

Analysis and Evaluation of the Online Teaching Practicum Guidelines for Higher Education in the UAE

Fatema Ebrahim Al Awadi

1. Doctor of Education Student, The British University in Dubai , P. O. Box 345015, Dubai, UAE
2. Education Lecturer, Higher Colleges of Technology, P. O. Box 4792, RAK, UAE

*Corresponding author's email: falawadi@het.ac.ae

Abstract

The Online Practicum Guidelines policy is developed within the education division in a higher education federal institution in the UAE. The interest in such a policy development is shaped by the current change in the learning experience due to sudden circumstances such as COVID-19. This study aims to evaluate and analyze the online teaching practice guidelines as a policy in higher education. A horizontal analytical approach will be used to identify the policy content, analyze the policy implementation and evaluation processes. The analysis also aims to identify the underpinning theory and approach, understanding the policy effectiveness, and drawing associated recommendations for additional enhancements. The evaluation results revealed that the policymakers followed the *Elite* theory and the *top-down* and *successive-stages* approaches to policy design. It also demonstrates that following such approaches can be beneficial for developing theories under specific circumstances. At the same time, it needs to be modified to meet the needs of the specific context. Recommendations include preparing participants for policy implementations through trainings, taking their feedback into consideration and taking immediate actions that reflect an evaluation during the implementation process. Another recommendation is to compare the development of different policy versions to identify the similarities and differences happening through a period of time.

Keywords Online learning, practicum, teaching practice guidelines, education, practicum policy

1. Introduction

The development of educational policies in higher education is often influenced by changing circumstances facing teaching and learning. The current COVID-19 pandemic has influenced higher education teaching and learning policy development to shift towards online approaches to teaching and learning. One example of such policy developments is the Online Teaching Practicum Guidelines designed by the Education Division in one higher education institutions in the UAE that this paper aims to analyse and evaluate. The role of these guidelines is to clarify the Education student teachers' roles and responsibilities during their virtual internship experience in schools. These guidelines were developed according to the current situation of COVID-19, which turned the students' face-to-face experience into online practice. Thus, the main aim of this policy is to guide the students throughout their college practicum courses, as well as ensuring the successful achievement of enjoyable teaching practice days that comes in line with the Ministry of Education (MoE) requirements for online learning. Thus, not only the students are guided by this document but also '*mentor school teacher (MST)*', '*mentor college teacher (MCT)*', '*program team leaders*' and '*practicum teacher*'. However, developing the policy document is also considered part of the Education program accreditation aspects, leading to meeting the standards of program success within the institution and higher education as a whole.

There are several reasons for focusing on the online practicum to be evaluated as a policy. First, it is much related to my job roles and responsibilities as a practicum coordinator at the institution, hence engaging in such analysis will help inform the work and guide the process of students' placements (Craddock et al. 2013). Another reason is that it will support the mentors' and students' understanding of the online internship and what is required from both (Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al. 2017; Bush 2008). Furthermore, since this is the third developed version over three semesters during the COVID-19 situation, this guidelines document is becoming a focus of interest in my institution as well as for MOE to ensure successful collaboration. As a practicum coordinator, I would like to consider any areas of development in the policy and draw recommendations for future improvement.

This paper aims to analyze and evaluate the online teaching practicum guidelines as a policy in the education division in one of the higher education institutions in the UAE. Therefore, the following objectives are stated to be considered through the policy analysis and evaluation process:

- Determine the theory and approach underpinning the policy
- Understanding policy effectiveness in keeping up with the current situation of online teaching practicum
- Provide recommendations based on experience for further development in the policy framework

The paper consists of six sections, starting with the introduction that discusses an outline of the analysed policy and the research paper's aim. The next section includes the theoretical underpinning of the paper and discussion of related literature. The third section will entail an overview of the methodology used to evaluate and analyse the policy based on theoretical perspectives. This is followed by an overview of the policy document and the outcome of the analysis and evaluation in terms of implementation and evaluation processes. Finally, discussion, recommendations and conclusion are provided in the last section.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Underpinning

This section focuses on reviewing literature related to the evaluation and analysis of the online practicum guidelines policy. Further attention will be focusing on the theoretical and historical research, which will lead to shape the framework of this study. The review attempts to consider recent and current students teaching practice related to the UAE context application of similar policy evaluation, as well as international studies to understand and initiate the analysis process of the selected policy.

