

# **Universitas 21 Deans of Education Meeting 4 in Chicago**

**Sunday, April 20, 2003  
2 to 6 pm**

**VENUE: Michigan Meeting Room, Renaissance Hotel  
1 West Wacker Drive, Chicago (ph: 312 372 7200)**

## **Participants**

David Clarke – University of Melbourne (convenor)  
Carolyn Callahan – Curry School of Education, University of Virginia  
Ratna Ghosh – McGill University, Montreal  
Hirek Kwiatkowski – Glasgow University  
Bob Lingard – University of Queensland  
Jim O'Brien – Edinburgh University  
Stella Parker – Nottingham University  
Bridie Raban – University of Melbourne  
Rob Tierney – University of British Columbia, Vancouver  
Amy Tsui – University of Hong Kong

## **Report**

### **1. Professional Portability Agreement**

The draft “Statement of Agreement on Initial Teacher Education and Undergraduate Educational Studies Equivalencies” prepared by Bart McGettrick was tabled.

Rob Tierney provided a very comprehensive overview of the Portability issue. Of immediate interest to the group was the news that Rob is currently involved in a portability study in Canada. Rob undertook to provide those present with a paper related to the portability issue.

**ACTION: R. TIERNEY**

Among the items addressed during this discussion:

- Information should be obtained regarding portability agreements in other professions
- Among the key portability issues confronting Canada and elsewhere is the nature of the Provincial/Federal credential interface
- National accreditation is a priority issue in Canada
- Portability issues are being addressed by the United Nations from the perspective of international standardization

- U21 is currently involved in two initiatives related to portability – Surveyors/Assessors in Real Estate (the group addressing this issue includes non-U21 institutions), and Accounting
- An accord has been established between Engineering groups in U21 to the effect that they “have concluded that these programs are comparable”

Some key questions were identified:

- Why pursue portability agreements?
- What information do we have on mobility of students and graduates between U21 institutions?
- What are the available models by which portability might be achieved?
- What are the relevant considerations: Experiences, Examinations, or Educational Programs?

The approaches of “Comparability” and “Common Standard” were contrasted.

**Proposal:** Convene a meeting specifically addressing the issue of portability, with invited participants with experience in issues of portability (eg from Engineering) who could report on the process of achieving agreement on professional portability.

A role was identified for U21 in providing a network to address the issue of professional portability, but this would require clear identification of the purpose of the portability. Three distinct forms of portability were identified;

1. Mobility within teacher education programs
2. Access to postgraduate programs
3. Portability for professional practice

The distinction between these three was seen to be significant and, while items 1 and 2 were related, item 3 is a separate matter dependant on local requirements for registration for purposes of professional practice.

In relation to items 1 and 2, the meeting felt that the sort of “Equivalencies” employed in the tabled Draft Agreement were more restrictive and less helpful than an approach based on comparability of programs. Employing this approach, portability agreements would be based on reciprocal recognition of programs.

The ‘Global Teacher’ model implicit in the McGettrick draft is one possible approach. If the proposed meeting were to be convened, other models should also be considered.

As a step towards producing a plan for action, distinct scenarios were identified for the forms of portability related to items 1 and 2 above:

**Scenario 1** – Student enrolled in Institution A goes to Institution B for some fraction (less than half) of their course. Example: The University of Hong Kong has these sort of arrangements in place with five other institutions (involving about 40 students in the BEd program).

**Scenario 2** – Graduate of Institution A enrolls for postgraduate study at Institution B.

**Plan for Action in relation to Scenario 1**

- A. Document “Models of Process” from institutions such as the University of Hong Kong, McGill University, and the Curry School of Education that currently have Scenario 1 arrangements in place.
- B. Identify Guiding Principles of such arrangements, particularly the clear specification of Reciprocal Responsibilities between pairs of institutions engaging in Scenario 1.
- C. Collect Cases or ‘Template Agreements’
- D. U21 Institutions identify (i) courses into which students from other institutions might be accepted, and (ii) courses from which places at other institutions might be sought.

