

Mohammad Reza Sarkar Arani with J. Alagamandan & H. Tourani (2004)
“Work-Based Learning: A Practical Approach for Learning to Work and Working to Learn-A Case Study on Decision-Makers’ Professional Development in Iran-”,
In: *Challenges in Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, Edited by Victor M. S. Gil; Isabel Alarcao & Hans Hooghoff, Portugal: Portugal University Press, pp.131-146.

Work-Based Learning: A Practical Approach for Learning to Work and Working to Learn A Case Study on Decision-Makers’ Professional Development in Iran

Mohammad Reza Sarkar Arani, Ph.D.,

Associate Professor of Tehran Allameh Tabatbai University

J. Alagamandan, and

Dean of the OERP

H. Tourani, Ph.D.

Academic Advisor of the OERP

Abstract

The work-based learning model of human resource development has captured a great deal of attention and has gained increasing importance in higher education in recent years. Work-based learning is a powerful phenomenon that attempts to help policy-makers, managers and curriculum developers improve the quality of the decision and organizational behavior. This paper tries to clarify the experiences of a “work-based learning” project and training model for the professional development of twenty-four decision-makers and curriculum developers at the Ministry of Education-Organization for Educational Research and Planning- in partnership with the University of Western Sydney of Australia from 2000 to 2002. The case study method is used to examine the role of the work-based learning model as an effective scheme for the professional development of human resources, enrichment of decision practices, and improvement of organizational activities and environment of workplace. This study illustrates that the examination of the work-based learning model offers the possibility for Iranian decision-makers and curriculum developers to integrate work and learning at the workplace and help each other develop the skills, knowledge and attitudes required for changing workplaces.

Search words: Work-Based Learning, Professional Development, Change Management, Work-Based Project, Learning Organization

Background

Our review on recent work (Petrick & Furr, 1995; Heaton & Lawson, 1996; Castling, 1996; Weick & Quinn, 1999; Sarkar Arani & Matoba, 2002; Tickle, 1987; Barth, 1990; Dean, 1991; Theissen, 1992; Imazu, 1996; Fueyo & Koorland, 1997; Adams & Hamm, 1994), suggests that one of the most important things for human resource professional development is to conduct research into their own workplace with their own colleagues and workforces. This has been found to promote human resource self-renewal and continuous improvement in the quality of their efforts (Adams & Hamm, 1994; Harris et. al., 1996).

Recent approaches to human resource development have centered more in workplace. They involve the workforce more directly in decision-making process, change management, informal learning in the workplace which shape their productivity approaches (Garrick, 1998; Theissen, 1992; CEBE, 2003). The work-based learning helps decision-makers to reconceptualize the ways of improving both their professional effectiveness in their work and the relationships with their colleagues through workplace efforts and related activities (Garrick, 1998; Petrick & Furr, 1995; Tickle, 1987; Ashton et. al., 1989; Graves, 1990; Smyth, 1995; Smylie, 1995). "Learning by doing" is a way through which teachers, curriculum developers and decision-makers can become engage in significant professional development (Schon, 1987; Fish, 1989).

Work-based learning is a modern way of creating university level learning in the workplace. Its special work-linked features enable learning to take place-and be centered on- the working environment. By using the actual role of the work-space and an organization's objective as the focus for academic enquiry, work-based learning is uniquely structured to benefit both the individual employee and the employing organization (NCWBLP, 2003). As Center for Education in the Build Environment (CEBE) noted, "work-based learning is a subset of workplace learning. It refers specifically to the achievement of planning learning outcomes derived from the experience of performing a work role or function. It focuses on *knowing how to*; emphasizes often on *learning and mentoring*; emphasizes often on *transferable skills and competences*. It provides the students with the experience to *carry out routine tasks effectively* and to *identify non routine or unpredictable situations*; requires students to *develop reflective skills*, to *reflect on their actions* and to *develop and refine their own conceptual models*" (CEBE, 2003).

Therefore, work-based learning has a more significant effect on the development of the human resource competence and quality improvement of the organizational behavior than other types of training (Petrick & Furr, 1995; Garrick, 1998; Morant, 1981; Thiessen, 1989; Lunt et. al., 1993; Darling-Hammond, 1998). The work-based learning approach provides a generic framework to which participating individuals bring the specific content of their own work and other life experiences (NCWBLP, 2003). The work-based learning program appeals to decision-makers' interests. It is responsive to their variability, and provides an opportunity of *learning to interact with staff, building parental support for their work, and justifying ongoing decisions and actions on the basis of their research*.