2.1 The Elite Theoretical Model in Education Policy

The Elite theory is selected as the umbrella of this research, which involves the notion that policy making is determined by the key people of authority who are considered the *elite* group. Thus, the elite group's decisions are forming the public views regarding policy decisions (Knill & Tuson 2008). Hence, this group consists of decision-makers with

unique qualities such as job positions, skills, higher qualification degrees, intelligence, etc., so they have control over the public group. Therefore, the idea of having a few policymakers enables a further organization process, less time consumption and quickly made decisions (Anyebe 2018). The policy-making process reflects the governing elite's ideas and guidelines, so the policies' flow is coming from the ruling position downwards to public implementers (Anyebe 2018; Knil & Tuson 2008; Haddad & Demsky 1995). Simultaneously, these policies are incremental and shall consider the changes to enhance the policy, which is still reflecting the elite values and serves the elite target goals (Anyebe 2018). This type of managerial leadership focuses more on functions, tasks and behaviours, which are linked to and based on the status of formal positions. Furthermore, more focus is given to the application of decisions, evaluating the results, and feedback of policy conduction (Bush 2008).

However, other research agrees that there is a significant need for a debate and discussion when it comes to policy modification involving public opinions as they are the ones who will implement and face issues while conducting the policy (Young 2010). This lack of interaction due to the possession of authority cannot transcribe all the problems encountered during the implementation process, so not all the issues will be sorted immediately, only the major ones noticed by the elite group (Colebatch 2014).

2.2 Top-Down Model

The top-down model views people with authority as the starting point in policy making and decisions. This entails identifying the issues and construct the implementation process of the policy, which requires stating clear goals, structure the needed change, and assign roles to change agents (Signé 2017). It has been argued that specific positions require the leaders to follow the *top-down* model when leading a group of people within an organization, which is also reflected in the orders given for implementation (Bush 2008). Therefore, this model views policy as linear and hierarchical, which mainly focuses on transferring the policy objectives into actual practice (Souto-Otero 2011). It starts with a policy formulating process and concludes with implementing it and reaching the outcomes (Colebatch, Hoppe & Noordegraaf 2010). Within higher education institutions, the *Dean* or *Head of faculty* following the *top-down* approach tend to control the development of the curriculum, including the related policies of the division, and later transfer that for actions by faculty and students or other related parties (Craddock et al. 2013).

On the other hand, when the policy is imposed from the centre of authority, there is a great chance of failure in achieving the objectives due to the fact that it may not give enough attention to how people will receive it at local levels (Souto-Otero 2011). Consequently, there is less window for input from teachers and students when this model is implemented in higher education. In contrast, the *top-down* is needed on occasions when there are sudden changes affecting the implementation process. As a result, leaders must take immediate

decisions and control variables not to waste time and guide the local groups (Qian & Walker 2019; Fitzsimmons-Doolan et al. 2017; Bush 2008).

2.3 Successive-Stage Approach

The successive-stage approach connects different stages of processes, where each one has a gradual change in the actions followed in each step. These stages start with setting up clear goals, then arranging steps of actions followed by the implementation of these actions.

This process will often end with the policy evaluation and modification (Colebatch 2009; Hahn 1987). Hence, to enhance understanding and succeed through the process stages, it requires the policymakers to present a high level of clarity when communicating the policy and its implementing processes with stakeholders and participants (Bush 2012). However, if any application of the stages is facing any glitches or issues, this can lead to reconsidering and modifying the process (Howlett, McConnell and Perl 2015; Bell & Stevenson 2006).

As for higher education policies following the successive-stage process, it is essential to implement the stages within a clear context, which justifies a precise aim for each phase before initiating it (Chase 2014). Another critical aspect is that people who are at the point of authority must ensure that all participants understand where the stated policy comes from, what they seek to achieve, how this is going to contribute to the learning experience and what are the outcomes of implementing the policy (Bell & Stevenson 2006). Thus, answering all previous questions can also lead to identifying the problems that might occur during each stage, selecting the suitable response to each issue, and then making sure that

updated modifications are implemented (Colebatch, Hoppe & Noordegraaf 2010). Therefore, the problems may occur and continue to exist if the intended change does not take place during the implementation (Bush 2012).

