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1 Executive summary

In this LTIF project, an alternate approach was used to design a Work-Integrated-Learning course in the School of Education. WIL, often referred to as practicum in teacher education, centres on the practical experience that students gain in schools. WIL is an important part of teacher education and is highly valued, yet a number of issues continue to be consistently identified both in research and reports into quality practice. There is little consensus around its provision and there is concern around lack of connection between theory and practice and between universities and schools (Top of the Class, 2007; TEMAG, 2015). The recent development of national standards and procedures for initial teacher education programs is a regulatory effort to alleviate these concerns.

Against this backdrop of ongoing review and changing regulatory environment, the School of Education began its routine reaccreditation of its four year Bachelor of Education program. Program design decisions were particularly influenced from literature advocating greater connection between theory and practice and between universities and schools (Top of the Class, 2007, TEMAG, 2015) the use of effective WIL features (Orell, 2011) and forming productive partnerships (Top of the Class, 2007; TEMAG, 2015).

A number of WIL courses were embedded into this program, including Connected Classrooms: Professional Experience. In the first part of this course students would develop 4 STEP goals (Student, Teacher, Elearning, and Planning) which they would then apply in the second part of the course, on site in WIL settings. A Distributed Open Collaborative Course (DOCC) approach, because of its foundation in feminist principles of openness, shared responsibility and collaboration, was selected to achieve design principles. This course was collaboratively designed by practising teachers from 15 partner schools and School of Education staff during semester 1, 2015. Course content was uploaded into a Google Site, and then localised by School-Based-Coaches, practising teachers employed by the School of Education, in each WIL context. Some 200 second year Bachelor of Education students, organised into smaller groups in each of our partner schools, undertook this course on-site in semester 2, 2015.

To evaluate the effectiveness of this innovative and alternate approach to WIL course design and delivery, an action learning methodology was used (McKernan, 1996). A pre-survey collected student data around expectations of a WIL course, including its design features. A post-survey then measured whether these were experienced. Results are overwhelmingly positive. These students expect a WIL course to be hands-on and practical, to give them more teaching confidence and experience and equip them to be more work-ready and employable upon graduation. The vast majority felt that these expectations were achieved, with the role of the School-Based-Coach being pivotal to this achievement.

The ‘What’s up DOCC?’ project has led to a shift in thinking in WIL course design and delivery in the School of Education. It has led to increased collaborative partnerships with industry, leading to a shared responsibility for teacher education. It has led to high quality learning experiences, and greater student work-readiness and likelihood of future employment as a teacher.

2 Outcomes

This LTIF project directly impacted in some 200 second year Bachelor of Education (primary) Program students, through the design and delivery of the course, Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms. This course was collaboratively produced by practising teachers in partner schools and School of Education staff. The course was developed into a Google Site which enabled flexible delivery to pre-service teachers on-site in 15 partner schools. A pre and post survey instrument was designed to measure expectations and experiences. Further details of this instrument are in Section 3 and a copy of the instrument is included in the Appendices. Below is an overview of the project’s outcomes and impact.
Outcome 1: An alternate approach to WIL course design and delivery

Project impact
This project used a DOCC design, based on openness, collaboration and shared responsibility, as an alternate approach to WIL course design and delivery. The impact can be evidenced in both pre-survey and post-survey data.

Pre-survey
The pre-service teachers had very high expectations of WIL courses. They expected them to be practical, to be hands-on, and to be able to apply through them what they had learned at the university. They expected to get lots of teaching experience, to learn more about becoming a teacher and to learn skills they would need including classroom management, lesson planning and using ICT. They wanted WIL courses to teach them how to be work-ready. These expectations were quite different from those that they had with non-WIL courses. WIL courses for some were more highly valued as these were perceived as more practical with more direct bearing on their future career.

Post-survey
These high expectations of WIL courses were realised through the course, Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms. The pre-service teachers highly valued this course. They especially liked having a coach who supported them to achieve their learning goals, and provided them with feedback, drawing on expert and localised knowledge. They thought they were able to better connect theory and practice and had increased teaching confidence in their ability to teach.

Outcome 2: Flexible course delivery on site in WIL settings

Project impact
This course was produced as a Google Site, to enable flexible delivery on site in 15 WIL settings. School-Based-Coaches, practising teachers in each of these settings, localised the content to suit their particular WIL context. Project impact can be demonstrated in the following ways:

Development of a Google Site
This course can be accessed via this link: https://sites.google.com/site/pexconnectedclassrooms/

Production of handbooks
Various handbooks for students, School-Based-Coaches, schools and Teacher Mentors were produced, some of which are located on the Google Site, while the DOCC Handbook which outlines how to design and deliver a DOCC, is accessible in a PDF version.

Student post-survey data
Survey data shows that this flexible course delivery was realised and was highly valued.

Outcome 3: Shared responsibility for curriculum design by School of Education and industry partnership

Project impact
Fundamental to a DOCC design are feminist principles around distribution of power and collaboration. To achieve this principle, various partners in the project worked together to design and deliver this WIL course. Evidence of impact is demonstrated in the following ways:

Think Tank Day
Held on Tuesday 5th May, this day enabled practising teachers from partner schools and School of Education staff to work collaboratively to produce content. Some examples of activities used to generate this content are included in the DOCC Handbook.
Professional learning program
Delivered on Wednesday 29th July, Thursday 30th July and Friday 31st July this program also enabled stakeholders to share further responsibility for the course design. Examples are included in the DOCC Handbook.

Post-survey data
Students reported that this collaboration was achieved and importantly, that it mattered ‘a lot’ to them.

Outcome 4: Innovative use of DOCC redesign for WIL programs

Project impact
The innovative design and delivery of this Distributed Open Collaborative Course (DOCC) is also based on essential elements of WIL curriculum identified by Orrell (2011). Project impact can be demonstrated by:

Survey data
Students enthusiastically supported the design and delivery of this course. They considered the role of the coach as very important, as this practising teacher supported their learning while on site.

Publications
This project has resulted in a number of research-based peer reviewed publications that have highlighted the innovative DOCC design.

This includes:


Forthcoming publications include:
Book chapter: Innovating in first year pre-service Teacher Education: “Buddy up” in the book, Teacher Education - Innovation, Interventions and Impact to be published in February 2016, with authors being expected to present at the Australian Teacher Educator Association (ATEA) conference to be held at Federation University in June 2016.


Outcome 5: Deep partnerships formed between RMIT University School of Education staff and industry

Project impact
A number of partnerships have been formed as a result of this project. Partnerships were formed with the 15 schools, in which the course Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms was taught on site in semester 2, 2015, along with partnerships with the School-Based-Coaches and school leadership teams at these schools. Partnerships have also been formed with the DET Digital Learning team and the VCAA.
Outcome 6: Enhanced work-readiness and employability of graduates

Project impact

Research has shown that practicum or WIL is highly valued by students in teacher education programs. Survey data from this project strongly revealed that being prepared for work really mattered to these pre-service teachers. Responses to open-ended questions revealed most pre-service teachers wanted a WIL to be hands-on and to teach them practical skills. Responses to closed-items revealed that 95% valued a WIL course that 'Prepares me for the future workplace' and 88% valued one that 'Enhances my future employability'. Importantly, post-survey data revealed that they believed that these work-related expectations of WIL courses were achieved through this course design and delivery. For example, 90% commented that the course 'Provided me with quality learning experiences in my development in becoming a teacher', 92% thought that it taught 'about teaching in a workplace' and 85% commented that it fostered relationships needed 'to demonstrate in the workplace.'