Work-based learning as a new higher education approach is as part of major changes influencing universities; including contributions of the pioneers of work-based learning; and it explores the changes in academic work practices associated with work-based learning (Boud & Solomon, 2001). The notion of work-based learning has captured a great deal of attention and has gained increasing importance in higher education and professional training in recent years. Many universities have strategic plans to design and deliver work-based learning course, center or unit. For example, the following quote, from the Vice Chancellor of Middlesex University, has been taken from his speech at the signing ceremony at the launch of the Bovis self-development program in partnership with Middlesex University:

“...For Bovis it’s an investment in intellectual capital, a leading example of university learning in the workplace. For Middlesex University it’s part of our commitment to making learning accessible to people throughout their lives. The Bovis program achieves this and because it is work based it meets the needs of individual employees and the wider corporate objectives of the company. This is really what life long learning is all about and it is precisely what the university had in mind when we established the national center of work-based learning partnerships (NCWBLP, 2002).”

The University of Western Sydney (UWS) is committed the reduction of barriers to access higher education by taking the university into the workplace. It is also has taken necessary action to the development of flexible learning processes in a wide range of disciplines. The provision of work-based qualifications is a major step towards meeting these commitments. The work-based course takes the learning program out of the university into the students’ workplace. It does it through focusing student learning around projects undertaken in their workplace¹⁾ (School of Social, Community & Organizational Studies & the Work Based Learning Unit, UWS, 2000).

The Organization for Educational Research and Planning (OERP) try to change its cultural and structural organization through delivering in-service training opportunities to work-based learning in recent years. As Garrick (1998) reviews, recent studies of “the learning organization” (Senge, 1990 & 1994; Ford, 1993; Kasl, Dechant & Marsick, 1993; Watkins & Marsick, 1993) have argued that effective and productive organizations have their special cultures that provide structured and active learning environments for employees at all levels (Garrick, 1998).

This is the one we believe has been overlooked and yet has the potential for significant impact, especially working can become site-based learning. In addition, the work-based learning has become useful in the learning society workplaces and many workplaces now seek to harness its productive potentials.

Research Method and Data Collection

The case study method is used to examine the role of work-based learning model as an effective scheme for the professional development of human resources, enrichment of the decision practices, and improvement of organizational activities and environment of workplace.

The data presented in this paper come from our research project in the OERP, which is in charge of making policy, planning, delivering and reviewing education of all elementary and high schools in Iran. We have worked and conducted research in the OERP continuously since 1999. We employed a case study method for data collection. Our approach involved the work-based learning program observations and interviews with advisors, coordinators, students and the examination of other relevant organization documents such as memorandum of agreement between the OERP and the UWS for provision of the Graduate Diploma in Social Science (Change Management) awarded by the UWS.

Interview and observational data were collected not only from students before and after their participation in the work-based learning program, but also from the supervisor and the work-based learning coordinator from the UWS during and after delivering and developing the program here in Tehran. In the interviews, students were asked to discuss their background and experiences in policy development, educational planning and research on curriculum development. In detail, students were asked to describe what had changed as a result of the work-based learning project relative to their professional development in general and their own workplace and organization behavior specifically.

The UWS's Work Based Learning Program in the OERP

The OERP-a department of the Ministry of Education- in partnership with the UWS of Australia delivered and developed a “work-based learning” project and training model for professional development of twenty-four decision-makers and curriculum developers from 2000 until 2002. The work-based learning program (Graduate Diploma in Social Science-Change Management-), which attempt to help decision-makers and curriculum developers in the field of education to improve quality of the activities of the decision-makers, organizational behavior and their competences.

Based on the UWS data, the Graduate Diploma is an accredited postgraduate qualification offered by a leading regional university in New South Wales, Australia-the UWS. The University's School of Social, Community and Organizational Studies (SCOS) and Work-Based Learning Unit (WBLU) deliver it. As the School of SCOS mentioned, this program *focuses on students* and has a number of benefits for the students and for their workplaces such as:

- It makes learning directly relevant to the students' work;
- The work based project will have direct relevance to the

- employing Organization;
- The students' learning can flow on directly into organizational development (School of SCOS & WBLU, UWS, 2000).

