
GENERAL NOTICE

NOTICE 389 OF 2009

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

I, Grace Naledi Mandisa Pandor, MP, Minister of Education, established a Ministerial Committee on National Education Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU), in terms of Government Notices 31403 of 2008 and 31492 of 2008 respectively. The Ministerial Committee has since submitted its final report.

All interested persons and organisations are invited to comment in writing on the final report on NEEDU as set out in the schedule.

The comments must be directed to the Director-General, Private Bag X895, Pretoria, 0001 for attention: Mr. T.E. Rabotapi, fax 012 312 6049, tel. no. 012 312 5987 or email Rabotapi.T@doe.gov.za.

Kindly provide the name, address, telephone and fax number and email address of the person or organisation submitting the comments.

The comments should reach the Department within 30 days from publication of this Notice.

The final report on NEEDU may also be obtained on www.education.gov.za.



GNM PANDOR, MP
MINISTER OF EDUCATION

DATE: 6-4-2009

**MINISTERIAL COMMITTEE ON A
NATIONAL EDUCATION EVALUATION
AND DEVELOPMENT UNIT**

16 January 2009

FINAL REPORT

Members of the Ministerial Committee

Mr Paul Colditz, Federation of Governing Bodies of South African Schools

Ms Francine de Clerq, University of the Witwatersrand

Ms Matseliso Dipholo, South African Democratic Teachers Union

Dr Jonathan Jansen (Chairperson)

Dr Cassius Lubisi, Superintendent General for Education, KwaZulu Natal

Dr Peliwe Lolwana, Umalusi

Mr Peter Matthews, former Ofsted, United Kingdom

Ms Sussana Miller, National Professional Teachers Organisation of South Africa

Mr Mxolisi Roman, National Association of School Governing Bodies

Mr (JS) Steve Roux, Suid-Afrikaanse Onderwysersunie

Ms Amanda Sanger, District Six Museum

Professor Linda Darling-Hammond, an international consultant from Stanford University, was not able to participate

Administrative support from Department of Education officials

Mr Enoch Rabotapi

Mr Thula Nkomo

Word of thanks

The Ministerial Committee on a National Education Evaluation and Development Unit wishes to express its sincere gratitude to every member of the broad education community who made the time and effort to contribute to this report. This includes senior officials in the national department of education, the nine provincial departments of education, district and circuit officials, school principals, teachers, concerned members of the general public through submissions, teacher unions, non-governmental organizations, business and industry, university academics, senior and retired members of the teaching profession, and independent citizens.

This report would not be possible without the constructive and passionate inputs from citizens across the country.

However, the Ministerial Committee takes sole responsibility for any errors, omissions or limitations in the final report.

Finally, the Committee thanks the Minister of Education, the Honourable GNM Pandor, for entrusting it with this vital task.

Acronyms

ABET	Adult Basic Education and Training
DAS	Development Appraisal System
DIP	District Improvement Plan
DoE	Department of Education
DSG	Development Support Group
ELRC	Education Labour Relations Council
FEDSA	Federation of Governing Bodies of South African Schools
FET	Further Education and Training
IQMS	Integrated Quality Management System
NAPTOSA	National Professional Teachers Organisation of South Africa
NASGB	National Association of School Governing Bodies
NEEDU	National Education Evaluation and Development Unit
NEPA	National Education Policy Act
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education (United Kingdom)
PGP	Personal Growth Plan
PM	Performance Management
QA	Quality Assurance
SACE	South African Council for Educators
SADTU	South African Democratic Teachers Union
SAOU	Suid-Afrikaanse Onderwysersunie
SDP	School Development Plan
SDT	School Development Team
SIP	School Improvement Plan

WSE

Whole School Evaluation

Table of Contents

Committee Members

- A. The brief
- B. The methodology
- C. The long shadow of history
- D. Review of national policies, structures and processes of school evaluation
- E. What we know from the international research on school evaluation and teacher appraisal
- F. Key findings
- G. Core Recommendations
- H. Next Steps

References

List of organisations and individuals who made *written* submissions

MINISTERIAL COMMITTEE ON A NATIONAL EDUCATION
EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT UNIT

15 January 2009

FINAL REPORT

A. The Brief

The Ministerial Committee on the establishment of a National Education Evaluation and Development Unit was appointed by the Minister of Education in September 2008 to recommend mechanisms through which the evaluation and development of schools can be undertaken.¹

The specific tasks of the Committee were

1. to review all existing policies, mechanisms, structures, processes and tools that evaluate and develop schools and teachers;
2. to review the international literature on similar school evaluation and development bodies in other countries;
3. to make recommendations on the structure and composition, location, functions, governance, name, costs and financing of an external organization, accountable to the Minister, which will have the overall task of school evaluation and development;

¹ The full details of the Appointment of the Ministerial Committee and its brief can be found in two documents: Government Gazette, 12 September 2008, No. 31403, Appointment of Ministerial Committee on National Education Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU), Department of Education, Notice 970 of 2008; and Government Gazette, 7 October 2008, No. 31492, Amendment to the Notice on Appointment of Ministerial Committee on National Education Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU), Department of Education, Notice 1242 of 2008;

4. to advise on the relationship between the proposed unit and existing policies and mechanisms aimed at school (including teacher and learner) evaluation and development;
5. to report to the Minister of Education on the Committee's findings and recommendations; and
6. to propose to the Minister a refinement of these terms of reference, if necessary.

The terms of reference were accepted as given, and no need for refinement of the terms was deemed necessary.

