Chapter 5: Opportunities and tensions in the experiences of collaborative professionalism during the enactment of the GTPA

Tanya Doyle, Neus (Snowy) Evans, and Peta Salter

Abstract

Through discursive analysis of narratives of practice, this study examines the tensions and opportunities that arise for teacher educators as a result of implementing a teaching performance assessment into an existing program of study. The introduction of the Graduate Teacher Performance Assessment (GTPA®)[1], and the requirements to ensure assessment fidelity, disrupted our thinking, programmatic curricular and organisational structures. Drawing on the notion of collaborative professionalism, we analyse our implementation experiences and reflect on our professional learning in relation to the sites of practice (the university and partner schools) for our work, and the risks of implementation. Moreover, we draw on nuanced notions of accountability to illuminate how we have reconceptualised and reimagined our work as teacher educators. Simultaneously, we assert our capacity as teacher educators to shape and steer decision-making in initial teacher education (ITE) in ways that respond to the needs of the communities our graduate teachers serve.

Introduction

The report by the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG) for the Australian Government entitled *Action Now, Classroom Ready Teachers* (Craven et al., 2014), called for reform in initial teacher education in Australia. One key finding of this report concerned "poor practice" across a number of programs that were "not equipping graduates with the content knowledge, evidence-based teaching strategies and skills they need to respond to different student learning needs" (p. viii). In response to the report, and the 38 recommendations made by the authors, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) revised its 2011 standards for Accreditation of Initial Teacher Education programs in Australia. The latest program accreditation standards (AITSL, 2015, revised 2018, 2019) foreground the significant role that a teaching performance assessment (TPA) plays in the accreditation of initial teacher education (ITE) programs delivered by universities throughout Australia.

Of particular relevance are the Professional Standards (AITSL, 2011, revised 2018), and Program Standard 1.2 that highlights the essential contribution of a TPA in the design of the teacher education program: "Program design and assessment processes require pre-service teachers to have successfully completed a final year teaching performance assessment prior to graduation" (AITSL, 2015, revised 2018, 2019, p. 12). Moreover, Program Standard 6 requires the university to report aggregated TPA student performance data as a means of demonstrating the impact of the teacher education program on preservice teachers' progression into the workforce, and on classroom students' learning. Additionally, aggregated TPA data must be considered by the university for program evaluation and improvement purposes. As of December 2019, AITSL had endorsed three TPAs for use by universities to meet Program Standard 1.2, inclusive of The Graduate Teacher Performance Assessment (GTPA). The GTPA is a culminating "assessment of pre-service teachers' profession readiness" (Adie & Wyatt-Smith, 2020, p. 269), which must be implemented with fidelity across the

[1] Acknowledgment: The Graduate Teacher Performance Assessment® Project [GTPA] was created by the Institute for Learning Sciences and Teacher Education, Australian Catholic University, and has been implemented in a collective of Higher Education Institutions in Australia (graduatetpa.com).

GTPA Collective. The definition of fidelity, here, seeks to establish conditions for assessment implementation which are "recognisably comparable across sites, and yet be responsive to diverse contexts of [university] programs and professional experience placements" (Adie & Wyatt-Smith, 2020, p. 270). Risks to the fidelity of implementation can be framed in relation to four sites of practice at the university implementing the GTPA: the teacher education academic program; the school-based professional experience program; the requirements of a TPA; and the assessment policy of the university (Adie & Wyatt-Smith, 2020, p. 282). It is important, therefore, to examine our own implementation of the GTPA in relation to these sites of our practice.

It has been argued in the literature that the introduction of a TPA for the accreditation of Australian ITE programs seeks to steer the work of teacher educators in managerial directions. This reflects the influence of critiques from implementation of the edTPA in the US, warning of teacher educators who face the risk of losing control over the outcomes of their programs (Charteris, 2019; Cochran-Smith et al., 2018). Furthermore, Bourke (2019) argues that through the ITE reform agenda underway in Australia, teacher educators are being discursively repositioned as being "out of touch, side-lined and condemned to window dressing the implementation of top-down directives from regulatory authorities" (p. 41). Some Australian teacher educators have shared narratives of their practice which highlight the tensions they have experienced in implementing new regulatory requirements (Dwyer et al., 2020). White (2019) finds that "teacher educators urgently need a shared understanding [of their roles] and highlights the importance of an examination into the many hidden facets of their collective work" (p. 210).