2.4 Online Practicum Guidelines Development in Higher Education

The Online Practicum is considered as a current shift in teaching and learning recently due to either program requirement at higher education or changes in the situation of face-to-face learning (Lilienthal et al. 2017). It is the obligation of higher education institution to ensure effective preparation of student teachers for the online practicum and the schools as well as to set up the online environment for practitioners. Therefore, the higher education institutions and schools which follow the Ministry of Education must work side by side to ensure the coverage of the primary key points of professional learning (Jones & Ryan 2014). Emphasis is placed on preparing the students for the internship needs and the reality of teaching rather than just sticking to theoretical and pedagogical knowledge. Similarly, both students and school mentors must be prepared and informed about the field-experience requirements, which will enable the mentors to guide their mentees successfully (Hew & Knapczyk 2007). In addition, research has identified that due to the sudden shift to the online practicum as a result of COVID-19, a lot of student teachers are demotivated and not accepting the idea of having their online internship. Therefore, they need more than any other member these specific online practicum policies to grant a high quality of learning experiences (Charbonneau-Gowdy & Cechova 2020).

Furthermore, it is highly demanded that practicum guidelines are structured and linked to course content to enable learners to apply learning into practice, providing a meaningful context for assessing abilities by both course teachers and school mentors (Frey 2008). However, some institutions may require to set up guidelines immediately and embrace them to the students, mentors, and faculty to implement the change immediately and consider a high level of experience and avoid any issues that might occur when shifting to online learning (Barrett 2012). Simultaneously, as part of the successful communication between MOE schools and higher education, practicum guidelines are stated to satisfy the needs and follow the policies of each institution which can sometimes become a bit threatening for the students and mentors (Kadbey & Dickson 2014; Jones & Ryan 2014).

To summarize, several educational theories are judging the patter of policy making and influence policy makers, so this can affect the followers in the institution as well and the flow of goals achievement (Lilienthal et al. 2017; Signé 2017).

3. Methodology

The research intends to follow the theoretical analysis of the policy, which is based on the drawn literature from the previous section. It mainly follows the horizontal approach to evaluate the practicum guidelines as a policy in higher education. This approach is part of the evaluation research that entails a formal analysis and objective measurements of a given policy (Habib et al. 2014). Thus, the horizontal approach discusses the policy-making cycle including; analysis of the policy overview, implementation, and evaluation, which will be addressed in this research to achieve its aims and objectives (Mosti 2009). The first reason for selecting this analytical approach is to consider the online practicum guidelines policy components and pay a close look at the policy objectives and outcomes. Another reason for the analytical approach is to understand the policy document's effectiveness based on drawn literature in terms of achieving its purpose, which is keeping up with the current situation of the online situation. I would also draw my own experience as a practicum coordinator in the higher education institution to provide recommendations for further policy enhancement. My own practice with the policy document will be added to support the policy implementation effectiveness and whether it supports or is considered a threat to the students and faculty, which will also be matched with the stated literature.

Following only the theoretical framework in the methodology to guide the process can be considered a limitation, since this type of policy can gain further input in terms of evaluation through following the empirical design. Thus, using interviews and some related

archival documents can enhance the validity and reliability of the research (Mills 2014).

Another limitation is that discussing one case of a single policy document is not enough to make an informed judgement of the policy effectiveness.

Regarding the ethical consideration of this research, the name of the institution and the online practicum policymakers will be kept confidential as part of maintaining mutual trust and professionalism (Mills 2014). Considering only the policy document and the theories underpinning can be a limitation of this study while considering further views and opinions of policymakers, students and faculty and add further data to the research.

4. The Policy Overview

The main aim of the Online Teaching Practice (TP) policy is to initiate a successful learning opportunity during the online experience for students, Mentor School Teacher (MST) and Mentor College Teacher (MCT). Another aim is to reduce potential stress and anxiety that the target group may be having due to the virtual learning atmosphere, so everyone is aware of their roles during the practicum period. In addition, the role of each member is identified in the *roles and responsibilities* section, where the student-teacher is supposed to assist the school mentor, students and parents through virtual learning. The MST, on the other side, shall grant a supportive experience to the trainee, MCT also must work collaboratively with MST and trainee to fulfil her TP tasks and ensure achievement of assessment requirements, effective lesson planning, virtual teaching, and writing reflective journals during the

practicum period. Furthermore, the policy contains the first day in online class recommendations through debriefing sessions between MST and student-teacher, sharing workload information, class information and reaching consensus on ways of communication. This shall be built upon the last two experiences in the previous semesters with the online transformation of the practicum since the start of COVID-19.