Course Delivery

According to the School of SCOS (2000), the Graduate Diploma draws on the discipline of Social Science applied to Educational systems. It is designed as a professional development program that allows students to develop their professional skills, knowledge and expertise in close interaction with theory and practice. The Graduate Diploma in Social Science (Change Management) is suitable for people working in the field of educational policy and programming looking for further qualifications and seeking new ways of working. The work-based project, which makes up half of the course, provides the participants with the opportunity of specializing in the issues such a curriculum reform, flexible delivery of learning, and helps them to link with government policies (School of SCOS & WBLU, UWS, 2000).

The Graduate Diploma is delivered as a combination of ***work-based project*** conducted by students in their organization; block ***workshops and seminars*** conducted by academic supervisors, work-based learning coordinator and participants; and peer ***group meeting/study circles*** conducted by the work-based learning coordinator with local peer groups and individuals.

Work Based Projects

The work-based projects form the centerpiece of the study program and provide the background for the development of reflected practice. Students negotiate a work-based project with the academic supervisors in the workplace. The project needs to be complex and based on problems that allow candidates to move towards finding a solution. For example, projects may include: developing, implementing and /or evaluating a new program; developing, implementing and reviewing effective systems for supervision of staff; and designing, reviewing and setting up a selection and training process (School of SCOS & WBLU, UWS, 2000).

Workshops and Seminars

The content of seminars and workshops are based on the subjects mentioned above. No distance education is involved and all components will be delivered locally and face to face. Seminars and workshops will be delivered by academics and otherwise appropriately qualified staff. All participants will come together for 4 blocks of study over a 12-month period. Block 1 (setting-up) is 10 days; Block 2(input) is 5 days; Block 3(input) is 5 days and Block 4(debrief) is 5 days. The seminar is divided into:

1. Project management sessions-critical incident analysis, situational

- exercises and project planning.
2. Analysis session- theory testing and theory formation sessions.
 3. Guest speakers and other input sessions.

Study Circles and Peer Group Meeting

The role of the work-based learning coordinator is to bring participant together to meet at regular peer group sessions. Peer group sessions involve 3-hour meetings to exchange experiences and to act as a local support network. It takes a total amount of 30 hours over 12 months (School of SCOS & WBLU, UWS, 2000).

The Curriculum of the Course

According to the School of SCOS of the UWS (2000) design, the curriculum of the course is based on learning outcomes. The questions, problems and issues arising from the work-based projects guide the selection of content and materials, which are later matched with the learning outcomes in the course. The direct link between theory and practice in this course is designed to deliver complex learning outcomes for participants and organization. The Course comprises the following subject: Organization Behavior (12.5%); Power, Control and Decision-Making (12.5%); Participation in Policy Making (12.5%); Work-Based Learning and Organizational Development (12.5%); Work-Based Project (50%).

Assessment

Assessment is a continuous process throughout the course. Award of the course is based on production of a portfolio, which is jointly examined, by the UWS resident coordinator and another UWS academic staff member involved in the teaching of the course. Candidates are assessed on:

- Project outcomes
- Project documentation (problem identification, project definition, strategy development, action planning and pilot: implementation, feedback and evaluation, and recommendation)
- Portfolio developed and assessed throughout the year of study, which will include: reflective field notes, research enquiry, process documentation, critical incident analysis (School of SCOS & WBLU, UWS, 2000).

The memorandum of agreement for developing and deepening academic relationships, including implement work-based learning course in educational change and strategies between the OERP and the UWS, was signed in the latest of 1999(14 December, 1999). Then, the two institutes cooperate with each other in order to allocate their responsibilities such as course structure and administration;

finance apportionment of fee; duties and obligations; the mode of academic support, advisor, and etc. in detail. Afterward, they acquired admission requirement, assessed applications and registered students, brought an effective environment for implementation of the course. They also accomplished the role of the work-based learning coordinators in Sydney and Tehran (until August, 2000), and implemented the course (from September 2000 until February 2002). Finally, twenty-two of students who completed their projects were evaluated by academic advisors committee in the UWS (3 February, 2002). They presented highlights of their projects in a formal graduation seminar (9 & 10 June, 2002), and the OERP carried out a close ceremony and a final celebration where the graduate students were awarded –a Graduate Diploma in Socials Science (Change Management)- by the UWS (11 June, 2002).