Our experience of contributing to the development of, and then enacting the GTPA – while not without challenge – could not be characterised as a process in which our ideas were side-lined or deemed irrelevant. In the work of the GTPA Collective, teacher educators have debated and tested their interpretations of impact of ITE programs by collectively establishing forms of accountability that matter to the Collective of teacher educators who were part of the collaboration. How we worked together, then, as teacher educators, to navigate tensions and realise opportunities in response to these new policy imperatives is the focus of this chapter. We draw on Ball's (1994) sense of policy as "both text and actions, words and deeds, it is what is enacted as well as what is intended" (p. 10). As Rizvi and Lingard (2009) note, the implementation of policy always "encounter[s] complex organisation arrangements and already-existing practices" (p. 5). To whom teacher educators are primarily accountable in relation to the implementation of policy imperatives, and the grounds upon which that accountability is established, are central to determining the drivers of enacting TPA policy as a social practice with purpose. Teacher educators, then, work as the mediators of the policy (Blackmore, 2010) through the enactment of their individualised and/or collective (or contested) notions of professionalism (Biesta, 2017). Our individual and collective conceptualisations and enactment, then, of both 'accountability' and 'professionalism' are significant to our analysis of our practice as teacher educators working within, and for, universities as complex organisations.

Two notions of accountability are identified and applied to signify the specific form of accountability that we privilege when we use the term. These include democratic accountability (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018) and intelligent accountability (Lillejord, 2020). The notion of democratic accountability foregrounds the idea that teachers can appraise their practice in ways that positively impact on learning in the communities they serve. As teacher educators (and teachers), we are ultimately accountable for student learning. Foregrounding principles of democratic accountability in the ITE program enables teacher educators to steer the professional learning of preservice teachers towards recognising 'what matters most' in the context they serve. Enacting this notion of accountability requires preservice teachers to make discerning choices about the 'measures' of student success they privilege and to whom those measures are communicated, in which form and for what purpose; to families, to the school and to the schooling system. Lillejord's (2020) notion of intelligent accountability shapes our enactment of 'measures' of accountability by allowing us to frame it as part

of an interpersonal system that is based on dialogue, participation, and co-creation. The form of accountability we hold ourselves to in relation to the impact of our teacher education programs then, in turn, shapes the perspectives of professionalism we as teacher educators can draw upon to enact policy-as-practice.

The contestation surrounding professionalism and teacher education in the Australian context is explored by Alexander et al. (2019). These authors note that managerial professionalism is often critiqued within the literature because it is viewed as "control constructed from 'above' or 'outside' the profession and imposed through performance cultures and accountability structures" (p. 11). In contrast, democratic professionalism "focuses on collegial relations, and collaborative work practices where teachers are advocates and change agents working for the common good of the communities and contexts within which they work" (p. 10). Democratic professionalism resonates with our own intended practice as teacher educators, as well as the notion of professionalism which we seek to develop within our preservice teachers. It also underpins the mindset of service to colleagues and the community that the GTPA Collective seeks to foster as teacher educators from across the nation and universities collaborate to reach consensus on 'what matters most' in the demonstration of graduate teachers' work in Australian classrooms.

Hargreaves and O'Connor's (2017) collaborative professionalism framework resonates with the notion of democratic professionalism we experienced while working together as part of the GTPA Collective. Collaborative professionalism "make[s] a strong case for communities of expertise and service where collegial solidarity permeates cultures of teaching, and strives to connect student learning with big ideas of social transformation" (p. v). The utility of the framework for forming productive partnerships and for recognising our role in the collective responsibility for teacher education have been identified by Adie (2018) and described as contributing to "growing a new kind of agency in ITE" (Wyatt-Smith, 2018, p. 68). Moreover, the collaborative professionalism framework seeks to establish this cultural change in teacher education and new way of working as normative; a position which drives change in relation to policy implementation in universities.