The division's expectations from the students were listed to adhere to represent a high level of professionalism and commitment in the MOE online classes. MCT must be informed regarding any communication with MST and students to post pieces of evidence of that communication in their TP portfolios. If there are any modifications in the tasks must be shared with team leaders and the program chair. Flexibility is recommended during the experience and support to be provided at all times. Students to complete tasks and conduct needed observations and recording all evidences for e-portfolio purposes. At the end of the document, a list of ideas to be conducted during the practicum is provided to guide participants on how to ensure having a productive fulfilment of the experience.

5. Analysis of the Online Teaching Practicum Guidelines and Discussion

The intention of this research is to evaluate and analyse the online teaching practicum guidelines as a policy in the education division in the UAE federal institution. This section will include an analysis of the policy implementation and evaluation planning processes and linking this analysis to literature and the researcher's experience. The data analysis and

findings will be interpreted according to the policy evaluation leading to achieve the research objectives as outlined above.

5.1 Policy Implementation

The analysis of the policy process revealed that it had been controlled by a group of decision-makers who are in a higher position and have higher qualifications than other members in the institutions, which confirms that they are following the *Elite Theory* in policy-making (Anyebe 2018). This is evident through the messages provided by the Dean and the mention program chair in the guidelines. Regarding the implementation process in the online practicum guidelines, it was clear that the policy was following the *Top-Down* approach, as it was developed by the policymakers and passed down to the implementers who are the students, faculty and school mentors (Souto-Otero 2011; Bush 2008). This is also linked to my experience as a practicum coordinator, where I used to share these directions with the students and mentors to ensure adherence to these guidelines, which is also considered as part of assessment and guidelines. It was also noted in the document that the stated time for the implementation action planning is mentioned clearly at the top of the policy and within the document, which is during a whole academic semester. This is referred to in the policy with the number '202020' that indicates the second semester in the 2020-2021 academic year. I assume that this is related to the fact that the policy is incremental but it is still reflecting the goal of the education division as the elite group (Anyebe 2018; Knil & Tuson 2008), which is providing the students in every semester a

chance to do the practicum in schools. Another point noted that is linked to the *successive-stage* approach and TP guidelines analysis is that it reveals that it consists of stages starting with stating the objectives, then the expectations from the target group and how that would impact the changes to be made later (Colebatch 2009; Hahn 1987). For instance, this is related to organizing the application action plan of policy which we shall follow as faculty and coordinators before, during and after the practicum, which guides all the implementation actions.

In addition, the primary policy resources that are needed to initiate the process of implementation are human resources, including Program Chair, Practicum teachers, and more precisely students and mentors (Colebatch, Hoppe & Noordegraaf 2010). Hence, the policy indicated that monitoring the effectiveness of the applied guidelines is going to be done through the MCT and MST record and students' fulfilments of the TP tasks (Hew & Knapczyk 2007). It also reflects that the amendments or modifications shall be done in the next term based on the needed change in the learning experience. For example, the policy states that any modification shall be approved by the program chair and team and actions will be implemented in the next policy cycle not during the current one. These modifications shall also involve the MOE decision-makers and it serves both ends of the higher education institution and ministry (Jones & Ryan 2014).

However, as stated in the *Elite* approach and due to the control of the authority group, the policy did not indicate an interaction between the local group and people at upper positions

(Colebatch 2014; Young 2010). According to my experience, the use of the *top-down* model was a need in designing the online TP policy at the beginning of the change in the learning situation due to COVID-19 and the transformation to virtual classes. There were a lot of issues that occurred when the students started the practicum, which needed further input from the students who struggled during the implementation period (Qian & Walker 2019; Barrett 2012; Souto-Otero 2011).

5.2 Policy Evaluation

An assumption on the evaluation process of the policy and based on the researcher's own experience, it considers *formal* and *outcome* evaluations of a policy (Knill & Tuson 2008). Therefore, I noticed the policymakers and participants follow formal evaluations done through the fulfilment of the tasks. This can be considered an indication of policy implementation achievement of objectives and outcomes (clearly stated in the *Expectations and the Executive Dean's message* section). Another area is to seek the participants' satisfaction who are mainly seeking school and college mentors' views, which is still related to the fact that the evaluation of the policy requires most opinions from people in higher positions in the field.

