Developing Practice: Teaching Teachers Today for Tomorrow

Theme: Formal Education

Sub-theme: Revamping Teacher Education

Tony John Mays, Contracted researcher to Unisa

usso4@unisa.ac.za

Context: A call for more and better teachers

A recent policy statement from the Department of Education in South Africa (RSA 2007) calls for ‘more teachers, better teachers’ (emphasis added) and the NEPAD education desk (NEPAD c.2006:2) has identified a number of challenges facing teacher education in Africa more generally while also expressing concern about numbers and quality.

The central defining role of a teacher as a knowledge worker, able to organise knowledge and learning in a systematic way, needs to be foregrounded (Morrow 2007). Nurturing a commitment and ability regarding lifelong learning and the appropriate use of appropriate technology to attain educational goals would seem to be pre- and co-requisites given the current explosion of access to information.

The new teacher education policy framework in South Africa (RSA 2007) meanwhile makes teaching practice a central focus of an Initial Professional Education and Training programme and national accreditation requirements (CHE 2008) expect direct institutional involvement in the placing and supervision of student teachers on teaching practice.

Do as I do or do as I say?

Glennie and Mays (2008, 2010) suggest that often teacher education courses do not sufficiently model appropriate practice and Robinson (2003:208) notes a tendency to focus on certification rather than on developing practice.

The challenges of developing suitable curricula that influence the practice of teaching in a positive and sustained way are well documented (Adler and Reed 2002, Kruss 2009, UNESCO-BREDAD 2009, Welch & Harley 2010, Woolfolk 2007). Three currently forceful arguments are for greater attention to be paid to the context of practice and student-teachers’ own value systems (Harley, Barasa, Bertram, Mattson and Pillay 2010, Smit and Nduna 2008, Whitelaw, de Beer and Henning 2008, Moon 2006, Barak and Mansur 2009a, b; Burton 2009; Ropo, Mäkinen, Yrjäinen, Syyänen, and Portimojärvi, 2009) as well as the pedagogical content knowledge of the teacher (Adler and Reed, 2002; Botha, 2009).

Within these broad theoretical parameters, Figure 1 sets out a possible curriculum model based on the modified requirements of current policy in South Africa (RSA 2000), (RSA 2007).
The starting point of the initial processional education and training of teachers, **Component 1**, is the start of a conversation about what it means to ‘become a teacher’. Starting from this foundation, the four components of the programme build upon each other in the sequence in which student-teachers tend to have questions – starting from personal experience and then thinking about WHAT to teach (Component 2), HOW to teach (Component 3) and WHY to (continue) to teach (Component 4) as reflected in a study by Karaman (2009) and a commitment to nurturing the growing autonomy of practice of the student-teacher.

Overall the realities of the postmodern connected environment suggest the need to develop communities of learning and practice (Wenger 2000:163-4) to facilitate the exchange of ideas and support for research-based practices in teacher education and development. Increasingly this dialogue would be mediated via mobile networking (Ally 2009).

**Competent use of appropriate technology**

A growing body of literature provides insight into the possible advantages and the minimum requirements for integrating ICTs into ODL provision more generally (Simonson, Smaldino, Albright & Zvacek (2003) and on the unique opportunities provided by the online environment in particular (Anderson & Elloumi c.2004). The literature suggests the need to recognize the increased diversity of the potential learners and to design with different learning needs in mind from the outset (Ehlers 2004; Davis in Moore 2007), including the need to address issues of cultural diversity (Gunawardena and LaPointe in Moore 2007), and to make the necessary investment in appropriate curriculum design ahead of marketing and registration Butcher (c. 2001). It is then necessary to create awareness of the nature and demands of distance and technology mediated learning prior to registration (Simpson 2004; Davis in Moore 2007) and to give attention to the ways in which both tutors and learners are prepared, monitored and supported in an online or technology mediated learning environment.
(McPherson and Nunes 2004) during the learning process. The learning process must be informed by an understanding of adult learning theory (Davis in Moore 2007) and the changing expectations and preferred learning styles of students (Dede, Dieterle, Clarke, Ketelhut and Nelson in Moore 2007). Caplan, and Thiessen and Ambrock (in Anderson & Elloumi c.2004) point to the need for multi disciplined teams to develop these kinds of programmes – which will obviously have implications for project management, time and cost and in turn models a particular form of professional practice.

Welch, Drew and Randall (2010) report on a Saide engagement with an on-line learning process to explore how to train tutors to support distance learning on-line. They conclude that, designed appropriately, an on-line course can result in greater engagement and interaction but question whether such an approach can be used effectively for large scale provision.

Generally, teachers (and trainers) in South Africa have tended to be slow to access the potential of computer technology generally and online potential in particular. In schools which have access to ICTs, reliable internet connectivity varies widely as does teacher readiness to use the technology, so administrative usage tends to outweigh curriculum usage (Saide 2010).

The key point to be made here is that the way in which we use technology as teacher trainers models particular values and uses for our student-teachers. Therefore we need to make conscious choices to use appropriate technologies in appropriate ways taking cognisance of both our learning purposes and the technology profile and contexts of practice of our target learners.

**IPET through ODL**

Moon et al. (2007: 64) observe: “One common mistake in the design stage of program development is to give attention to material development at the expense of well-thought-through strategies for support, assessment, and quality assurance”.