The OERP as a Learning Organization

The OERP looks for new perspective on the process of policy making and curriculum development in recent years. The management of the OERP used training opportunity to introduce management philosophies stressing on new corporate cultures. The work-based learning is also used to provide decision-makers with the experiences of carrying out the tasks effectively and to identify non-routine or unpredictable situations. In practice, the work-based learning brings effective cultural environment of sharing the experiences for all of the staff, developing reflective skills, conducting collaborative research, planning reform strategies, considering continuous learning, and developing a new organizational behavior.

It seems that the management of the OERP examines this very important Lewin's assertion that "you cannot understand a system until you try to change it" (Weick & Quinn, 1999) through the work-based learning project. Also, they consider one of the basic discoveries of works on the process of educational change in the 1970's that demonstrate "change is a process, not an event" (Hall, 1991).

The OERP strategy management tries to use work-based learning project approach as a productivity model of professional development for staff empowerment. Although, empowerment has deep political implications (Garrick, 1998), the OERP suppose that work based learning project is very important for the improvement of staffs' working condition. It contributes to the development of their enterprise, and the reflection on their actions and the improvement and refinement of their own conceptual models.

Based on work-based learning approach the course of Social Science (Change Management) in the OERP places students at the forefront of reform in the education field through developing skills by which they can critically analyze education practice, and skills through which, they can re-shape practice in such ways that they be able to face the subsequent educational challenges in the next millennium (School of SCOS & WBLU, UWS, 2000).

The main aim of change strategy of professional development in the OERP is to organize cultural environment that encourages workplace cultures based on empowerment and participation. The management of the OERP looks to move

from *efficient* firm model (planning, supervision and control) to *innovation* firm (team-work, participation, promotion diagonal communication) through *quality* firm (total quality management) and *flexible* firm (adaptation to social change) based on Bolwijn and Kumpe (1990) model. Their theory holds that people in the innovative firm need to be empowered to take responsibility and set organizational goals (Garrick, 1998).

It seems that the work based learning program in the OERP, supports management to bring necessary changes for efficient improvements and a cultural shock to the efficient firm model. In addition, the work-based learning brings the OERP an alternative approach to change structural organization and management based on *flexible* firm (adaptation to social change). The students of the work-based learning projects reached to the fact that the OERPs' staff and managers need more training. They need more professional development, and cultural pathway for change management strategies to an *innovation* firm management structure (more participation and democratization). More innovative management and professional development strategies and tools for building a learning organization are one of most important expectation of the OERP from the work-based learning course. For this very important goals, the OERP attempt to face some fundamental challenges such as: how the staff become more flexible, how new skills are being acquired, how teamwork influences on the staff and workplace, how it changes management, and how participation and democratization are being acquired.

The students of the work-based learning program in the OERP provided 19 projects²⁾ including: *problem identification*, *project definition*, *strategy development*, *action planning*, and *pilot*. These projects as the outcome of the work- based learning and human resource development in the OERP bring a new perspective and rationalization to leadership of the organization to enrich organizational environment so that *systemic thinking* will be applicable. Indeed, the students' projects bring a cultural management to workplace that supports discipline of a learning organization. As Senge (1990, 1994) argues, systematic thinking is critical to a learning organization and *Systems Thinking* is now the fifth discipline for building a learning organization. The other four disciplines are: developing *personal mastery* (emphasizing a personal vision), having *mental models* (which test assumptions), building *shared visions*, and understanding the influence of *team learning* (Senge, 1990, 1994; Garrick, 1998).

One year after completing the Social Science Course (Change Management) using work-based learning approach and developing 19 projects in workplace, it seems that the OERP is going to face the challenges and strategic cultural changes which Petrick & Furr (1995) collected based on a review of total quality management and organizational transformation work in early 1990s. Petrick and Furr (1995) argued that the cultural change requires continuous improvement ushers in a new employee mindset, leadership style, and work design. Among the mindset shifts, there is a change from the *traditional organization* to the *new process focus*, as indicated in Table 1 (Petrick & Furr, 1995).