The analysis also revealed that two options of evaluation are applied, which are *desirability* and *feasibility*. Regarding the first option, it was observed throughout the practicum guidelines that it was reviewed and will be evaluated based on its impact on the target group. Another dimension that also might serve the evaluation purpose is to match the institution

and MOE standard objectives by updating the guideline accordingly (Haddad & Demsky 1995). Students, school and college mentors are the human resources when considering the *feasibility* evaluation option. Yet, as noticed throughout my experience, students and college mentors are more trained on how to apply the guidelines more than school mentors because this is part of the students taught practicum courses in every semester (see the *expectations* section) (Kadbey & Dickson 2014; Jones & Ryan 2014; Frey 2008).

5.3 Discussion

The analysis revealed different outcomes or conclusions related to the aim and objectives of the research. The first is that the online practicum guidelines follow the *Elite theory, top-down* and the *successive-stage* approach in policy planning, implementation and evaluation. The reason is that policy was developed according to the current situation of COVID-19 and this required immediate action by the key points of authority, minor reflections from the public (Anyebe 2018; Souto-Otero 2011; Bush 2008). Another reason is that it follows steps of policy development process that requires actions to be implemented by the students and mentors which are directed by the upper management (Howlett, McConnell and Perl 2015; Bush 2012). Additionally, implementers are not allowed to modify any aspect of the policy during the implementation process without the approval of the program chair and team (Lilienthal et al. 2017). Thus, the achievement of all the policy objectives and aspects lead to serve the division outcomes and meet the institution and MOE standards (Charbonneau-Gowdy & Cechova 2020; Kadbey & Dickson 2014; Jones & Ryan 2014).

All of the previous reasons help to achieve the first research objective which support the identification of related policy theory and approach.

Regarding the second objective of understanding its effectiveness, it is evident that the policy when initiated was effective as a result of the sudden change in the learning experience. It can be argued that stating these policies was essential to guide the learners through their new internship experience, by providing more explicit guidance and support related to the communication points and practicum course application (Charbonneau-Gowdy & Cechova 2020). Another indication of its effectiveness is that it covers the related assessments that link the taught courses to the practicum experience. This helps understand the students' applied learning through mentors' feedback and fulfilled tasks (Kadbey & Dickson 2014; Jones & Ryan 2014).

To respond to the third research objective, there are several recommendations to enhance the online policy guidelines, which are drawn based on the analysis. First, I suggest that the *bottom-up* approach in policy-making and implementation should be considered as a viable alternative as this will consider the feedback and modifications from the trainees and mentors. It is assumed that this would consume a lot of time to reach consensus but it is more valid in terms of policy objectives achievement (Signé 2017). Second, I would recommend considering the modification needed during the implementation process, since the learners are still trying the system and some are new to the online practicum, especially freshmen (Frey 2008). Therefore, I will argue for adding additional training sessions to the

students and their mentors on how to use the different online learning platforms and understand all the requirements (Jones & Ryan 2014). I will also recommend that appropriate changes are made during the implementation process and providing the freedom or flexibility to teachers and students to apply whatever can positively impact on the learning experience, at the same time does not negatively affect the main aim of the policy. Thus, policy evaluation must not be implemented at the end of the cycle but in an integrated way, particularly within the semester (Knill & Tuson 2008; Haddad & Demsky 1995).

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

To conclude, this paper focuses on an education online practicum policy through a theoretical lens empowered by related literature and the experience of the author. The study concludes that even though some underlining theories of policy-making may have some negative impact on the target group of implementers, it is still useful to control variables and sudden incidents happening in teaching and learning. In addition, a policy document can always be reviewed and adapted in order to reflect the needs of the situations, stakeholders and change agents (Bush 2012).

Two recommendations are given for further research. The first suggestion for future research is to consider using qualitative research design. Thus, using data collection tools such as interviews with stakeholders, students and line managers in the education division can provide additional input to increase the quality of the findings. This can also be

supported with documentary data such as observation notes taken during the online practicum guidelines development meetings, which can lead to provide further insight into the process. Another recommendation is to implement a study comparing documents of the different versions of the policy to understand what aspects of implementation and evaluation were changed, deleted or remained the same and rationale behind those decisions. Regarding future research, it will be useful to consider the impact of the online policy guidelines on the practicum course syllabus and assessment development. Another aspect of importance to be considered for study is to compare the higher education practicum policy to MOE training department policy and identify the correlation between both published documents.