In the remainder of this chapter, we draw on understandings of accountability and professionalism and take up the following questions: How do we, as teacher educators, reconcile the tensions and opportunities of implementation of the GTPA in relation to notions of democratic accountability and the requirements related with fidelity of implementation? What tensions and opportunities challenge our conceptions of professionalism while implementing the GTPA across our many sites of practice? First, though, we explain the methodological approach to this work.

Methodological framework

Capturing and analysing stories of practice allow us to identify both synergies and disconnects in the shared experiences of staff implementing the GTPA. The methodological framework is organised with three phases. The first is to collective narratives of practice. The second analyses the narratives of practice to identify and extract excerpts that align with tenets of collaborative professionalism. Finally, critical discourse analysis (CDA) is applied to narrative excerpts to locate discord or disconnect within and between the narratives of collaborative professionalism.

Firstly, narrative inquiry (Chase, 2018) frames the methodological approach in this study. Narratives are positioned as discourse-in-practice. Moreover, personal narratives are conceptualised as "meaning-making through the shaping of experience; a way of understanding one's own or others' actions; of organising events, objects, feelings, or thoughts in relation to each other" (Chase, 2018, p.

549). In other words, narrative inquiry supports the exploration of how one story reads in relation to other stories; enabling examination of how the local conditions make each story possible. In this study, written narratives of practice were sought from the small team of teacher educators, comprised of three full-time academics and one sessional staff member, who were implementing the GTPA in a regional university. The narratives of practice were written in relation to the stimulus questions: Has the GTPA shaped our work as teacher educators? In what ways? What are your feelings about this? Do you consider the enactment of the GTPA at [university] has been shaped by collaborative professionalism?

Secondly, Frank's (2012) principles of dialogical narrative analysis (DNA) recognises stories as a way that people can revise their sense of self and situate that self in relation to others in a group. In analysing dialogue, the researcher must respect each participant's capacity for continuing change, and they must aim to not summarise findings. Instead analysis should aim at, "increasing people's possibilities for hearing themselves and others… to expand people's sense of responsibility… in how they might respond to what is heard… It seeks to show what is at stake in a story as a form of response" (Frank, 2012, p. 5). The conceptual framework of collaborative professionalism (Hargreaves & O'Connor, 2017) was integrated with Frank's (2012) principles of narrative analysis in order to uncover the potential ways in which the tenets of collaborative professionalism as a "new kind of agency" (Wyatt-Smith, 2018, p. 68) informed:

1. the narrative resources available to the participants, that is to what extent does the story of collaborative GTPA enactment make use of narrative resources already familiar to the participant?;
2. the extent to which these narrative resources play a role in establishing affiliations among the participants;
3. the extent to which the identity of participants claim, reject, or experiment with elements of collaborative professionalism through the implementation of the GTPA; and
4. what is at stake through the work of enacting the GTPA across the various sites of practice of teacher education at our university, from the perspective of each of the participants.

Finally, the narrative excerpts were further interrogated using CDA (Fairclough, 2010). CDA offers a method to elucidate potentially discordant aspects of discourse-in-action between colleagues; with respect to institutional expectations; and/or with the field, in otherwise seemingly harmonious stories.

Narratives of practice: Implementing the GTPA

Mutual dialogue, as an element of collaborative professionalism, is focused on listening, clarification, and honest feedback. Through this line of analysis we identified discordant perspectives between narratives shared by full-time academic staff and sessional staff. A full-time staff member described productive partnerships between colleagues during the implementation of the GTPA.