Table 1 Comparison of Traditional Organizational and New Process Mindsets

<i>Traditional organizational focus</i>	<i>New process focus</i>
-Employees are the problem	The process is the problem
-Doing my job	Help to get things done
-Understanding my job	Knowing how my job fits into the total process
-Measuring individuals	Measuring the process
-Change the person	Change the process
-Can always find a better employee	Can always improve the process
-Motivate people	Remove barriers
-Controlling employees	Developing people
-Don't trust anyone	We're all in this together
-Who made the error?	What allowed the error to occur?
-Correct errors	Reducing variation
-Bottom-line driven	Customer driven

Source: Petrick & Furr, 1995, p.124.

In the OERP work-based learning students recognized that this approach focuses on the process and the educators who are the managers of the process. Therefore, they should appreciate the change process and the steps such as: *understanding and describing, problematising, and reshaping*. Also, they have to realize the way of moving from a *traditional organizational focus* (here) to the *new process focus* (there). Students needed a tool to examine the journey of the change (from here to there). In the workshops and seminars, they learned *force field analysis* manner and applied it in their work-based project as an effective tool for *organizational change*.

Wagner (2001) presented this tool for students in the workshops on change management. She mentioned that relevant factors in workplace change could be found on four levels: individual, group (team), organizational, and political. All factors combine to form a 'force field' of influences that drives or restrains change. A *force field analysis* can reveal the points of intervention and action to improve the status quo. She asked students to make a strategic plan consist of an analysis of their driving and restraining forces, the ways of dealing with them, and their expectation of outcome along with the steps taken to achieve their expected aim (Wagner, 2001).

As an example, Wagner and Bennett, academic advisors and lecturers from the UWS, asked students to use *force field* manner to analysis the OERP organizational change during the workshops and seminars on change management. They used *force field analysis* and defined restraining and driving forces for organizational change as follows:

Driving forces

Restraining forces

<p>1) Bureaucracy: Lack a unified cooperation among various departments</p> <p>2) Language problem: General English, English for Specific Purpose, Language of Technology</p> <p>3) Financial issues</p> <p>4) A cultural passive approach: national cultural consideration, human relationship and capital, having a weak basis in team (group) working</p> <p>5) Technology literacy: disability to organize indefinite information, shortage of hard and softwares, disability to use technology, digital divide</p>	<p>1) OERP's policy to strengthen international cooperation to advance the scientific level of the whole system</p> <p>2) Global village: e-learning, on-line education, ICT in education, Virtual/Smart School, digital area</p> <p>3) Human resource development</p> <p>4) Changing world: up-to date information, specialization rapid advancement of science</p> <p>5) Democratic education: 2001, year for dialogue among civilizations, peace education learning to live together</p>
---	---

Source: Bennett, OERP, 2001.

Based on the change process and restraining and driving forces, students delivered their own project in workplace and started action research on *strength of driving forces* and *weakness of restraining forces* journey of change. Students used strategic plan method to setting action plans to achieve goals, journey changes and to move from 'status quo' to a 'new status' in organizational cultures and behaviors. Through the work-based project students found out that in a balance organizational state no change processes would acquire (Wagner, 2001). They used the indicators of quasi-stationary equilibrium, (stable resources, stable staff turnover, stable management practices, no irresolvable conflicts, no abnormal absenteeism, no acts of sabotage, working policies, procedures and practices), as tied to stages of organizational development (conception, formation/selection, balancing contradictions, quasi-stationary equilibrium, losing balance, disintegration).

In addition, academic advisors advised and supported them during the work-based project through the Internet, web-based learning and special website (<http://blackboard.uws.edu.au>). To assist in the process, they offer the following suggestion:

- 1-What problem have you identified in your project?
- 2-Describe the organization in relationship to your project
- 3-How do you explain this relationship?
- 4-What can you do about the problem?
- 5-Is there any other possibility?
- 6-What next? (Shaw, 2001).

According to the work-based learning coordinator of the UWS in Tehran, students had some restriction such as limited time, unfamiliarity with this kind of

professional development program, lack of computer literacy and English efficiency (Honari, 2001). Indeed, the coordinator of the work-based learning in the UWS, Wagner, also reflected that the work-based learning course is a new one in its specific application in Iran. The cultural differences among the nations had the most restrictive effect on implementation and on going delivery. The UWS has attempted to put procedures, flexible enough to cope with issues as they occurred (Wagner, 2001). The students also reported some border such as: lack of harmony among their competence and professional level, organizational status and background; misunderstanding of the course through distance learning; no up-to-date resources in change management; unfamiliarity of the supervisors and lecturers with the situation, problems and challenges of Iranian educational system; lack of clear definition and common understanding of the course keywords and syllabus between students and lecturers; variation of expectation among students, coordinators, supervisors and lecturers. It should also be mentioned that the graduate students didn't receive any feedback on their projects and work in detail from their supervisors (taken from Students Interviews, October, 21, 29; November, 5, 10, 11,13, 2003).