Outcome 7: Increased opportunities for students to interconnect theory and practice

Project impact

In terms of interconnecting theory and practice, pre-service teacher survey data was positive. In response to the survey item, 'Enables me to connect knowledge (e.g. skills, ideas, concepts, theories) to real-life practice in classrooms' a very high number reported that it mattered to them 'a lot'.

Further support for this outcome is demonstrated through the explicit use of goal-setting in the WIL course. Goal-setting was used to enable pre-service teachers to connect the theoretical goals set at the university, with those that they later refined and modified with support of their School-Based-Coach in relation to the specific school context in which these goals could be realised.

3. Project outcomes and impacts

3.1 Project background

Work-Integrated-Learning has a long association with teacher education. Often called practicum, or professional experience, WIL is a traditional feature of programs and is more often than not perceived as important and of value, particularly by pre-service teachers. Yet practicum, as indeed teacher education, is the subject of continued debate in Australia, as evidenced by the large number of national and state reports that have been conducted over the last thirty years. These debates around practicum are seemingly constant, that is, the same issues more or less seem to be identified, and then often the same, if not very similar recommendations are then proposed to fix them. This process of identify, report and recommend, has become an ongoing cycle.

The Top of the Class report (2007) charged with reporting on the scope, suitability, organisation, resourcing and delivering of teacher training courses, and preparedness of graduates to then teach, provides an influential account of these debates, as well as illuminating some of the recommendations put forward at the time to resolve them. The more recent report by the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) provides a more current account of these debates. Established in 2014 by the then Minister of Education, Christopher Pyne, this report was charged with providing advice on the quality of teacher training in Australia and how it could be improved to better prepare teachers with the practical skills needed for the classroom.

One of the key debates discussed in both these reports is provision of practicum. In 2007, the Top of the Class report (2007) commented that there was:

…no single model of practicum provision in teacher education courses in Australia. There is also little consensus on questions such as how much practicum there should be, when practicum should begin and the best structure for practicum (p 70).
Yet the report did add that block placement models, such as that used by the School of Education were most common. In this model students undertake designated periods of time in schools, where they undertake supervised practice under the guidance of a Teacher Mentor.

Subsequent national accreditation of teacher education programs, beginning in 2011, aimed in part to resolve this debate by mandating a common set of standards and procedures around provision. As a result, a minimum number of days for practicum were stipulated (at least 80 days in undergraduate programs and 60 days in post graduate programs). Providers were required to form partnerships with schools, and to document the nature and length of practicum, planned experiences and assessment, and arrangements for supervision and professional support. It seems however, given recent recommendations by the TEMAG report (2015), that these measures were not enough to resolve the issue. This group, established to provide advice on the quality of teacher training and to make recommendations to better prepare teachers with the practical skills needed for the classroom, recommended a greater focus on the timing, length and frequency of practicum. It is currently suggesting a further number of reforms to national accreditation.

Another of the key concerns identified by both reports is lack of connection. This can refer to lack of connection between theory and practice, referring to the common practice in teacher education of designing programs in two components; a theoretical component taught at the university often through coursework and a practical component undertaken on site in schools. Ure, Gough & Newton (2009: 13) refer to this conceptualisation as a “two-step process”. Lack of connection can also refer to universities and schools. In this instance, lack of connection can refer to such things as poor communication, lack of understanding of expectations of either or both sites and lack of support by universities during placement. Both the Top of the Class Report (2007) and TEMAG (2015) make similar recommendations to improve connection, especially around forming partnerships.

Being able to link practicum experiences with university-based courses has been identified as one of the most effective ways to support pre-service teacher learning (Darling-Hammond, 2006). This includes involvement by the school and university staff, and well-designed practicum experiences that link theory and practice through reflective practice (Darling-Hammond, 2006). Yet, as noted by numerous researchers including Grossman et al (2009, p. 276):

...though scholars of teacher education periodically revise the relationship between theory and practice, teacher education programs struggle to redesign programmatic structures and pedagogy to acknowledge and build on the integrated nature of theory and practice as well as the potentially deep interplay between coursework and field placements.

The notion of forming partnerships between schools and teacher education providers has long been advocated on the grounds that this will enable greater connection between the coursework delivered by providers, and the practice experience at school sites, moving towards a shared responsibility for teacher education. Indeed, it was one of the key recommendations in the Top of the Class Report (2007), and the report by the Victorian Council of Deans of Education (Ure, Gough & Newton, 2009). The Victorian Institute of Teaching, which governed the accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Victoria, and more recently AITSL, the national governing body, all mandate partnerships with schools as a requirements for accreditation (AITSL 2011).

There is now considerable research around how to best structure WIL in higher education programs. Orrell (2011) in her Office of Learning and Teaching commissioned review of some 28 funded studies and final reports categorised essential elements of WIL into three areas: institutional, educational, and partnership. Within the Institutional category, she included features such as having a shared vision of WIL in the university and recognition that both the university and the workplace have a role in learning. Within the Educational category she listed features including the provision of structured and reflective learning experiences, and use of technology. Finally in relation to partnerships she suggested that successful WIL required all stakeholders to be involved.

Against this backdrop of reports and research into teacher education, practicum and WIL, the School of Education began to redevelop its Bachelor of Education (primary) program in 2012 as part of its routine 5 year accreditation cycle. The Bachelor of Education program is one of the initial teacher education programs delivered within the School. This program has around 800 students. In the second year in 2015, there were around 200 students teachers covering all four streams:
Program design decisions were influenced by the literature around the need to connect theory and practice, to use effective WIL features and to have productive partnerships with schools. These are discussed in further detail below.

### 3.1.1 The need to connect theory and practice

The School of Education has traditionally divided its Bachelor of Education (primary) program into two components: a theoretical component undertaken via coursework at the university and a WIL component undertaken in schools. When designing the new program initial decisions involved addressing this issue. Thus, a number of WIL specific courses (which aimed to connect theory and practice) were embedded into the program design. *Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms*, a second year course at the centre of this project became one of these courses. This course also used Goal-based learning in which students set their own learning goals (STEP goals) at university and then enacting them on site in partner schools as an explicit strategy to foster connection between theory and practice. This course was designed in Semester 1, and then taught in Semester 2 to around 200 pre-service teachers from both the Brunswick and Bundoora campuses.