> Mutual dialogue is an extremely strong component of our practice with the GTPA. I truly value the mutual dialogue that strengthens our practice. All members of this team are respectful, open to new ideas and practices. We may not all hold the same opinions, but we accept that they are equally valid, and we are all open to diversity. For example, within the team there are different conceptions of the instrumentality of the GTPA, but we understand and accept that we don't have to share the same thinking on this aspect – that having different conceptions of the instrumentality of the GTPA will not affect student outcomes. (Academic 1)

However, this sense of collaboration through mutual dialogue does not appear to be a resource available to the sessional staff member to use in the narration of their practice:

> Unfortunately, the only aspect of collaborative professionalism I experienced was moderation of assessment. While my relationship with my course coordinator was positive, and we conversed via phone and email, as a sessional lecturer, I felt isolated. (Sessional lecturer 1)

The full-time staff member describes how teacher educators work together as a team in a manner which is respectful, open to new ideas and to new practices, and in accordance with the principles of mutual dialogue. Moreover, they note that the teaching team does not always agree on the extent to which the conceptualisation of a TPA could, or should, be aligned with notions of managerial professionalism (Alexander et al., 2019), consistent with Ball's (2003) notion of performativity and/or Biestas's (2017) view of evidence-based practice distorting the work of the democratic professional. This staff member notes that despite this lack of agreement around the potentialities of the GTPA, this discord among staff need not negatively impact the experiences of the preservice teachers. This view speaks to the notion of fidelity described by Adie & Wyatt-Smith (2020) in that the assessment provides scope to speak to contextual considerations of significance. In other words, the assessment can be enacted through a lens of both democratic (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018) and intelligent (Lillejord, 2020) accountability and in the spirit of democratic professionalism (Alexander et al., 2019). In contrast, the sessional staff member tells of a sense of isolation from this mutual dialogue, recognised here as 'collaborative professionalism', highlighting a lack of affiliation between full-time and casual academic staff members. Given the high-stakes nature of the GTPA for program accreditation, this realisation requires an organisational response which has implications for future human resource planning, particularly in terms of time allocation for ongoing communication and collaboration between staff members. In addition, given the allocation of such resources, full-time academic staff members would need to allocate more time to ensure that mutual, positive dialogue with sessional staff occurs routinely such that their contributions and feedback are recognised as integral to the successful implementation of change.

Similar patterns in experience emerge with respect to collective autonomy and responsibility, particularly in relation to the institutional response to the marking and moderation demands of the GTPA.

> There was a combination of individual and collective responsibility and commitment. While we worked with our individual cohorts, we shared practices and, in this way, contributed to each other's professional development. (Academic 1)

> Our internal moderation processes have strengthened our approach to implementation and our professional conversations have shaped the strategic directions of our program and subject development. (Academic 2)

> The marking component is extremely demanding and needs to be considered when developing further assessment. Each assessment element took at least ninety minutes to mark efficiently and fairly. This is an issue for both full and part-time staff. (Sessional lecturer 1)

The sessional staff member speaks to the limitations of the university's exisiting assessment policy as a site of practice. These limits have the potential to introduce risk to the fidelity of implementation of the assessment (Adie & Wyatt-Smith, 2020). Hearing this story prompts us to seek new organisational arrangements, at an institutional level, to legitimate and enable the sustained collaborative professionalism of teacher educators that underpin the work of the GTPA Collective. In particular, assessment policies around resource allocation for sessional staff need to be re-examined in order to reflect the required commitment from sessional staff, to mark, moderate and evaluate as part of a

teaching team with collective autonomy and responsibility. In other words, more organisational recognition of ways of "talking, thinking, acting and being a teacher educator" (Adie & Wyatt-Smith, 2020, p. 274) rather than simply being related to as a 'casual marker' are required. Failure to consider this implication leads to reduced opportunities for professional learning through collaboration for both full-time and sessional academic staff and risks notions of managerial professionalism, rather than democratic professionalism (Alexander et al., 2019), dominating this aspect of the work of teacher educators. When read together, this multi-voiced narrative makes clear that what is imagined by the organisation to be possible in terms of the time and effort required to be invested in the implementation of the GTPA, does not reflect the experience of enactment which is constrained by a university assessment policy that no longer aligns with the regulatory requirements of initial teacher education. What is at stake here, is the risk to fidelity of implementation for the university.