Outcomes: “Work” as a Learning Environment and “Self” as a Teacher

As an essential admission requirement, students of the work-based learning project in the OERP had more than ten years relevant experience in educational planning, curriculum development, policymaking development, and educational research. Also all of them hold an undergraduate degree and most of them had M.S. or M.A.

Having these backgrounds, students reflected upon their own decision-making and behaviors during the work-based project. They learn how to bring alternative perspective into their own workplace and decision-making processes. They practiced to use effective tool for describing and analyzing their workplace circumstances, to make strategies for changing management and to implement their strategic plan. They learn to think in a new approach about their workplace activities and reconsider the staff expectations of their professional development.

The students started viewing their development and management change as more of a continuous and positive process. In the end of the course, students reflected that decision-making is a collaborative activity and professional development is best conducted in peer groups study and networks where ideas and experiences are shared and discussed. They calculated their *work-based project* and *peer groups study* as a very important and effective parts of the work-based learning process. Reviews of recent works on human resources development practitioners illustrate that professional identities are shaped within new waves of communication devices such as ‘learning organizations’, self-directing teams, empowerment strategies, quality circles and so on (Garrick, 1998; Casey, 1995; DuGay, 1996).

Through the work-based learning, as an effective approach for human resource professional development, decision-makers found opportunities to work together, to reflect upon their decision-making experiences, to understand and communicate

their ideas to others, and to learn from their workplace assessment and *force field analysis*. Rather than learning a formal theory of change management and organizational change in a formal meeting, decision-makers learned and developed their knowledge and skills through reflection on their practices, analysis and evaluation of decisions, learning journal, and collaborative discussions about restraining and driving forces to change in workplace. Work-based project conducted by students during the work-based learning, brought opportunities for them to discuss and decide their own research theme, action research and plan, strategy for implementation, examining and reflecting their decisions and the involvement of the staff as partner of their action plans and research on workplace changes.

In this study, we examined the influence of the UWS's course of Social Science (Change Management) in the OERP on the decision-making process, specifically upon the quality of decision and organizational behavior. We found that students changed their management philosophies stressing new corporate cultures after participating in the course, based on their own assessment (self-reflection) as well as feedback from their colleagues who had been partners of their action plan and peer groups meeting and study circles (collaborative reflection). These reflections caused them to revise their skills, ability, and knowledge and decision so as to:

- Accept possibility of changing management in workplace,
- Understand significance of process of change in workplace,
- Develop an action plan for change organizational behavior,
- Analyze journey changes in workplace,
- Deliver strategic plan in the organization, not for the organization,
- Learn and train continuously, and understand essential of lifelong learning,
- Transport previous experiences to new culture of management,
- Work, study and research in teamwork,
- Appreciate systematic thinking and necessity of organizational culture for it,
- Encourage workplace cultures based on empowerment and participation,
- Create strategy in the organization through force field analysis,
- Emphasis on cooperative learning in workplace,
- Recognize self-reflection, self-directed learning and self-improvement mode,
- Practice diversity of learning modes and styles in workplace (taken from Students Interviews, September, 28, 30, October, 30, 31 and November, 10, 11, 12, 13, 2003).

Conclusion

It is possible to have a model of decision-makers and curriculum developers' competency on which the OERP is not only a place of work but also a source of professional development. The work-based learning project in the OERP considers 'work' as a site of enquiry, as: recognition of prior competence, curriculum, basis for program design, reflection on implication of change, redefinition of learning, assessment and development. As Garrick (1998) noted that learning in the course of working seems to be a common sense that implies a 'curriculum', which exists in everyday activities. The on-going professional

development of decision-makers is a very important area, which has real meaning. The OERP staff struggle to view professional development and enhancement of skills as a lifelong pursuit. They perfectly realize that experience, self-study, self-directed learning, self-review and improvement critiques of their activities by their colleagues and self-reflection are important parts of this process. Rather than one-time workshops on the latest educational topics, they are engaged in a long-term process of self-reflection and development. Indeed, the best way of developing new skills, and continuous change is to practice for interpretation, application and evaluation your self and work environment in the workplace. As one of the most important outcomes of the work-based learning project in the OERP, it seems that the participants changed their sense of “*work*” as a new learning environment and “*self*” as a teacher.

