

**2nd APRU Education Deans Meeting
7-8 December 2009**

The University of Auckland, New Zealand

In attendance:

Associate Professor Graeme Aitken - The University of Auckland, New Zealand (Chair)
Professor Chiharu Fujii - Waseda University, Japan
Professor Saya Shiraishi - University of Tokyo, Japan
Ms Guihua Zhao - University of Tokyo, Japan
Professor Kar Yan Tam - Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong SAR
Professor Eiichi Miyakoshi - Tohoku University, Japan
Professor Sungeun Baek - Seoul National University, Korea
Professor Youngdal Cho - Seoul National University, Korea
Professor Xiaozhou Xu - Zhejiang University, China
Professor Robyn Ewing - University of Sydney, Australia
Dean Karen Gallagher - University of Southern California, USA
Dr Rob Tierney - University of British Columbia, Canada
Dr Mi Zhou - University of Science and Technology of China, China
Dr Sirichai Kanjanawasee - Chulalongkorn University, Thailand
Professor Shirley Grundy - The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR
Associate Professor Ray Misson - The University of Melbourne, Australia
Dean Jane Conoley - The University of California, Santa Barbara, USA
Professor Xiong Qingnian - Fudan University, China
Dr Qian Haiyan - Fudan University, China
Professor Dr Moses Samuel - University of Malaya, Malaysia
Dr Kenneth McGillivray - Secretary General, APRU
Ms Margaret Leong - Director (Secretariat) & Treasurer, APRU

The two-day conference covered a broad range of themes. These are summarised below in two sections. The first section describes themes where discussed – the possible actions are then listed. The second section outlines the substance of the discussion around the other themes.

SECTION A

Discussion themes and actions

1. *Evaluation of Faculty:* How does each university evaluate the research and teaching work of Faculty? How do we position the nature and uses of educational research more strongly within the university? What systems and protocols do we use to evaluate teaching?

What are the implications of the digital world for considering quality teaching in a university? How are digital developments infusing our practices and programs? What challenges do these developments pose for faculty?

What are the interactive possibilities for online programs that encourage collective meaning-making? (MAT@USC illustrated a number of these) What research do we need to be doing into on-line programs? What possibilities do these programs offer for preparing the “global educator” (see theme 2 below)? How are on-line programs improving access for students with disabilities or for those in remote locations?

Possible action:

1.1 Each university could circulate a copy of their teaching evaluation protocols, policies and practices. These could be collated and distributed, and some analysis done of this in preparation for the next meeting.

2. *The Concept of Teaching*

Discussion focussed on two main themes – the preparation of the global teacher, and the nature of the global learner.

Preparation of the Global Teacher

What does it mean to prepare a global educator, especially in the context of a growing international demand for teachers? What are the implications of context (especially in relation to practicum experience); of differing national and state curriculum; and of differing licensure/registration requirements in preparing the global educator? How might we better respond to new trade and mobility agreements and their implications for the supply of teachers? More fundamentally, what do we each understand about the concept of teaching itself and what might be the implications of this?

Possible actions

2.1 Perhaps a series of papers to better understand how each of us sees the concept of teaching (part of understanding each other better).

2.2 Prepare discussion papers on theme of the global teacher as a basis for discussion at 2010 conference – identifying opportunities, potential difficulties, and suggested resolutions of difficulties.

Nature of the Global Learner

We need to develop a multi-faceted description of the global learner and use this as a guide for our thinking as teachers, and for how we educate young people as leaders for the globalising world. This description needs to be informed by:

- a. greater knowledge of popular culture and how to work with it in education;
- b. the influence of cross border flows of influence from multi-epicentres (for example, Manga Fan Club);
- c. the way that learning is being redefined in a cyber-space world (the new “world Kid”);
- d. the multiplicity of contexts of the global learner and to be inclusive of indigenous groups. The Canadian First Nation Initiatives show what multiple worlds students are now living in. Consideration of these initiatives brings together 2

themes: barrier free education which accommodates the global learner and the multiple worlds in which they inhabit.