In relation to the element of collective initiative – which is focused on trialing and enacting innovations – there was general affinity between the responses of full-time and sessional academic staff. All staff noted that implementing innovations within our program structure and curriculum had positive implications for preservice teachers and community partners:

> We have had to come up with new systems for collating and reporting the PST [preservice teacher] results on GTPA. This has required us to work with data systems staff, and professional experience unit staff to trial and refine new workflows and intersections between the work of academic and professional staff. We have also had to trial new forms for the QPERF [Queensland Professional Experience Reporting Framework] portfolio, such that it supports and works with the GTPA, rather than duplicating or undermining the forms of evidence school partners value in the presentation of the PST portfolio. I think we need to be more intentional in the ways we record and recount these decisions so that we demonstrate the ways we are adapting and innovating in response to regulatory requirements and feedback from our school partners. (Academic 2)

> We might individually try different types of activities and pedagogical strategies, then share and evaluate them with the other team members… We all responded to our own cohort requests and needs then shared our experiences and outcomes… We had one goal in mind, to innovate our curriculum to ensure student preparation to undertake the GTPA. (Academic 1)

However, these innovations were coupled with tension which was noted within narratives from full-time academic staff at the intersection of two sites of practice, namely: the assessment policy expectations of universities and the teacher education program, including the professional experience component which is assessed using the QPERF by school-based teacher mentors. Staff noted the complexities of establishing new program requirements within existing university policies and processes. Furthermore, while the implementation of the GTPA made it possible to enact evidence-informed teacher education accreditation decisions, accessing the data and evidence required from within institutions was curiously difficult, largely due to the new demands on the workflows and resource allocation of professional staff within the institution. These findings highlight the need for establishing innovative ways of working with professional and technical staff to enact program-level innovations within university staffing structures. At the same time, Academic 2 recognises the need to not only record data about the range and quality of GTPA submissions, but also the need to systematically document the narrative of the innovative work required of both academic and professional staff to demonstrate the university response to new regulatory expectations; clearly articulating the role that TPAs now play in ITE program accreditation (AITSL, 2015, revised 2018, 2019).

Again, these stories highlight how already existing, complex and, often-times, rigid university organisational structures, practices and processes (Rizvi & Lingard, 2009) can act as barriers to

collective initiative. As noted by Rowe and Skourdoumbis (2019), the Australian university sector is currently facing budget cuts alongside uneven funding and resource distribution, making the role of the university as an organisation invested in this collective initiative even more significant. Moreover, the collective initative required to negotiate 'the fit' of a TPA into an existing, already accreditated teacher education program, can prove challenging, particulary when working towards developing a shared understanding of the significance that misalignment between these elements of the program can cause for accreditation purposes. As such, the teacher educators' careful development of the academic program is seen as critical to steering the collective initiative at the university, so as to avoid a collision between the four key sites of practice (the ITE academic program, the school-based professional experience program, the requirements of a TPA, and the assessment policy of the university) and risk the fidelity of implementation of the GTPA.

It is in relation to the element of collective efficacy – focused on shared belief in positive impact on teacher education programs and the learning of preservice teachers – that we have observed the most tension both within and between narratives. For example, Academic 1 evidences the role of collective efficacy in the collaborative process:

> We approached the work with an open mind and contributed to each other's developing understanding of the GTPA by bringing together individual understandings during the process involved in planning for the subject before teaching (for example, readings, subject outline, subject structure), during the teaching (for example, planning lectures and workshop content and activities), during moderation and cross-checking samples. We considered all options and continuously questioned each other with the students in mind. (Academic 1)

However, the narratives offered by the sessional staff member and Academic 3 do not evidence the same sense of collective efficacy in relation to the GTPA:

> My conversations with teaching colleagues in schools imply that the GTPA philosophy/ practices directly support education systems and school practices. That is, they are interwoven with the current stress on measurement engendered by the competitive NAPLAN drive for constant improvement… The idea that using measurement – either hard or soft data – will lead to successful outcomes fails to recognise the influence of past learning, the make-up of the cohort and its influence on learning, the influence of the enthusiasm for learning and innovative teaching strategies, and care for the individual which are in fact keys to life-long learning success. In other words, knowledge of the 'craft' of a complex profession is not acknowledged. However, the benefit for preservice teachers is that they begin to learn how to articulate their practice – vital for continuing improvement. (Sessional lecturer 1)

