: “a massive rule-bound, hierarchical public bureaucracy that is increasingly seen as anachronistic and ill-fitted to the post-industrial society” (p.14).

Whilst the Australian context is different, and many of the ideas may not be pertinent here, this is a provocative book which should be used to stimulate discussion.

References

Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE), 2001, *New Learning: A Charter for Australian Education* Canberra, ACT

Australian College of Educators (ACE), 2001, “Beyond the Rhetoric: Building a Teaching Profession to Support Quality Teaching”, Australian College of Education, Canberra, ACT

Australian Education Union (AEU), 2003, *AEU Response to the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education*, (available at <http://www.aeufederal.org.au/Publications/Teachingresponse.pdf>)

Brennan Marie, 2001, “Positioning Teachers in the Quality Debate: Inventing a Range of Definitions of Quality” in ACE, 2001

Commonwealth Government, 2000, “Innovation – Unlocking the future”, Innovation Summit Implementation Group, Canberra, ACT

Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003a, “Interim Report: Attracting and Retaining Teachers of Science, Technology and Mathematics”, Commonwealth of Australia/DEST, Canberra, ACT

Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003b, *Young People, Schools and Innovation: Towards an Action Plan for the School Sector*, Commonwealth of Australia/DEST, Canberra, ACT

Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003c, *Australia’s Teachers: Australia’s Future: Advancing Innovation, Science, Technology and Mathematics*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra

Cuttance, Peter, 2001a, *School Innovation: Pathway to the Knowledge Society*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, ACT

Cuttance, Peter, 2001b, “The Impact of Teaching on Student Learning” in Kennedy 2001.

Department of Education, Science, and Training (DEST), 2002, *Employability Skills for the Future*, Canberra, ACT

Department of Education, Science, and Training (DEST)/Curriculum Corporation, 2002, “The Enterprising School”, Curriculum Corporation, Carlton, Vic.

Kennedy, Kerry, 2001, *Beyond the Rhetoric: Building a teaching profession to support quality teaching*”, Australian College of Education, Deakin, ACT.

Kerchener, Charles, Koppich, Julia and Weeres, Joseph, 1997, *United Mind Workers: Unions and Teaching in the Knowledge Society*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco

Lokan, Jan, Greenwood, Lisa, and Cresswell. John 2001 *How Literate are Australia’s Students?* ACER, Melbourne

MacPherson, Ian and others, 1999, *Places and Spaces for teachers in Curriculum Leadership*, Australian Curriculum studies Association, Deakin, ACT.

National Statement from the Teaching profession on Teacher Standards, Quality & Professionalism, downloaded from <http://www.austcolled.com.au/projectspage.html> September, 2003.

Nelson, Brendan “Taking Schools to the Next Level” speech made at the “Pursuing Opportunity and Prosperity Conference, University of Melbourne, 2003a, downloaded from <http://www.dest.gov.au/Ministers/Media/Nelson/2003/11/n---131103.asp> 17 November 2003.

Nelson, Brendan, 2003b, “A National education Framework for Schools”, Media Release 13 November, 2003, downloaded from <http://www.dest.gov.au/Ministers/Media/Nelson/2003/11/n526131103.asp> November, 2003.

OECD, 2003b, “Schooling for tomorrow: The “Tool box for forward thinking, innovation and school system change – Analytical, methodological and operational implications”, downloaded from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/61/26/2634510.pdf> 17 Jul. 03

OECD, 2001, *What schools for the future?* Paris

OECD/CERI, 2001, *New School Management Approaches*, Paris

OECD, 2003a *Networks of Innovation*, Paris.

Ramsey, Gregor, 2000, “Quality Matters: Review of Teacher Education, New South Wales.” NSW Department of Education and Training

Spender, Dale, and Stewart, Fiona, 2002, *Embracing e-Learning in Australian Schools*”, Commonwealth Bank

Teese, Richard and Polesol, John, 2003, *Undemocratic Schooling: Equity and Quality in Mass Secondary Education in Australia*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Victoria.