### 3.1.2 The need to use effective WIL features

When scoping *Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms*, key elements for successful WIL design identified by Orrell (2011), were used as a guiding framework. Orrell (2011) who had been commissioned by the Office of Learning and Teaching to review WIL studies and reports, identified a number of elements for successful WIL which she later categorised into three areas: institutional, educational, and partnership. These elements are shown in the table below alongside those that are traditionally associated with WIL curriculum in teacher education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional WIL curriculum in Teacher Education</th>
<th>Effective WIL Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Compartamentalised and not interconnected</td>
<td>• WIL activity is integral to the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tendency for ‘one size fits all’ design</td>
<td>• Curriculum meets diverse learning needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• quality of mentors is ad hoc</td>
<td>• Curriculum supported by high quality supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• mentors have little knowledge of university-based learning practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• current partnerships are an administration arrangement</td>
<td>• WIL curriculum builds partnerships with industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• university site ‘directs’ school role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Effective WIL features*

### 3.1.3 The need to form partnerships

The School of Education organises over 2000 WIL placements each year, but for the most part arrangements with schools are based on administrative convenience. As other teacher education providers, the School has found it increasingly difficult to secure placements for students. There is no formal requirement for schools to take students for practicum, and providers have no control over the quality of Teacher Mentors assigned to support students. Research has long advocated the formation of productive partnerships with schools, to enable greater connection and therefore provide richer learning experiences for students (see Top of the Class report as an example). The need to form partnerships with schools to address these issues (finding placements, building relationships with schools, enhancing the student learning experience), became another set of key decisions when redesigning the program.
3.2 Distributed Open Collaborative Course (DOCC)

Traditionally courses in the School of Education have been designed in a lecture and tutorial structure, and taught in a face-to-face learning mode. When designing Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms, our decision-making was influenced by literature discussed previously.

An overall pedagogical framework needed to enable:

- Participation by partners
- Building of relationships
- Technology to support learning
- Communication with partners
- Structured learning experiences
- Theoretical and practice links
- Well-designed learning experiences

A Distributed Open Collaborative Course (DOCC) pedagogical approach was selected as a way to achieve these intentions. A DOCC is a new approach to course design based on the feminist principles of openness, sharing of power and knowledge, and collaboration. The first DOCC, Feminist Dialogues on Technology involved instructors at 15 universities and colleges in the United States, with each participating institution teaching a 'nodal course' in which they designed an aspect to suit their own students, institution, location and discipline (Juhasz & Balsamo, 2012). The table below shows how this initial DOCC was designed in light of its feminist principles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>DOCC Design Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared responsibility and power</td>
<td>Course created collaboratively by staff from multiple institutions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>notion of distributed expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localised and adapted core content</td>
<td>Shared content production – each nodal course produced by one institution, who knows the students, institution, location and discipline, but courses would have credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive online learning</td>
<td>Use of technology to enable collaboration and course delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner input and interaction</td>
<td>Connected collaborative learning via nodal or connected courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Feminist-based Principles and DOCC Design Features

Further information about a DOCC is included in the DOCC Handbook. In the next section we discuss how these principles and design feature influenced the development of the WIL course, Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms.

3.2.1 Shared responsibility and power

To achieve this principle around sharing responsibility and distributing power, a number of steps were taken.

**Step 1: Form partnerships**

Partnerships with schools and industry were formed. Over several months (February to May) we approached a number of primary schools, many of whom we knew by reputation or had had successful dealings with previously. This involved meeting with the principal or other members of the leadership team to discuss key tenants of this DOCC course: collaboration, a rich and authentic placement experience based around practical learning, greater connections between theory and practice and greater likelihood of preparing work-ready graduates. To become a partner school, schools needed to want to host small groups of pre-service teachers (around 9-15) at a time, with schools ultimately deciding on the number to be placed. Fifteen schools in the northern metropolitan region agreed to form partnerships and these are listed in the following table.
Table 3: Partner Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apollo Parkways Primary School</th>
<th>Mernda Primary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick East Primary School</td>
<td>Mill Park Heights Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham North Primary School</td>
<td>Montmorency South Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping Views Primary School</td>
<td>Moreland Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findon Primary School</td>
<td>Morang South Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenvale Primary School</td>
<td>Plenty Parklands Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Glen College</td>
<td>Viewbank Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurimar Primary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department of Education and Training (DET) and the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA) became important industry partners. Several meetings were held over February to May with both organisations that resulted in rich conversation about the DOCC design and in-principle support to the project. Our industry partners included: Ms Leanne Compton, Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority; Ms Lynn Davie, Director of Digital Learning Branch, Department of Education and Training; and Mr Marc Blanks, Project Officer, Digital Learning Branch.

Step 2: Form a community

A Professional Learning Community (PLC) was formed in March, to represent the interests of partners and to support collective decision making and the sharing of power. This PLC also served to foster a shared purpose and collective responsibility to the design, implementation and evaluation of the course. A key function of the PLC was to keep all stakeholders abreast of the project. To this end three LTIF Newsletters were emailed to all community members over the course of the project. A copy of the first newsletter is included in the Appendices. A template for forming a PLC is included in the DOCC Handbook.

Step 3: Have a joint enterprise

A vital part of an effective PLC is a joint enterprise, or a project that enables the community to work together to achieve common goals. The decision was made early in the scoping of the course, that this joint enterprise would involve university staff and practising teachers working together to design and deliver the WIL course, Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms. This decision was a departure from usual practice in the School, in which courses were only designed and delivered by university staff.

A Think Tank Day in which partners could collaborate together as a group to think about, scope and design possible content for the WIL course was then held on Tuesday 5th May. An email was sent to all partner schools inviting the principal to nominate an outstanding practitioner to attend this day, resulting in some 20 teachers collaborating together on the day. A number of pedagogical strategies were used to encourage open-communication, teamwork, joint decision making, and problem solving. Stimulus activities were also used to draw out classroom specific issues and realistic scenarios to ensure the authenticity of the course. A number of these strategies are provided in the DOCC Handbook.

As a result of the Think Tank Day considerable possible content for the WIL course was generated. This content was then reviewed and decisions made around what to include, and how to include it. Thus some course organisational decisions and course delivery decisions were then made. The course was subsequently organised or structured into two interconnected parts.

In the first part of the course, delivered over 5 weeks at university, the students were introduced to the course and its core elements. They audited their past performance on practicum, and their current knowledge and expected levels of performance based on the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers. They then developed four STEP goals using the GROW and SMART framework, explained later in the Handbook.

In the second part of the course, delivered over 4 weeks on site in one of the partner schools, the students put their goals into practice. To do so, they were supported by a School-Based-Coach, a practising teacher employed by the School, who coached them on how to review and modify their
goals based on the specific school and classroom context. During these 4 weeks, the SBC led students through a weekly observation and feedback cycle, and guided individual and / or group coaching sessions where goals were refined or revisited, as well as running a weekly workshop with their peer group.

These four workshops included:

i. Refining student goals to suit learning context. Discuss and develop some protocols/expectations for working together.

ii. Develop lesson plans to be more aligned with what would suit the classroom context, goals and capabilities.

iii. Reflect upon your placement period to date and participate in professional conversations about goal achievements and challenges.

iv. Discuss learning experiences in relation to their goals and the theory and reflect upon their professional learning in schools.