> … the GTPA is conducive to and productive of a translation of student into a data point (student-as-object). Second, and as a consequence, the 'student-as-object' translation serves to support a wholescale denial of the emotional, cultural, political, ethical and social circumstances of teaching to the full benefit of a discourse of accountability. (Academic 3)

The positions demonstrate a more 'instrumental' view of the task, rather than recognising that the assessment requires the preservice teachers (PSTs) to demonstrate that they have considered the community, the school, and the class needs in order to determine, then justify, the pedagogical approaches needed to support the progress of their students. This reflection critically positions care for students in an appraisal of authentic practice that can lead to a "shift [in pedagogical strategies] with a deepening knowledge of their students' standpoints and… this intervention to care provides opportunities for transformative pedagogical practices" (MacGill, 2016, p. 242). It is clear that further collaboration between academic and sessional staff is required in order to establish a shared understanding of the intentions of the assessment of practice so as to avoid risking fidelity of implementation of the GTPA.

Furthermore, the criticality of establishing collective efficacy not only between academics delivering the ITE program, but also with the community partners who support, employ and rely upon the democratic professionalism of the graduate teachers, is made clear:

> Given the current policy climate, and the appetite for policy-makers to determine 'what counts' in teacher education, I see that we have two choices – we could resist participating which risks us becoming subjects of the determinations of policy-makers who may not hold nuanced ideas about what counts as exemplary practice in our community contexts. Or, we actively engage in steering policy settings, by making it clear that we as teacher educators are capable of making informed, reliable judgements about the performance of our graduates and that we know which measures of impact are relevant in, and to, our communities. I also think it is essential that we prepare graduate teachers who can think about data and evidence with criticality so that they can make discerning judgements about what counts as a measure of student learning progression – both with, and for, those communities. If we don't take charge of these decisions, and demonstrate that we have the capacity to make research and evidence-informed, contextually responsive, decisions then I fear that aspect of our professional autonomy will be removed from the scope of our practice. (Academic 2)

Here, Academic 2 speaks to what is at stake in relation to collective efficacy and the implementation of the GTPA. Despite the tensions experienced, they advocate for the opportunities provided by participating in the project that is the GTPA as an opportunity to shape and steer decision-making about which data and evidence counts both with, and for, communities. This staff member notes that failure to participate risks loss of autonomy of teacher educators to decide what matters to the field of teacher education with specific risks evident in relation to two sites of practice: the teacher education academic program and the requirements of a TPA. In this sense, this narrative uses the GTPA as a resource to experiment with their new identity as a teacher educator-as-advocate, who is drawing on notions of democratic professionalism to steer their approach to this new work. It is argued herein, that it is from these tensions that the richest opportunities to shape and steer programmatic innovations arose.

Across these narratives of practice, we hear some harmonious discourse-in-action. This is more likely to occur for academics who have been able to align the new work of the GTPA with their existing storylines of practice and, through those narrative resources, take shelter in the knowledge that they were building an affiliation with the group of teacher educators working to do the same. We also hear discord through attempts to reconcile layers of meaning-making in the account offered by the sessional staff member. They note that in terms of school partner perspectives, there is little at stake for the university when implementing the GTPA because the requirements of the task directly align with expected practice in schools and in schooling systems in the local context. So, sharing the story of enacting the GTPA will be low risk, as the storyline presents elements of practice that bring familiar narrative resources for teachers and school partners. However, the perspectives that the GTPA fails to take into account the broader 'craft of teaching' or that it has the potential to reduce students to data points, prompted the academic team enacting the GTPA to foreground intended notions of democratic (Cochran-Smith et al., 2018) and intelligent (Lillejord, 2020) accountability in the curriculum of the academic program. The academic team sought to make clear that while teachers need to demonstrate that they can be accountable for the learning of their students, they also need to establish the criteria for evaluating student progression in a manner which is dialogical, fair and just. The preservice teacher must make discerning, critical choices about the 'measures' of student progress they privilege alongside considerations of how, to whom and for what purpose we communicate patterns of learning progression. In other words, hearing these narratives of practice resulted in curriculum innovation that foregrounded the notions of democratic and collaborative

professionalism alongside democratic and intelligent accountability in the academic program, in doing so, managerial conceptions of professionalism as accountability were challenged.