Recently within Unisa there has been recognition of the need to think and plan more holistically in terms of the “student walk” through the institution (Louw 2007) and the “fit” or lack thereof between student and institution expectations, preparedness and responsiveness at each key step of the walk (Prinsloo 2009). Table 1 below illustrates how appropriate technologies can be harnessed appropriately in each step of the student walk at Unisa (thus modelling appropriate practice for student-teachers):

**Table 1: Technology and the student walk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step in the student walk</th>
<th>Appropriate technology for purpose and audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marketing and orientation</td>
<td>Provision of information in user-friendly styles and multiple modes (e.g. online, mobile – CDR, DVD, podcast, audio/video, print) and access to OER examples of learning resources enables potential students to make more informed choices. Supported by online advisors, call centre, or staff at decentralised regional centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Application: Responsible Open Access Programme</td>
<td>Provision of diagnostic self-test quizzes available on-line, on DVD, on flash drives or in-person at regional centres can help potential students to make appropriate choices about what, how much and in what mode to study. The emphasis should be on the most appropriate route to access learning rather than on testing for exclusion. Supported by online advisors, call centre, or staff at decentralised regional centres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Registration

Students can register online remotely, at a self-service terminal at a regional centre, or seek personal assistance at a regional centre. Currently about 70% of Unisa students register on-line. A technology-enhanced registration process allows for automatic pop-up alerts regarding pre- and co-requisites, possible exam clashes, workload challenges and WIL components such as teaching practice. It also allows for the possibility of immediate access to digital versions of resources immediately on successful registration through the use of a ‘toaster’.

### 4. Teaching and learning

#### Orientation

Traditionally Unisa has relied on printed tutorial letters at programme (300 series) and module (100 series) levels for orientation purposes and these are also available in PDF format online and so can be downloaded should students lose their copy. Other orientation possibilities include YouTube, video-conferencing, satellite TV or radio broadcast, video on DVD or podcast, an etutor led small group online or tele-conference, and where the need exists and numbers justify it, even a face-to-face contact session in a regional centre, other institution, school, church hall, teacher centre etc.

All contact with student-teachers should consciously model appropriate teacher-student behaviour.

#### Maintenance/Formative assessment

In many institutions, formative assessment in the form of assignments, is a pre-requisite for entry to summative assessment (most often in the form of a formal examination). 10% of students either do not complete or do not “pass” their formative assessment.

So:
- Provide SMS and email reminders of deadlines
- Set up online discussion fora related to assignment preparation
- Provide for an etutor or student led (PCL) small group online or tele-conference, and where the need exists and numbers justify it, even a face-to-face contact session
- Provide for online, postal and in-person submissions
- Provide for online marking and marks submission
- Automate routing of non-submissions or weak submissions for proactive follow-up by an etutor – by phone, email, or skype
- Provide feedback on problem areas in a TL, email, sms, in the online forum, via etutor or face-to-face tutor
- For the joint exploration of practice consider having students engage with digital copies of lesson planning documents and videos of classroom practice and encourage critical engagement online, by mobile, in an etutorial or in a face-to-face tutorial; maintain a programme and TP website throughout the programme including updates on policy, news articles, research publications etc. as well as informal chat room facilities

#### Consolidation/Summative assessment registration

10% of students successfully complete the formative assessment but although registered to attempt summative assessment do not present themselves.

So:
- Provide SMS and email reminders of timetables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd examination opportunity</th>
<th>Summative assessment</th>
<th>5. Graduation and alumni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide SMS and email reminders of timetables</td>
<td>Of the 80% of students who present themselves, 70% of Humanities students pass first time (pass rates tend to be lower in other fields), yielding an initial cohort throughput of 80% x 70% = 56%. Track trends automatically to prioritise interventions. Where possible provide both online and more traditional opportunities to complete summative assessment</td>
<td>Build and maintain a database of graduates; keep regular contact with alumni through a quarterly enewsletter; conduct eimpact studies; recruit graduates as etutors...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide SMS or online booking of exam candidacy and automated reminders for deferrals</td>
<td>Automate routing of non-registrations for pro-active follow-up by an etutor – by phone, email, or skype</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide feedback on key areas/ assessment foci in a TL email, sms, in the online forum, via etutor or face-to-face tutor, or use YouTube, video-conferencing, satellite TV or radio broadcast, video on DVD or podcast</td>
<td>Automate routing of no-shows or poor performance for pro-active follow-up by an etutor – by phone, email, or skype</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide feedback on key areas/ assessment foci in a TL email, sms, in the online forum, via etutor or face-to-face tutor, or use YouTube, video-conferencing, satellite TV or radio broadcast, video on DVD or podcast</td>
<td>Automate routing of non-registrations for pro-active follow-up by an etutor – by phone, email, or skype</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

There is a hierarchy in decision-making implied by the discussion in this paper:

First, we need to design a curriculum that actually focuses on the practice of teaching.

Second, we need to design learning pathways and learning activities that model the approaches to knowledge, learners and technology usage we would like student-teachers themselves to exhibit in their own teaching.

Third, we then need to use the most appropriate technologies in the ways most appropriate to the learning intention taking cognisance of the (changing) technology profile of our student-teachers and their learners as well as their contexts of practice.
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