Possible action

2.2 Identify prospective researchers in each of our institutions who could be invited to work on a collaborative project on youth culture and/or the global learner – possibly a stocktake of research that is going on in each of our institutions on youth culture and the global learner.

3. *Professional doctorate*: Discussed the possibility of developing a curriculum together around a shared theme with the research differentiated by the location of the problem (for example, UBC Masters: Adult Education and Global Change theme – 2 courses taught in each of Sweden, Australia, South Africa and Canada – students operate as a cohort across the world).

Possible actions

3.1 Consider development of possible shared themes – e.g. the global learner (see above); achievement gap; educational leadership; higher education; educational policy; teaching and the curriculum; student development; assessment.

3.2 Develop model for a possible international study tour for doctoral students based around practitioner themes (e.g. social promotion).

3.3 Consider the development of a Summer Institute possibly based on something like the Melbourne Three Deans Conference – 6 staff members from 3 institutions engaged in an intensive period of teaching around a theme.

4. *Internationalisation*: How do we make internationalisation concrete? Is there value in setting up a shared indicator system of internationalisation in a university, or establishing an agreed means of describing what internationalisation might look like in a Faculty of Education? If so, how might we do this?

Possible action

4.1 An initial draft of indicators prepared for responses from other Deans.

5. *World Education Research Association(WERA)*: Discussions were held around the possibilities of creating scholarly working groups led by two or more experienced researchers to leverage off the power of national organisations (possibly embedded in a national association's annual meeting).

Possible action

5.1 Form a working group to prepare a synthesis White Paper identifying research gaps and issues to inform possible productive collaborations.

SECTION B

Other Discussion Themes

A number of other themes were discussed over the course of the two days. No specific actions were discussed in relation to these.

6. *Initial teacher education*: What evidence do we have about the efficacy of our work as research-intensive universities in preparing future teachers? How can we avoid a one-size-fits-all approach to assessing the impact of our work? How well are we able to respond to the challenges of alternative routes with evidence of our own effectiveness? How might we develop better information systems to track teacher education students through their programs and into their work as teachers? The presentation on MAT@USC showed how this was possible through an online program.
7. *Teacher retention*: The role of mentoring through the initial years of teaching and the impact this has on retention.
8. *Subject/disciplinary focus in the preparation of teachers*: What is the place of subject matter knowledge in teaching? How might disciplinary preparation and pedagogical preparation be better integrated – especially in STEM subjects? What forms of integration are effective across faculties? (Content courses, double degrees, team teaching).
9. *Relationship between universities and schools*: How are we responding to the need to develop strong partnerships with schools in the preparation of teachers? (e.g. Melbourne Master of Teaching – groups of 25 student teachers working with clusters of 4-5 schools supported by a teaching fellow (0.5) and a clinical specialist from the university (0.25))
10. *Educational research*: How are we responding to the combined challenge of research for accountability in research-intensive universities (impact factors etc), and authentic research that is making a difference? (Does there need to be a tension here if those who are working in practice are conceptualising their work in a way that speaks to an international audience as well as a local one?) How can we encourage and build stronger inquiry communities/teams?
11. *Student achievement*: What do we know about educational policy and practice that makes a difference to student achievement, especially in the context of a multi-cultural school population? We also need to ‘problematise’ what it is we are educating students to achieve. (The session with The University of Auckland researchers and a senior Ministry official on Day One of the conference identified the importance of understanding the values and beliefs inherent in policy and practice, and open discussion about possible disjunctions in these beliefs).

Next Steps

It was agreed that:

- we would aim for a follow up conference in December 2010 in Hong Kong
- that an initial organising committee of Karen Gallagher, Shirley Grundy and Graeme Aitken would be formed and that further representation would be sought

As Ken noted in the final session there are unlimited opportunities to create connections and projects between each of the member organizations: workshops; conferences; working groups etc. But his advice was to pick a project to begin with, achieve some success with that, and then branch out in time. On this basis the organizing committee would develop 1-2 key focuses for 2010 and disseminate these in a memo to 2009 participants and to senior staff in Education faculties in APRU universities.

Graeme Aitken

g.aitken@auckland.ac.nz