An outline of both interconnected parts can be found in the DOCC handbook.

Thus, many stakeholders contributed to the successful design and delivery of the DOCC. This includes School of Education staff, industry partners, as well as School-Based-Coaches. The diagram below shows the many stakeholders involved and their connection. Further information on the roles of each of the stakeholders, can be found in the DOCC Handbook.

![Diagram 1: Roles in the DOCC Course Design](image)

### 3.2.2 Localised and adapted core content

To achieve this principle, content for the WIL course needed to suit the specific context in which it was delivered or taught. This DOCC course was delivered on site in some 15 partner schools in Semester 2, 2015, and the role of the School-Based-Coach, a practising teacher employed by the School, became pivotal to this project. Each of these schools is very different from one another, in terms of student cohort, curriculum focus, approach to learning and background of students, such as language, socio-economic status and disability. Some of these characteristics, using data from the Myschool website are outlined in the table below.
Partner schools | Characteristics
--- | ---
Apollo Parkways PS | Located in the outer northern suburb with an enrolment of 803 students. The school has a high profile with regard to information and communication technologies (ICT).
Brunswick East PS | An older school, which opened in 1893. Core curriculum is based around an inquiry approach and philosophical discussion.
Eltham North PS | A medium sized, well-resourced school, located in a quiet residential suburb.
Epping Views PS | Located in the rapidly expanding growth corridor with a 2014 enrolment of 970 students operating across 42 grades. 68% of the school population has a language background other than English.
Findon PS | A Foundation to Year 6 government school with an enrolment of approximately 420 students. The school has a 1:1 netbook program for all students in Year 4 to Year 6 and is recognised as being innovative in integrating ICT into learning.
Greenvale PS | Current enrolment is approximately 660 students. The school has a 1:1 tablet/netbook program for all students in Year 4 to Year 6. A well-resourced school with a strong emphasis on student welfare.
Hazel Glen College | A new large kindergarten to Year 12 school. Incorporates a middle years program.
Laurimar PS | A new primary school opened in 2009. This school enjoys outstanding physical resources.
Mernda PS | With enrolments of 740 students, Mernda has been constructed through the Partnerships Victoria in Schools Project providing the school with 'State of the Art' 21st century buildings, grounds and resources.
Mill Park Heights PS | A large school with 1010 students and 96 staff. It has 53 different nationalities and Educational Maintenance Allowance goes to 37% of families, indicating a low-SES student cohort.
Montmorency South PS | A medium sized schools with an extensive Stephanie Alexander Kitchen Garden.
Moreland PS | A culturally-diverse community with families originating from more than 20 countries and speaking 23 languages. 78% of the school enrollees have a language background other than English with a population of 2% Indigenous students.
Morang South PS | A committed and unified partnership of teachers, parents and students. 30% of the school population has a language background other than English.
Plenty Parklands PS | A school with a focus on academic, social and emotional wellbeing. It has 770 students, and 58% have a language background other than English.
Viewbank PS | A medium sized school with approximately 560 students. In this school, a proportion of students (5%) are the children of parents working in the Defence Forces.

Table 4: Partner school characteristics

To highlight these differences to our students, we produced a video of each partner school, using a professional production company. Each school was asked to identify their defining characteristics to inform the production of the video snapshot. This included: their demographic, curriculum priorities, location and learning spaces.

It was the role of the School-Based-Coach to customise or localise the core curriculum produced for this course to their specific school context. To support the SBC in this process, a 3 day Professional Learning Program was produced. A brief outline of this program is provided below.
### Day 1
- Welcome and Introduction
  - Introduction to the role of the SBC and coaching
- Course structure, framework, assessment
- Google Site demonstration and Q and A
- Practising observation / assessing practice

### Day 2
- Coaching strategies
- Building the learning partnership
- Foundations of good coaching
- Coaching dilemmas

### Day 3
- Practicing clarifying and probing questions
- Developing a coaching plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Outline of SBC PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 3.2.3 Interactive online learning

To achieve this principle, decisions around the interface design and how to manage the learning environment needed to be made. The 8 dimensions of elearning devised by Khan and Granato (2008) were used to generate a set of questions to inform this decision making (see Handbook). These dimensions being: Pedagogical, Technological, Interface Design, Evaluation, Management, Resource Support, Ethical, and Institutional. One key decision involved selecting the platform to deliver the course in multiple partner school locations. As the RMIT Blackboard site restricts access to RMIT staff and students, Google Site which enables easier access was selected.

Each week of the course was structured in the same way with a workshop focus, set of learning intentions, pre-workshop tasks, and workshop resources such as activities, podcasts and success checklists. A sample Google Site page is included in the DOCC Handbook.

A separate Google Site was created to provide online support for School-Based-Coaches, who needed to localise the content to suit their specific school setting. A screenshot of this site is included in the DOCC Handbook. This Google Site included:

- Glossary of terms
- Contact details and roles
- Practicum and course materials
- Workshop guides
- Samples of students’ work for each week
- Coaching materials
- Assessment and moderation podcasts.

A closed Facebook group was also created for SBC’s to support one another, to provide a central place for a Q and A section, and to share ideas for practice. A closed Facebook group was also created for students to support their learning during practicum.

#### 3.2.4 Learner input and interaction

To realise this principle a goal-based approach to learning was used in the course design. Goal based learning (Conzemius & O’Neill, 2006) has a long history in education, and focuses on valuing the individual learning needs of students. In the course design, students were asked to formulate four goals, known as their STEP goals: a Student goal, a Teacher goal, an eLearning goal, and a Planning goal. They set these goals at university in the first weeks of the course and then refined and enacted their goals in their school settings. The role of the School-Based-Coach became vital to supporting the pre-service teacher to not only align these goals to those of the partner schools, but to realising them in practice. The School-Based-Coach’s actions were guided by a broad coaching model. Some strategies for developing coaching skills are found in DOCC Handbook.
Coaching, as a means of supporting the professional learning of teachers is a popular strategy in schools, particularly those in the northern region, in which all of our partner schools are located. It was therefore a way of exposing students to the professional learning that they may experience once they begin their teaching careers. To Whitmore (1992), coaching is about helping people to learn rather than teaching them, and he developed the GROW framework to help structure a coaching conversation. This framework was then used to guide development of coaching skills. Templates for designing SMART goals and the GROW framework are included in the DOCC Handbook. To further facilitate student input into the content of the course, we invited students to create a video diary of their experiences in relation to a number of set topics. A copy of these topics is also included in the DOCC Handbook. Each video was requested to be around 1-2 minutes.

3.3 Evaluating the DOCC

A pre and post-survey was designed to measure the objectives of the project around work readiness, employability and learner satisfaction. A copy of the instrument in included in the Appendices and the Handbook.