References

Anyebe, A. (2018). An overview of approaches to the study of public policy. *E-Bangi: Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol, 13 (1), pp. 1–14.

Barrett, B. (2012). Creating online content with real world application by designing and implementing online practicums for virtual and physical environments. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research (Littleton, Colo.)*, vol. 5 (4), pp. 265–270.

Bell, L. and Stevenson, H. (2006). *Education policy: process themes and impact*. London: Routledge.

Bush, T. (2012). International perspectives on leadership development: making a difference. *Professional Development in Education*, vol. 38 (4), pp. 663–678.

Bush, T. (2008). *Leadership and management development in education*. London: Sage Publications.

Charbonneau-Gowdy, P. and Cechova, I. (2020). ‘Zoom-ing out: the impact of international online practicum opportunities on pre-service teachers’ development’, in *European Conference on e-Learning*, pp. 95–XIII.

Chase, M. (2014). Culture, politics, and policy interpretation: how practitioners make sense of a transfer policy in a 2-year college. *Educational Policy*, pp.1-40.

Colebatch, H. (2014). Interpretation in the analysis of policy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 73 (3), pp. 349-356.

Colebatch, H. (2009). *Policy*. United States: McGraw-Hill.

Colebatch, H., Hoppe, R. and Noordegraaf, M. (2010). *Working for policy*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Craddock, D., O’Halloran, C., McPherson, K., Hean, S. and Hammick, M. (2013). A top-down approach impedes the use of theory? Interprofessional educational leaders’ approaches to curriculum development and the use of learning theory. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, vol. 27 (1), pp. 65–72.

Hahn, A. (1987). Policy making models and their role in policy education. pp. 222-235.

Habib, M., Pathik, B. and Maryam, H. (2014). *Research methodology-contemporary*

practices: guidelines for academic researchers. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Haddad, W. and Demsky, T. (1995). *Educational policy-planning process: an applied framework*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Hew, K. and Knapczyk, D (2007). Analysis of ill-structured problem solving, mentoring functions, and perceptions of practicum teachers and mentors toward online mentoring in a field-based practicum. *Instructional Science*, vol. 35 (1), pp. 1–40.

Howlett, M. et al. (2015). Streams and stages: reconciling kingdom and policy process theory. *European Journal of Political Research*, vol. 54 (3), pp. 419–434.

Jones, M. and Ryan, J. (2014). *Successful teacher education: partnerships, reflective practice and the place of technology*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kadbey, H. and Dickson, M. (2014). Emirati pre-service teachers' experiences of teaching science during college internships. *Education, Business and Society*, vol. 7 (4), pp. 216–228.

Knill, C. and Tosun, J. (2008). *Policy making*. Germany: University of Konstanz.

Lilienthal, L., Potthoff, D. and Anderson, K. (2017). The development of an online, graduate practicum course. *The Delta Kappa Gamma bulletin*, vol. 84 (1), pp. 42–52.

Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S., Palmer, D. and Henderson, K. (2017). Educator language ideologies and a top-down dual language program. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol. 20(6), pp. 704–721.

Frey, T. (2008). Determining the impact of online practicum facilitation for inservice teachers. *Journal of technology and teacher education*, vol. 16 (2), pp. 181–210.

Mills, J. (2014). *Action research: a guide for the teacher researcher*. Essex: Pearson.

Mosti, G. (2009). Two key questions for horizontal policy making & implementation. *Institute on Governance*, vol. 34, pp.1-5.

UNESCO. (2013). *Key concepts in education policy analysis*. Vol.1, *UNESCO Handbook on Education Policy Analysis and Programming*. UNESCO Bangkok: UNESCO.

Qian, H. and Walker, A. (2019). Reconciling top-down policy with internal accountability: the role of Chinese school principals. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, vol. 31, pp. 495-517.

Signé, L. (2017). *Policy Implementation – a synthesis of the study of policy implementation and the causes of policy failure*. Rabat: OCP Policy Center.

Souto-Otero, M. (2011). Breaking the consensus in educational policy reform? *Critical Studies in Education*, vol. 52 (1), pp. 77–91.