Acknowledgement

The authors wishes to express their most sincere and heartfelt thanks to Professor K. Bennett, Chair of School of SCOS and Professor R. Wagner and their colleagues in the UWS as academic advisors of the work-based learning project in the OERP, and Dr. M. Honari as the work-based learning coordinator from the UWS for their collaborative planning, academic supports, invaluable suggestions and high motivation to deliver the project, and effective relationships to improve the quality of this work in the OERP. They thank especially, M. Dadashzadeh for her help in editing the paper and useful comments.

Notes

1) See “Bringing Knowledge to Life” website at;

<http://www.uws.edu.au/about/acadorg/cshs/sashs/research/clast>

2) The titles of the students’ work-based learning projects are as follows:

- 1-Information Communication Technology Strategies in Iranian Educational System
- 2-Developing a Model for Comprehensive Evaluation of VET System
- 3-The Art Curriculum in Iranian Primary Schools
- 4-Preliminary Report of Designing of Virtual High School
- 5-Designing an Evaluation Model for Five Year Educational Development in Iran
- 6-School Based Management: From Policy to Action
- 7-Project-Based Curriculum Development in Science Education
- 8-Inclusive Education for Disabled Children in Rural and Deprived Areas in Iran
- 9-Evaluating the Process of Compiling Technical and Vocational Textbooks
- 10-A Preliminary Plan for Evaluation of Technical and Vocational Curriculum
- 11-Designing the Management Information System in OERP
- 12-Improving OERP’s International Relations: Policies and Practice
- 13- Physical Education in the Iranian Girl Schools
- 14-Basic Vocabulary for Childhood Stage of Education in Tehran
- 15-Competency-Based Training Curriculum and Its Application to Educational System in Iran
- 16-Solutions for Development of Nonprofit Schools

17-A Shift from Literacy Teaching to Self-directed and Lifelong Learning

18-Organizational Communication of the Bureau of International Scientific Cooperation
Mission and Goals

19-Development of Strategies to Produce Sustainable School Textbooks

References:

- Adams, D. & Hamm, M. (1994). *New Designs for Teaching and Learning*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ashton, P. M. E., Henderson, E. S. & Peacock, A. (1989). *Teacher Education Through Classroom Evaluation-The Principles and Practice of IT-INSET-*, London: Routledge.
- Bailey, T. R.; Hughes, K.L. & Moore, D.T. (2003). *Work-Based Learning and Education Reform*, London: Routledge Falmer.
- Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving Schools From Within*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bennett, K. (2001). *Seminars on Work Based Learning: Force Field Analysis*, Tehran: OERP.
- Bolwijn, P. and Kumpe, T. (1990). Manufacturing in the 1990s: Productivity, Flexibility and Innovation, *Journal of Long Range Planning*, 23(4): 44-57.
- Bound, D. & Solomon, N. (eds.)(2001). *Work Based Learning: A New Higher Education?* London: Open University Press.
- Casey, C. (1995). *Work, Self and Society after Industrialism*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Castling, A. (1996). *Competence-Based Teaching and Training*, London: Macmillan.
- Center for Education in the Build Environment (CEBE) (2003). *Work Based Learning*, URL: <http://cebe.cf.ac.uk/learning/wbl>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher Learning That Supports Student Learning, *Educational Leadership*, 55(5): 6-11.
- Dean, J. (1991). *Professional Development in School*, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- DuGay, P. (1996). *Consumption and Identity at Work*, London: Sage Publications.
- Fish, D. (1989). *Learning Through Practice in Initial Teacher Training*, London: Kogan Page.
- Fueyo, V., & Koorland, A. M. (1997). Teacher as Researcher: A Synonym for Professionallism, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(5): 336-344.
- Garrick, J. (1998). *Informal Learning in the Workplace: Unmasking Human Resource Development*, London: Routledge.
- Graves, N. J. (1990). Thinking and Research on Teacher Education. In Norman J. Graves (Ed.), *Initial Teacher Education-Policies and Progress-* (pp.58-73), London: Kogan Page.
- Hall, G.E. (1991). *The Local Educational Change Process and Policy Implementation*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1991.