The pre-survey focused on collecting data about student expectations of a WIL course including its design features. This pre-survey was administered prior to commencement of the course. It used 2 open-ended questions, as well as a series of closed items, which participants were asked to indicate to what extent each mattered to them using a four point scale (a lot, some, a little, not at all). The post-survey, focused on student experiences of the course and was administered following the end of the assessment period. This survey again used open-questions and closed items. All second year Bachelor of Education students were asked to participate in both the pre-survey and post-survey, with actual participation rates shown in the table below. Comments to open-ended questions were analysed, and coded into themes, and closed item responses analysed as percentage data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Under 21</th>
<th>21-24</th>
<th>25+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST-SURVEY</strong></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Under 21</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Survey demographics

This report now considers the outcomes of the project in more detail.

Outcome 1: An alternate approach to WIL course design and delivery

Project impact

This project used a DOCC design, one based on openness, collaboration and shared responsibility, as an alternate approach to WIL course design and delivery. This course, designed by practising teachers and School of Education staff was produced as a Google Site, to enable flexible delivery on site to 200 students in 15 partner schools. Student survey data provides evidence of impact, as is discussed below.

Student responses to the 2 open-ended questions in the pre-survey around their expectations of a WIL course revealed they had very high expectations and that these were quite different from those they had with non-WIL courses. Responses to the post-survey questions showed that these high expectations were realised through the course, Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms.
The most commonly identified expectation of a WIL course was that it would be hands-on, or practical. Some 36 of the pre-service teachers identified this expectation as typified in these comments:

- “To be able to gain experience in real life classrooms”
- “To provide a practical aspect of my degree”
- “To experience what it is like to run a class”
- “Lots of ‘hands on’ activities and to feel that the assignments are relevant to my learning and future teaching”
- “Working through hands-on enhances the ability of problem solving, try and error and trying out new ideas”
- “Learning by doing rather than completing the theory in a different setting compared to where you are doing the practical learning”

For many pre-service teachers this expectation around being practical created anticipation, as shown in this comment:

“I cannot wait to begin, as it incorporates theories, subjects and ideas studied at university into a classroom and workplace. I expect a practical, hands-on, realistic, rich and beneficial course with strong and practical links to the education industry. I believe it to be an essential aspect of uni (and one I really look forward to) and a subject that prepares me the most.”

For some, being hands-on related to having valuable learning experiences that were not achieved through university coursework. One pre-service teacher articulated this view in this way, “To be able to learn things I won’t in university tutes and lectures,” while another commented in this way, “As students are all different and we can read about what to expect but with work integrated learning it can allow application of these readings,” and another in this way, “The working environment is a place I would prefer to learn as the application gives a much more realistic experience.”

Around a quarter of the pre-service teachers expected that a WIL course would give them teaching experience. For example, that it would give:

- “Ability to practice teaching by taking classes,”
- “A chance to work with different age groups,” and
- “Practice in how to go about planning for lessons and putting them into practice.”

For some this expectation related specifically to gaining ICT teaching skills, as shown in these comments. “A bigger focus on ICT skills and how to integrate them more efficiently into all areas of our teaching,” and this, “A clear and real depiction of classroom ICT expectations,” and this, “Knowledge of current ICT uses in classrooms.”

For some this expectation was expressed in terms of learning more about what was involved in teaching, as shown in the following comments:

- “To get a better idea of what life is like in a school environment,”
- “Experience roles and responsibilities of a teacher and how they handle any difficulties,”
- “Roles teachers perform other than teaching students during lessons,”
- “To learn more about becoming a teacher, the expectations required from a second year teacher. More knowledge about how to become a successful teacher.”

For some this expectation related to having opportunities to experiment and to “Practice in teaching in a variety of settings (small group, whole class, different subjects)” and to have the “Chance to trial different techniques learnt in uni.” To others, this expectation related more to gaining teaching confidence “in dealing with students and managing behaviour,” and “to test out new approaches and theories,” and to “Learn how to overcome fears and complex situations.” For some this expectation related to gaining specific teaching skills such as to “Observe and practice
how best to teach students, specifically diverse students (different backgrounds, learning abilities etc),” and to develop skills in “pedagogy that will help me to become the best teacher for my future students.” This notion of improving their skills through practice was also evident as shown in these comments, to “learn more in the classroom, to better myself as a pre-service teacher,” and “To assist me with becoming a teacher that has compassion.”

A number of pre-service teachers (around 13) expected a WIL course to make them job-ready so as to be “confident to teach when I graduate” and to be prepared “for my future career as a teacher so when I am in schools I want to be thrown into the deep end in terms of being able to work with students”.

Pre-service teachers were also asked their expectations of non-WIL courses. Most commented that their expectations were not the same as typified in this comment:

“Other courses provide the background information that will help shape how we behave, react and respond in a school.”

WIL courses they expected to be:

“Different - Because this course gets us into a classroom for learning experience than basing our learning on lectures, tutes and readings”.

Often this difference was perceived as superior, as shown in these comments,

“Learning in classes gives new insight to what being a teacher is about that can't be taught by reading or told about,” and this, that,

“I believe doing placement is better than sitting in the tutes or lectures. I learnt more during placement,” as well as this, that

“I have higher expectations because it reflects how I will cope in the real life situation of teaching.”

For around half of the participants, this difference in expectation related to being more hands-on or more practical as shown in the following comments, “WIL I expect to be more practical hands-on experience that is more beneficial to me as a pre-service teacher,” and this, that “WIL provides us with the opportunity to experience what it is like teaching, in a classroom, school.” This expectation was sometimes seen as more authentic, as shown in these comments, “Get an insight into real teaching.” And this, “I feel as though this course will be one that brings all of the other subjects together. It will involve how to incorporate the other subjects into the classroom.”

For some of the participants the WIL course was seen as very important in terms of shaping their career, as shown in this comment,

“I feel that everything involved in this course is practical and essential. I feel this course can make or break a career in teaching - I feel this is a course you need to be involved in, there is no way to learn this otherwise, you can't learn this once you have a job, you need to know it before you find yourself in a classroom.”

**Outcome 2: Flexible course delivery on site in WIL settings**

**Project impact**

This course Connected Classrooms: Professional Experience was designed to enable its flexible delivery on-site in 15 WIL settings. Project impact can be demonstrated by:

**Development of a Google Site**

This Google Site served as the central repository for the course content, which was then localised to each partner school site by the School-Based-Coach. All students were able to access this site, as well as all School-Based-Coaches, who while not employed by RMIT could not gain easy access to the university preferred platform. This course can be accessed via this link: https://sites.google.com/site/pexconnectedclassrooms/
Production of handbooks

Handbooks for School-Based-Coaches, Teacher Mentors, and pre-service teachers were also produced which can also be found on the Google Site. Each booklet outlined the following:

- Organisational plan/checklist
- Practicum expectations
- Observational planners
- Assessment requirements

A DOCC Handbook which outlines how to design and deliver a DOCC has been produced. It has a number of strategies, approaches, readings and models to support uptake by others across the university. This is accessible in a PDF version.