**Action 1. The collation and sharing of information from U21 Institutions regarding Scenario 1 (re A, B, C and D above).**

**Action 2. Portability Meeting dealing specifically with Professional Accreditation**

**ACTION: U21 DEANS OF EDUCATION**

It was suggested that Action 1 could be implemented or at least initiated through a Conference Call between Deans of Education. Use could also be made of Conference Call(s) involving outside experts in relation to Action 2. Position papers could also be solicited from regions in relation to this issue (eg. the paper to be distributed by Rob Tierney).

**2. Benchmarking**

A brief description was provided by Bridie Raban of the benchmarking discussions held between the University of Melbourne and the Curry School of Education – largely making the point that the relevant statistics were available and easily exchanged.

There was a general feeling among those present that the basic data for benchmarking of Faculty performance are fairly easily available and can be shared efficiently between interested institutions.

The point was made that the more process- or quality-related indicators are not required by university accountability procedures and therefore are generally not sought and less easily available.

That is, the conclusion of the group was that the quantitative data are available and easily shared, but the qualitative data on things like: who does the teaching, organizational arrangements, student teaching supervision, criteria for promotion, mix of sessional and tenured staff, mentoring processes, and so on, would be valuable.

A general discussion then ensued in which several points were made in relation to benchmarking:

- Don't confuse 'benchmarking' with 'benchmarks' (who determines benchmarks and what are they used for?)
- The indicators reflect our conception of what constitutes our core business
- Similar problems are dealt with in different ways – this should be documented

Similarities:

- Lack of money

Differences:

- Unit of accountability (Faculty or School or Department)
- The University of Melbourne Faculty of Education and the Curry School of Education appear to be at opposite ends of the accountability dimension. Generally, other institutions are not subject to the same productivity-based budgetary model as the University of Melbourne. In particular, the Curry School of Education has minimal specific documentation of performance indicators and there is no explicit link between funding and even such parameters as student numbers.

**3. U21 Global**

The document "UNIVERSITAS 21 GLOBAL: A Report to *Universitas 21* Directors and Managers" was tabled

**4. Special Issue of the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development***

David Clarke reported that the invitation from Y-C Cheng to develop the papers presented at last year's AERA U21 symposium on issues in teacher education as a special issue of the *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development* was accepted. The collation of papers was delayed significantly by the change in authorship of the US contribution, but things are now in hand and progressing satisfactorily.

**5. U21 Profile and Visibility at AERA or other research gatherings**

The usefulness of regular gatherings such as the Pre-AERA U21 meeting was endorsed by the group and a similar meeting would be convened in 2004. The U21 symposium on Teacher Professionalism submitted for inclusion in the 2003 AERA conference was unsuccessful (two favourable reviewers, one less favourable). David undertook to contact the relevant AERA Division Chair and establish the way in which the proposal might be improved for resubmission to the 2004 AERA conference.

**ACTION: D. CLARKE**

**6. Future Meetings and Action Plan**

*Meeting Practicalities:* The cost of meeting room facilities and catering in Chicago (in excess of US\$1000) will be paid in the first instance by the University of Melbourne (David) and participants will each be separately

invoiced by the Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne, for the sum of US\$100.

It was generally agreed that the viability of meetings was increased by holding them coincident with a major international conference. With regard to the Portability Meeting suggested in relation to Action 2 (above), it was suggested that the September meeting of the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER) would provide a useful and timely opportunity for a second meeting in 2003. Jim O'Brien undertook the responsibility to explore the possibility of affiliating U21 Education with ECER.

**ACTION: JIM O'BRIEN**

There was a general feeling that annual meetings allow too much time between meetings and that the enthusiasm generated is dissipated if the gap between meetings is as long as 12 months. The Planning of the proposed Portability Meeting would be a matter for communication between U21 Deans of Education.

**ACTION: U21 DEANS OF EDUCATION**

**Meeting closed at 6pm**