- Hamilton, S.F. & Hamilton, M.A. (1997). What is Learning Work-Based? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(9): 676-681.
- Harris, A., Jamieson, I., & Russ, J. (1996). *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, London: Pitman Publishing.
- Heaton, T. & Lawson, T. (1996). *Education and Training*, London: Macmillan.
- Honari, M. (2001). *A Report of Block2b, Graduate Diploma in Social Science (Change Management): Meeting with Individuals*, Tehran: Shahid Rejaei University, Wednesday 7 March 2001.
- National Center for Work-Based Learning Partnerships (NCWBLP). (2003). *What Is Work Based Learning?*
URL: <http://www.mdx.ac.uk/www/ncwblp/about.html>
- Petrick, J. A. & Furr, D. S. (1995). *Total Quality in Managing Human Resources*, Florida: Lucie Press.
- Raelin, J. (1999). *Work-Based Learning: The New Frontier of Management*, London:PrinticeHall.
- Shaw, M. (2001). *Outline of the Assessment Tasks Required*, Sydney: The UWS.
- Sarkar Arani Mohammad Reza & Matoba Masami (2002) School Based In-Service Teacher Training in Japan: Perspectives on Teachers Professional Development, *Journal of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development (Educational Sciences)*, Nagoya University (Dept. of Education), 49(1): 97-110.
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Senge, P.M. (1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The Art of Practice of the Learning Organization*, New York: Doubleday Press.
- Senge, P.M. (ed.) (1994). *The Fifth Discipline Field Book: Strategies and Tools for Building a Learning Organization*, Toronto and New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Smylie, M. A. (1995). Teacher Learning in the Workplace-Implications for School Reform-. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional Development in Education-New Paradigms & Practices-* (pp.92-113), New York: Teachers College Press.
- Smyth, J. (1995). Teachers' Work and the Labor Process of Teaching-Central Problematic in Professional development-, In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional Development in Education-New Paradigms & Practices* (pp.69-91), New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tickle, L. (1987). *Learning Teaching, Teaching Teaching: A Study of Partnership In Teacher Education*, London: The Falmer Press.
- Thiessen, D. (1992). Classroom-Based Teacher Development, In A. Hargreaves & M.G. Fullan (Eds.), *Understanding Teacher Development* (pp.85-109), New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wagner, R. (2001). *The Minute of the Meeting of the Course Management Committee*, Sydney: The UWS.
- Wagner, R. (2001). *Seminars on Work Based Learning: Force Field Analysis a Tool for Organizational Change*, Tehran: OERP.
- Weick, K.E. & Quinn, R.E. (1999). Organizational Change and

Development, *Annual Review of Psychology*, University of Western Sydney.

The Authors Biographical Notes:

Mohammad Reza Sarkar Arani (1965) is an Associate Professor of Comparative and International Education in the Faculty of Education at the University of Allameh Tabatabai, Tehran, Iran. He did his PhD at the Nagoya University, Japan. From April to September 2003, he was doing as a Visiting Professor of "Education and Sustainable Development" at the Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies of Kobe University in Japan. He is currently also Visiting Researcher at the Gakushuin Women's College in Tokyo. His areas of expertise include culture of teaching and learning, educational practice in the Asia especially Japan, teachers' professional development and global education in theory and practice. He has written extensively on teaching and learning in primary and higher education. He has participated in international conferences and seminars and published works in various national and international journals in Persian, Japanese and English.

Jafar Alagamandan (1952) is Head of the Organization for Educational Research and Planning (OERP) at the Ministry of Education in Iran. From 1981 to 1998, he was Deputy Ministry of Education in the secondary education. He has experience in implement of educational reform in Iran. He has specialized in secondary education with particular research focus on technical and vocational education in Iran.

Heidar Tourani (1963) is an Assistant Professor of Educational Administration in the Faculty of Management at the Tehran Open University. He is also an academic advisor of the Organization for Educational Research and Planning (OERP). His major areas of research include strategic planning in education, total quality management in education, and management information system in higher education.