Student post-survey data

Survey data shows on site delivery in schools was highly valued. Pre-survey data showed that pre-service teachers valued 'being on site in a workplace' with post-survey data showing that this feature had been achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Enhances my learning by being on-site in a workplace (school)</th>
<th>a lot %</th>
<th>some %</th>
<th>a little %</th>
<th>not at all %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Enhanced my learning by being on-site in a workplace</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, flexible course delivery framed in the surveys as 'interactive online learning environment' was not considered that important, with only 39% reporting it mattered 'a lot'. Survey data reveals however that it was achieved through the course design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Provides me with an interactive online learning environment; giving me access to the course (course information, activities, assessment requirements) at any time and place</th>
<th>a lot %</th>
<th>some %</th>
<th>a little %</th>
<th>not at all %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Provided me with an interactive online learning environment; giving me access to the course (course information, activities, assessment requirements) at any time and place</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 3: Shared responsibility for curriculum design by School of Education and industry partnership

Project impact

One of the key feminist principles in a DOCC design is sharing responsibility and distributing power. To achieve this principle, this particular project created opportunities for practising teachers and other industry partners as well as School of Education staff to collaborate through a joint enterprise. Evidence of impact is demonstrated in the following ways:
Think Tank Day

Held on Tuesday 5th May, this day organised by project leaders enabled some 20 practising teachers from partner schools and School of Education staff to work alongside one another to scope and develop content that could be utilised in the course. Some examples of activities used to generate this content are included in the DOCC Handbook.

Professional Learning program

Delivered over three days in July, 2015 (Wednesday 29th July, Thursday 30th July and Friday 31st July) this program enabled stakeholders to develop and practise coaching skills, discuss how they could apply assessment criteria, and commence planning. Likewise, examples of activities used during this program are included in the DOCC Handbook.

Post-survey data

One of the post-survey items asked pre-service teachers to indicate to what extent collaboration in course design and delivery by school and university teachers had been achieved. Some 79% of students reported that it had.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a lot %</th>
<th>some %</th>
<th>a little %</th>
<th>not at all %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Enables school and university teachers to work together to design and deliver quality learning experiences for me</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Enabled school and university teachers to work together to design and deliver quality learning experiences for me</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 4: Innovative use of DOCC redesign for WIL programs

Project impact

This course has various innovative design and delivery features. It is based around core feminist principles of shared responsibility and collaboration, resulting in design decisions around joint production of content, and distribution of content to each localised context. It is also based around key principles of effective WIL design especially around the formation of partnerships, to enable greater connection between theory and practice. Project impact can be demonstrated by:

Survey data

Students enthusiastically supported the innovative design and delivery of this course, and this can be captured in the comment by this one particular student.

“Thank you - This placement was amazing! This program was incredible! There were so many benefits including: 1. Constant, ongoing support. 2. Individualised learning and goals. 3. Particular focuses for placement and a clear idea of what to work on. 4. Personalised, individualised, specific feedback. 5. Constant advice and critical feedback. 6. Strong learning culture with peer support. 6. Workshop flexibility, allowing for workshops specific to the school or group of learners. 7. Massive increase in my confidence. 7. Highly practical and relevant to the teaching industry. 8. Strong links between theory and practice. 9. Progressive teaching requirements /expectations (slowly builds up).”

Most students identified the coach as the key innovative feature of this course, particularly around their ability to provide support as shown in these comments:

- “The availability of coaches to help and support you while on placement, including great level of support in assignments, lesson plans, different teaching practices and professionalism,” as well as in this comment,
- “I was able to discuss and talk about my learning with someone other than my mentor, allowing me to develop many different views on how to go about implementing a lesson or activity,” and this,
• “My coach was so supportive and so welcoming. I instantly had a place to be within the school. Everyone was expecting us to be there and my coach knew what was required. My coach was excellent! She had been a teacher at the school for many years and was able to provide me with so much knowledge.”

This notion of providing support was also related to providing a supportive environment, as shown in this comment, that

• “Knowing the theory is one thing, but being able to implement it in a school is another skill all together and providing experiences for us to safely participate in definitely helped with my professional development as a teacher and helped boost my confidence as I participated in more than I initially felt comfortable and confident in doing."

as well as in this comment,

• “Coaches gave us the opportunity to discuss and ask questions in a safe environment.”

Often as well, the capacity of the coach to provide feedback was identified.

“One-on-one support specifically related to my own goals and areas for improvement was highly beneficial for professional and personal growth as a PST. As a student I felt immensely supported and it was great to have allocated time to discuss ideas and receive feedback on ideas, plans etc.”

Similarly in this comment, that,

“It was the most supportive, safe and encouraging placement. I learnt so much more about the real goings on and responsibilities in a school which made the future seem less daunting. The experience of having a coach with that level of feedback was invaluable. I learnt so much and grew so much professionally.”

Several times as well participants commented on the value of the coach in providing expert or localised knowledge.

“We were working closely with a school based coach. Having someone who understands how the school works and how the course is run really made me feel comfortable and less anxious. I was able to share ideas with them, then alter them to suit the school itself. “

Publications

This project has resulted in a number of research-based peer reviewed publications that have highlighted the innovative DOCC design.

This includes:


Forthcoming publications include:

Book chapter: Innovating in first year pre-service Teacher Education: “Buddy up” in the book, Teacher Education - Innovation, Interventions and Impact to be published in February 2016, with authors being expected to present at the Australian Teacher Educator Association (ATEA) conference to be held at Federation University in June 2016.

Outcome 5: Deep partnerships formed between SOE staff and industry

Project impact:
Research and reports have clearly demonstrated that partnerships formed between teacher education providers and schools are important to enable greater connection between theory and practice. Project impact can be demonstrated by the partnerships formed.
A number of partnerships have been formed as a result of this project. This includes partnerships with:

- The schools in which this course was taught on site by School-Based-Coaches. These schools are listed in this report.
- School principals and school leaders in these schools who have been gracious hosts to our pre-service teachers and visiting School of Education staff.
- The School-Based-Coaches many of whom participated in our think Tank Day and Professional Learning Program.
- Representatives from the DET Digital Learning team who supported the delivery of the Professional Learning Program. Some of these resources are included in the DOCC Handbook.
- Representatives from the VCAA who also supported the delivery of the Professional Learning Program.

Outcome 6: Enhanced work-readiness and employability of graduates

Project impact:
Research and reports into the practicum or WIL have shown that it is highly valued, often because of its practical nature and because it can be seen as an apprenticeship into teaching. Survey data provides considerable evidence of project impact.
A number of survey items measured expectations around future employability and work-readiness. As discussed earlier, these features were those rated most highly by the pre-service teachers. For example, 95% of pre-service teachers commented that ‘Prepares me for the future workplace’ mattered ‘a lot’, and 88% commented that ‘Enhances my future employability,’ also mattered ‘a lot’.
All of these features relating to employability and work-readiness were achieved in the course design and delivery. For example, 90% commented that the course ‘Provided me with quality learning experiences in my development in becoming a teacher’, 92% thought that it taught ‘about teaching in a workplace’ and 85% commented that it fostered relationships needed ‘to demonstrate in the workplace.’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>a lot</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepares me for the future workplace (e.g. as a teacher in a school)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepared me for the future workplace (e.g. as a teacher in a school)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enhances my future employability (as a teacher in a school)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enhanced my future employability (as a teacher in a school)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provides me with quality learning experiences in my development in becoming a teacher (e.g. structured, active learning, reflective learning of self/peer, an element of risk)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provided me with quality learning experiences in my development in becoming a teacher (e.g. structured, active learning, reflective learning of self/peer, an element of risk)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enhances my learning by being taught by school teachers (school-based tutors) who teach me about teaching in a workplace (school)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enhanced my learning by being taught by school teachers (school-based tutors) who teach me about teaching in a workplace (school)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fosters me to form professional relationships with peers, which I will need to demonstrate in the workplace</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fostered me to form professional relationships with peers, which I will need to demonstrate in the workplace</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The achievement of this outcome is also demonstrated through responses to the open ended questions in both surveys.
Outcome 7: Increased opportunities for students to interconnect theory and practice

Project impact

Research and reports into teacher education have consistently expressed concern about the lack of connection between theoretical and practical components in program design. This project was particularly interested in being able to address this concern through its innovative approach to course design and delivery. Survey responses again provide evidence of project impact in relation to this outcome.