Continuing possibilities for ongoing practice: (Re)imagining opportunities for learning

Through this narrative inquiry into our own practice, we listened to each other's stories and identified opportunities to respond to what we heard. Reimagining this new work of teacher educators as an opportunity for learning and agentic collaboration aligns with our acceptance of the notions of democratic professionalism, democratic accountability and intelligent accountability which underpin our work.

In relation to the requirements of a TPA and the assessment policy of the university as sites of our practice, there is much work to be done to reimagine and rework organisational systems and processes to support these new regulatory demands. As teacher educators, we can respond by engaging in ongoing work to align the fidelity of the GTPA within existing accredited programs and institutional learning, teaching and assessment policies. We can seek ways to make the evidence-informed, collaborative practice of teacher educators, enacted so as to align with course accreditation requirements, more visible to, and valued by, the university. Failure to collaborate with professional staff who oversee institutional systems and processes could result in a lack of recognition of the innovative work being undertaken by teacher educators. Current resourcing models reinforce an outdated, siloed, view of the work of teacher educators. Resource reallocation will not only mitigate risks of fidelity of implementation, but also recognise that collaborative professionalism is central to the design, evaluation and innovation of initial teacher education which, in our experience, occurs across the breadth of the ITE curriculum, not only in relation to the GTPA.

In relation to the education academic program as a site of our practice, we can engage in mutual dialogue and collective inquiry, particularly with our casual and sessional academic staff, as we work to innovate our own curriculum. As a result of this work, our preservice teachers will develop the capacity to reflect on and appraise the impact of their practice with more rigour – in ways that go beyond a performance in relation to the Australian Professional Standards for Graduate Teachers to, instead, positioning themselves as agents for change, with a sense of critical care for their students. We can challenge views of the instrumentality of the GTPA through developing a shared understanding of the scope and intention of the task so, through their appraisal of their practice, PSTs are metacognitive of their own developing professionalism and expertise – both routine and adaptive (Timperley et al., 2018) – and the notions of democratic, intelligent accountability.

These continuing possibilities for ongoing practice align with opportunities recognised by Bourke (2019) who states that rather than seeing the TPA as a compliance mechanism, it could be a chance for innovation, improvement, and effective change. She notes that policies are interpreted in local contexts "so teacher educators have 'wriggle room' to craft and maintain a strong sense of local identity and integrity of practice" (p. 40). This notion aligns with the principle of fidelity (Adie & Wyatt-Smith, 2020) that has underpinned the assessment from its inception. Through our collaborative narrative inquiry into our own practices around the implementation of the GTPA, we have listened to and analysed the stories of our colleagues. Through doing so, we have identified opportunities to interrogate and refine our own initial teacher education programmatic intentions. As well, we identified the need to challenge existing (and complex) organisational structures, so as to drive universities to support the implementation of the GTPA in a manner aligned with the collaborative professionalism with which it was developed. It was through mutual dialogue and collaborative inquiry that we have been able to advance our conversations toward collective efficacy in implementing the GTPA. Acknowledging tensions and discord betwixt and between our stories allowed us to recognise opportunities to innovate and strengthen our own curriculum enactment so as to achieve our own goal of advancing the experience of education for the students and schools that we prepare our preservice teachers to serve.

References

Adie, L. (2018). *GTPA and a new model of shared accountability: Taking risks in collaborative professionalism in ITE.* Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) Conference: Education Research Matters: Impact and Engagement, Australia.

Adie, L., & Wyatt-Smith, C. (2020). Fidelity of summative performance assessment in initial teacher education: The intersection of standardisation and authenticity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 48*(3), 267-286. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2019.1606892.