Young, M. (2010). Alternative educational futures for a knowledge society. *European Educational Research Journal*, vol. 9 (1), pp. 1-12.

Appendices

(Policy Document)

VERSION THREE 202020

ONLINE TEACHING PRACTICUM GUIDELINES

with thanks to the MOE for giving our student teachers this unique opportunity.

A MESSAGE TO OUR STUDENT TEACHERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE DEAN

Please note it is a requirement for program accreditation to complete these practicum days and it is important for the MOE and ourselves that you continue to experience this new world from the point of view of a teacher in the schools.

This is a unique experience that you should not miss and the days working with the MST in the MOE Online platforms can only be an exciting learning opportunity. You, your MST and MCT will liaise on what is best for you, the children and the EPC Practicum course. Look at this NOT as a pressure filled, stressful, anxiety-ridden situation but an exciting, new, wonderful opportunity to demonstrate your creativity and talents in a supported environment where you can call on two professionals every step of the way.

This will be a special POSITIVE experience with teachers behind you, alongside you and helping you ALL THE WAY.

We fully understand your concerns, and that is exactly why we have taken on board all the feedback from the last two semesters with the System Course Team Leaders for every EPC Teaching Practicum course working with their teams and your MCTs to ensure you have all the support you require during this semester. This should be a wonderful learning experience to help you gain confidence in your use of the MOE platform for the future. If you have any doubts about anything, just speak to your MST and MCT. The TP tasks have been adapted to the online learning environment, and you should be able to experience planning, observation and reflection opportunities throughout the semester. All the tasks are aimed at giving you a unique opportunity to experience online learning from the teacher's perspective. The teaching practicums are set up so that you are fully supported all the way by both your MCT and MST, and have a completely unique, exciting learning experience 😊

We have planned it out very carefully, and hopefully you will be able to appreciate this throughout your TP experience. Remember if you have any difficulties you have your MST, MCT, EPC teacher, and PTL Chair all standing by to help you.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of these guidelines is to ensure that students, Mentor School Teachers (MST) and Mentor College Tutors (MCT) embrace the learning opportunities that this unique online learning and teaching situation has provided us with.

We realise that every situation in every class will be different and that everyone is feeling different levels of anxiety and concern as we continue to experience the ongoing virtual teaching and learning environment. These guidelines have been drafted to assure each and every one of you that we all realise this, and that our Online Teaching Practicum is designed so that each team of MCT-MST-Student Teacher feels empowered. The aim of this semester's Online Teaching Practicum is to give you all once again a unique and enjoyable learning and teaching experience.

ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

The Student Teacher is to support the MST as best they can to deliver learning opportunities to the children at home and help the parents as required.

The MST is to provide the Student Teacher with opportunities to contribute to their work as best supports them.

The MCT is to work with the MST and Student Teacher to complete the tasks that have been developed based on the last two semesters' online TP experiences and best practice to allow reliable and valid assessment of the student teacher's planning, teaching and critical reflection skills. These tasks are aligned with those tasks normally completed during physical Teaching Practicum (TP) in the schools.

THE FIRST DAYS EXPLORATION

During the first few days, we recommend that each team (MST-MCT-Student Teacher) explores what is the best way they can work together and how the addition of the Student Teacher can help the MST with the increased workload we know online teaching has created. It is recommended that this would best be done at a team (MST-MCT-Student) debriefing meeting. This should be a period of exploration, brainstorming and discovery, and agreement on how best to communicate throughout the TP, building on the experiences from the last two semesters.

EXPECTATIONS

Please note that Student Teachers are expected to adhere to the same attendance, punctuality and professionalism requirements as laid out in the Teaching Practicum booklets.

Remember you are representing the in the MOE Online Learning Environment and we rely on you to make us proud of your professionalism, commitment, drive and creativity as always.

Student Teachers should always copy the MCT on all their communications with the MST and also create a page on their e-Portfolio to keep all these communications. This will then be evidence of professionalism.

Any further task modifications required must be saved by the MCTs and shared with the Program Team Leaders and the Academic Programme Chair, Dr., so that a full record across all courses is available to everyone.

Everyone needs to be flexible, open to new ideas, stay in touch with each other and mutually support each other.

Student Teachers should maintain a record of their daily tasks, observations, reflections, and recommendations to MCT and MST, and keep all these records in their e-portfolios.