The most commonly identified expectation of a WIL course was that it would be practical. Some 36 of the pre-service teachers identified this expectation as typified in these comments:

• “To be able to gain experience in real life classrooms,” and this comment,
• “To provide a practical aspect of my degree,” and this,
• “To experience what it is like to run a class”.

For some this expectation related to being able to connect theory and practice, as shown in these three comments:

• “To put into practice the theory we have learned at Uni and to have exposure to real classrooms, real people and situations,”
• “Provide a strong connection between theory learnt at Uni with practical skill building in practical experience in the classroom” and
• “To adapt skills in a classroom. To connect what you learn in class at placement.”

Being practical and connecting theory and practice were also identified as advantages of this course, as illustrated in these two comments:

• “The WIL Course provided me with a hands on experience that allowed me to apply my knowledge and learnt theory from University into a real life classroom,” and this,
• “Being able to put into practice what we are learning at Uni is a great way to see how it works. I learn better when I can test out theories. I see teaching as an occupation where you learn from experience and being in the classroom is how we are going to learn and become better teachers.”

These references however were made less often than others referring to the coach.

Survey data provides evidence of this outcome being achieved, with post-survey data showing that 73% felt that being able to ‘connect knowledge to real-life practice in classrooms’ was achieved in the course design. Responses to open-ended questions showed that this connection was valued by the pre-service teachers and that it had been achieved through the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a lot %</th>
<th>some %</th>
<th>a little %</th>
<th>not at all %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Enables me to connect knowledge (e.g. skills, ideas, concepts, theories) to real-life practice in classrooms</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enabled me to connect knowledge (e.g. skills, ideas, concepts, theories) to real-life practice in classrooms</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus on goal-setting also contributed to the achievement of this outcome. Pre-service teachers were able to connect the theoretical goals set at the university, with those that they later refined and modified with their School-Based-Coach in relation to the specific school context so they could be realised.
3.4 Cross discipline links

At the request of the Vice-Chancellor and Members of the Academic Executive Portfolio Group (APEG) a meeting was held with Monica Tan, College of Business, Economics, Finance and Marketing on Friday 13th March, as she was also leading an LTIF Project around WIL, ‘Enhancing transnational business students' work-readiness and employability using a sustainable of Work Integrated Learning and work-related simulations via multiple channels and locations’. While discussions were interesting, there was no direct links between the two projects that would result in cross project collaboration.

3.5 Unforeseen issues

No unforeseen issues arose during this project. All project outcomes were achieved. Significant learning has been made in this project around how to design and deliver a WIL course so as to improve the quality of the student learning experience, work-readiness and employability.

4 Dissemination strategies and outputs

An active dissemination strategy has been implemented for What's up DOCC? Redesigning a flexible and sustainable Work Integrated Learning (WIL) program. Resources in a DOCC Handbook are available online. Publications (book chapters, journal papers and conference papers) will be uploaded into the Research Repository.

4.1 Outputs developed

• A pdf DOCC Handbook of how to design and deliver a DOCC has been produced. This handbook contains a number of templates that can be used by the university or groups of stakeholders within the university to guide the development of a DOCC.
• A literature review that provides an annotated account of key references relating to DOCC design and delivery is included in the DOCC Handbook.

4.2 Dissemination

The ‘What's up DOCC?’ project has been disseminated in a number of ways across the phases of the project, using the OLT Dissemination strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGED DISSEMINATION</th>
<th>INFORMATION PROVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of potential users and stakeholders</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible partner schools and industry representatives approached to take part in this project.</td>
<td>• LTIF Updates emailed to all School of Education Higher Education staff. A copy of Newsletter 1 is included in the Appendices of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monthly briefings about the project with the Head of School, School of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updates to School of Education staff at staff meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies to engage with the users throughout the project development</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The ACEN (Australian Collaborative Education Network) network has also been utilised.</td>
<td>• The news section of the RMIT website has been utilised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Working Paper series was developed and used as a key means to communicate the project to school partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social media updates to school partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Range of project outcomes that could be adopted and implemented by different groups
- DOCC Handbook produced.

Conference presentations
- These are documented earlier in this report.

Strategies for enabling each identified group of intended users to become aware of the relevant outcomes and ideas and how they might be involved in making effective use of them.
- Ongoing communication via newsletters, meetings and Working Papers and social media.

Publications eg Journal articles
- These are documented earlier in this report.

Describe strategies for engaging with intended users and obtaining feedback during the project development
- Ongoing communication via newsletters, meetings and Working Papers and social media.

Evaluation strategies of project outcomes with the intended user communities during and following the project
- PLC committee utilised.

Table 7: Dissemination strategy

5 Evaluation of project outcomes

The project has used the OLT guidelines as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of evaluation</th>
<th>Project evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proactive:</td>
<td>The environment in which the project took place was thoroughly scoped. A PLC committee was used to provide oversight of the project and to facilitate collaboration and shared learning by all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarify:</td>
<td>The project objectives were matched with the intended outcomes. A pre and post survey instrument was designed to ensure that key objectives of the project around work-readiness, employability and quality of the learning environment were measured and therefore could contribute to measuring project outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interactive:</td>
<td>The project used an Active Learning Methodology which fostered ongoing data collection and analysis. The pre-survey was timed to enable scope to review data in depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monitor:</td>
<td>The Project Leaders took the lead role in overseeing the project, its outcomes and deliverables. The PLC committee, involving representatives from all stakeholders, also performed a management role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact:</td>
<td>Project outcomes and deliverables were collected in an ongoing fashion so that desired impact was achieved. A question was included in the post-survey instrument around recommendations for future iterations of the DOCC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Project outcomes via OLT guidelines
Appendix A  LTIF pre and post survey

Pre-survey open-ended questions

Gender: Please circle one
- Male
- Female

Age: Please circle one
- Under 21
- 21-24
- Over 25

WIL course expectations:

A Work Integrated Learning (WIL) course such as Connected Classrooms aims to enable you to engage with workplaces, such as schools.

- What are your expectations of a WIL course like Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms?