Alexander, C., Fox, J., & Guttierrez, A. (2019). Conceptualising teacher professionalism. In A. Gutierrez, J. Fox & C. Alexander (Eds.), *Professionalism and teacher education*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-7002-1_2.

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2011; revised 2018). *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers*. https://www.aitsl.edu.au/teach/standards

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2015; revised 2018, 2019). *Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in Australia.* https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/national-policy-framework/accreditation-of-initial-teacher-education-programs-in-australia.pdf?sfvrsn=e87cff3c_28.

Ball, S. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach.* Open University Press.

Ball, S.J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(2), 215–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093022000043065.

Biesta, G. (2017). Education, measurement and the professions: Reclaiming a space for democratic professionality in education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 49*(4), 315-330. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2015.1048665

Blackmore, J. (2010). Policy, practice and purpose in the field of education: a critical review. *Critical Studies in Education, 51*(1), 101-111. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508480903450257

Bourke, T. (2019). The changing face of accreditation for initial teacher education programmes in Australia. In A. Gutierrez, J. Fox & C. Alexander (Eds.), *Professionalism and teacher education.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-7002-1_2

Charteris, J. (2019). Teaching performance assessment in the USA and Australia: Implications of the "bar exam for the profession". *International Journal of Comparative Education and Development, 21*(4), 237-250. https://doi.org.10.1108/IJCED-10-2018-0039

Chase, S. (2018). Narrative inquiry: Toward theoretical and methodological maturity. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 546-560). SAGE Publications.

Cochran-Smith, M., Keefe, E.S., Carney, M.C., Burton, S., Chang, W-C., Fernández, B., Miller, A., & Sánchez, J.G. (2018). Democratic accountability in teacher education: Now more than ever. *Teacher Education and Practice, 31*(2), 178-206. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1385061

Craven, G., Beswick, K., Fleming, J., Fletcher, T., Green, M., Jensen, B., Leinonen, E., & Rickards, F. (2014). *Action now: Classroom ready teachers – Report of the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group (TEMAG).* Australian Government. https://docs.education.gov.au/documents/action-now-classroom-ready-teachers-report.

Dwyer, R., Willis, A., & Call, K. (2020). Teacher educators speaking up: Illuminating stories stifled by the iron-grip regulation of initial teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2020.1725809

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Frank, A. (2012). Practicing dialogical narrative analysis. In J. Holstein & J. Gubirum (Eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis* (pp. 33-52). Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506335117.n3

Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M.T. (2017). *Collaborative professionalism.* WISE: Qatar Foundation. https://www.wise-qatar.org/app/uploads/2019/04/rr.12.2017_boston.pdf

Lillejord, S. (2020). From "unintelligent" to intelligent accountability. *Journal of Educational Change*, *21*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-020-09379-y

MacGill, B. (2016). A paradigm shift in education: Pedagogy, standpoint and ethics of care. *International Journal of Pedagogies & Learning, 11*(3), 238-247. http://doi.org.elibrary.jcu.edu.au/10.1080/22040552.2016.1272531

Rowe, E., & Skourdoumbis, A. (2019). Calling for 'urgent national action to improve the quality of initial teacher education': the reification of evidence and accountability in reform agendas. *Journal of Education Policy*, *34*(1), 44-60. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1410577

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2009). *Globalizing education policy.* Taylor & Francis Group. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jcu/detail.action?docID=465373.

Timperley, H., Ell, F., & Le Fevre, D. (2018). Developing adaptive expertise through professional learning communities. In A. Harris, M. Jones & J.B. Huffman (Eds.), *Teachers leading educational reform* (pp. 175-189). Routledge.

White, S. (2019). Teacher educators for new times? Redefining an important occupational group. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 45*(2), 200-213. https://doi/org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1548174

Wyatt-Smith, C. (2018). *Graduate Teacher Performance Assessment: An intervention project at the intersection of standards, professional knowledge and assessment.* Australian Council for Educational Research. https://research.acer.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1341&context=research_conference