- In what ways are your expectations the same / different from other types of courses?
Pre-survey closed-items

Any Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) course has various features. Please indicate to what extent (a lot, some, a little, not at all) each of the listed WIL features matter to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepares me for the future workplace (e.g. as a teacher in a school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables me to connect knowledge (e.g. skills, ideas, concepts, theories) to real-life practice in classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides me with quality learning experiences in my development in becoming a teacher (e.g. structured, active learning, reflective learning of self/peer, an element of risk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides me with an interactive online learning environment; giving me access to the course (course information, activities, assessment requirements) at any time and place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently prepares me for workplace (school) requirements via university briefings and school induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances my learning through using ICT tools in real classrooms so I can apply in my future classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances my future employability (as a teacher in a school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances my learning by being on-site in a workplace (school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances my learning by being taught by school teachers (school-based tutors) who teach me about teaching in a workplace (school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances my learning as school teachers (school-based tutors) adapt the course to the school I am placed in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables school and university teachers to work together to design and deliver quality learning experiences for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters me to form professional relationships with peers, which I will need to demonstrate in the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-survey open-ended questions

Gender: Please circle one
- Male
- Female

Age: Please circle one
- Under 21
- 21-24
- Over 25

WIL course experiences:

A Work Integrated Learning (WIL) course such as Connected Classrooms aims to enable you to engage with workplaces, such as schools.

- What do you see as some of the advantages in the WIL course Connected Classrooms?
  
- What do you see as some of the challenges in the WIL course Connected Classrooms?
  
- What suggestions can you make for improvement in future iterations in the WIL course Connected Classrooms?
### Post survey closed items

Any Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) course has various features. Please indicate to what extent (a lot, some, a little, not at all) each of the listed WIL features were achieved in the Connected Classrooms WIL course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepared me for the future workplace (e.g. as a teacher in a school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enabled me to connect knowledge (e.g. skills, ideas, concepts, theories) to real-life practice in classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provided me with quality learning experiences in my development in becoming a teacher (e.g. structured, active learning, reflective learning of self/peer, an element of risk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provided me with an interactive online learning environment; giving me access to the course (course information, activities, assessment requirements) at any time and place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sufficiently prepared me for workplace (school) requirements via university briefings and school induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enhanced my learning through using ICT tools in real classrooms so I can apply in my future classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enhanced my future employability (as a teacher in a school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Enhanced my learning by being on-site in a workplace (school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Enhanced my learning by being taught by school teachers (school-based coaches) who taught me about teaching in a workplace (school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Enhanced my learning as school teachers (school-based coaches) adapted the course to the school I was placed in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Enabled school and university teachers to work together to design and deliver quality learning experiences for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fostered me to form professional relationships with peers, which I will need to demonstrate in the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In a nutshell

Our LTIF project aims to trial and evaluate an alternate approach to WIL course design and delivery. The course *Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms*, in the second year Bachelor of Education (primary) program is being designed as a DOCC or a Distributed Open Collaborative Course. Developed in the United States, a DOCC is based around feminist principles of shared power, distribution of knowledge, and collaboration. This course is also being designed around core WIL principles and involves the collaborative efforts of a Professional Learning Community.

Course content is being collaboratively produced by both practising teachers in partner primary schools and School of Education staff, with support from other industry partners. Multimodal course content (including 4 purpose built videos) is currently being uploaded into a Google Site to enable delivery / teaching of the course in each of our partner schools in the Northern Metropolitan region. The course content will then be localised to each of these schools by School-Based-Coaches, practising teachers employed by RMIT. The course has a focus on learning how to effectively implement technology into an authentic classroom context.

Links to RMIT objectives

This project addresses the RMIT priority area of:

- Designing or redesigning sustainable programs including flexible delivery
- Improving student retention or the cohort experience

Where are we at

- We have formed partnerships with 15 primary schools who have each agreed to host around 9-15 pre-service teachers for the forthcoming placement
- We have employed around 20 School-Based-Coaches, who will coach our pre-service teachers when on placement in our partner schools
- Course content has been collaboratively produced. We held a think Tank Day back in May in which School-Based-Coaches from each of our partner schools workshopped some of the challenges in coaching, and developed criteria to assess performance, etc. We also ran a 3 day Professional Learning program at the end of July for all School-Based-Coaches, in which we workshopped the course, its assessment and Google Site, coaching skills and designing a coaching plan
- A Google Site is now live for School-Based-Coaches, ready for them to localise content during placement
- A Google Site for the pre-service teachers is live. It uses a flipped learning approach.
How it all fits together:

The course *Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms* is partly taught at the university and partly on site in partner schools. When on site in schools, Pre-Service Teachers are placed in small groups, and undertake:

1. a Placement Program (where they are supervised by a Teacher Mentor),
2. a Workshop Program (where they are taught about designing and teaching a lesson sequence of 3 to 4 lessons involving ICT), and
3. a Coaching Program (where they receive feedback, observation and modelling in relation to their learning goals).

The Workshop Program and Coaching Program are taught by a School-Based Coach.

Pre-service teachers are about to commence their 4 week practicum in schools.

If you would like to find out more about this LTIF project please contact Jen or Kathy
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# Appendix D  List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Council of Deans of Education (ACDE)</td>
<td>Representative body of all Australian universities and some private colleges that offer initial teacher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL)</td>
<td>Government body which oversees national regulation of initial teacher education in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Ed</td>
<td>Abbreviation for the Bachelor of Education (primary) program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Open Collaborative Course (DOCC)</td>
<td>Pedagogical approach characterised by collaboration, shared knowledge and distribution of that knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Standards, Graduate Professional standards</td>
<td>Abbreviation used to refer to the Graduate Professional standards, a set of standards that all graduates need to attain. All national teacher education standards and procedures are overseen by AITSL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-based learning</td>
<td>Type of learning characterised by targeted learning, based around goal setting by learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROW</td>
<td>Acronym used to describe an approach to goal-setting, Goal, Reality, Options, Will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service Teacher (PST)</td>
<td>Student in an initial teacher education program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience: Connected Classrooms (PX:CC)</td>
<td>Work-Integrated-Learning (WIL) course underpinning the DOCC pedagogical approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Community (PLC)</td>
<td>Community characterised by a shared vision and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Based-Coach (SBC)</td>
<td>Practising teacher who supports pre-service teacher learning on site in partner schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART goals</td>
<td>Acronym used to describe an approach to goal-setting, Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Timely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>Acronym used to describe the four types of goals set by pre-service teachers, Student, Teacher, ELearning and Planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Mentor</td>
<td>Practising teacher who supervises pre-service teacher learning on site in partner schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG)</td>
<td>Established in 2014 to provide advice on the quality of teacher training in Australia and how it could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA)</td>
<td>Regulatory body who oversees the development of P-10 curriculum in Victorian state schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT)</td>
<td>Regulatory body who oversees initial teacher education programs in Victoria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Integrated Learning (WIL)</td>
<td>Learning within the workplace, integrated into a program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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