B. The Methodology

The report for this study was compiled using seven sources of data:

1. **a synthetic review of national policy and planning documents concerned with the evaluation of schools and teachers**

In addition to the more obvious core documents from the national department—such as the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), the Whole School Evaluation (WSE) and the Systemic Evaluation—the national document analysis also included subsidiary materials and provincial documents that speak to or affect issues of school and teacher evaluation and development. The aim was to be as comprehensive as possible while recognizing, of course, that not all the district and provincial documents would be accessible or even manageable for purposes of analysis within the tight timeframes of this study. The analysis began with a simple grid that examined origins, purposes, expectations, audience, actors, silences and dilemmas within each document set. But this first iteration of analysis was followed by much deeper, context- and content-analysis tasks that brought to light the meanings and intentions of these policy frames, as well as their embedded theory of action. With such detailed analyses and evaluations of the key school evaluation and development documents, it was also

possible to conduct more intelligent interviews and focus subsequent research activities en route to composing this final report.

2. a comprehensive review of international research, policy and practice on school evaluation, teacher appraisal and development

There is now considerable experience and evidence about inspection systems specifically and school evaluation, teacher appraisal and development initiatives in the international arena. Several of these key reports are available to members of the Ministerial Committee. The task was to draw together the key insights, observations and findings from these different reports in different national contexts to present a concise summary of value to the decision-making on evaluation and development in South Africa. The international member of the panel served also as a critical reviewer of the emerging work of the Committee.

3. the conduct of provincial hearings on the experiences and recommendations of a cross-section of education practitioners concerned with, and affected by, school evaluation and development policies and initiatives

The Committee conducted provincial hearings with a cross-section of stakeholders involved in or experienced with school and teacher evaluation and development. Every provincial head of education selected the mix of about 20-30 key persons representing unions, district officials, school principals, teachers, independent agencies and provincial officers who could speak with authority about their experiences of evaluation and development with schools and among teachers, and who would be in a position to make informed inputs about the purpose, design, content and location of the proposed evaluation unit. The Committee members, in various combinations, visited each of the nine provinces and the mix of personnel invited shifted as the committee felt the need for more information from a particular sector; for example, the earlier meetings were dominated by department personnel in the provinces but later more and more teachers were represented.

4. the conduct of workshop-format interviews with key personnel in the national department of education under the Director General

This meeting, about mid-way through the data collection process, allowed members of the Committee to interact directly with senior government officials involved in the range of monitoring and evaluation policies from whole school evaluation, development appraisal system, performance management, and systemic evaluation in the different directorates. This was an opportunity to test some initial hypotheses from the field and to seek clarity and direction on aspects of the reporting since the initial Briefing Meeting with the Minister of Education. The experiences and perspectives of the designers and supervisors of government policy on school and teacher evaluation and development offered important complementary insights from those obtained in the provinces.

5. the collection of invited written submissions from the public at large and in particular from teachers and practitioners concerned with school evaluation, teacher appraisal and development

A published call for written submissions was made to the public at large in recognition of the fact that there are diverse actors and agencies working with schools throughout the nine provinces and who could make valuable inputs into the work of this Committee. It also served the democratic purpose to convey a sense of the broadest participation in this process of deliberating on the substance and aims of what an evaluation and development unit could look like. Submissions were received from a range of stakeholders including the teacher unions, professional associations, provincial education departments, statutory bodies concerned with evaluation, community leaders, and individuals concerned with education practice.

- 6. the collection of data from principals of “turnaround schools” — schools which, as a result of school evaluation and development interventions, were able to emerge as productive and well-managed institutions**

This process of gaining insights from experienced and effective school principals from the nine provinces was conducted in a half-day workshop format in Pretoria. Provinces were asked to nominate “reputational cases” of outstanding principals who for the most part work in dismal and under-resourced school environments and yet managed to make a positive impact on teaching and learning in their schools. These whole-group interviews were very valuable to the Committee and delivered profound insight into what is wrong in education and how leadership can play a critical role in redressing the stalemate in many schools beyond the appeal to more and more resources.

- 7. the conduct of seminars with selected personnel and expertise in and outside of the department where key and emerging findings of this study could be tested, refined and improved**

The emerging findings were shared through planned seminars with academics, unionists, practitioners, parents and agencies concerned with school and teacher evaluation and development. One seminar was convened in the north of the country (Wits University campus) and another in the south (University of Stellenbosch campus). The plan was to test initial propositions with a small group of informed persons who could comment on and indeed shape the final report on the basis of their participation at this crucial stage of the process. While this was not a voting exercise in which the findings depend how every outside person feels about the draft reports, the two seminars alerted the committee to gaps, silences, contradictions, sensitivities and dilemmas in the initial report on findings that were taken into account in the drafting of the final report.

C. The long shadow of history

Schools emerge from and are shaped by their social and historical contexts. Indeed, the education of young children stretches even further back beyond colonial influence and reflects in aspects of education today. In South Africa, formal education through institutions called schools cover more than 350 years during which time two great forces shaped the character of the contemporary school: colonialism and apartheid.

It was not, however, only the imposition of these two destructive forces on black schooling that defines the culture and character of schools today. It is also the resistance against the racial and class character of education that explains the current state of schools and proscribes the possibilities of change.

Because of this context the highly unequal character of schools persist despite comprehensive reforms since 1994 in pursuit of equal education for all. There are well-endowed public schools in South Africa with impressive resources and facilities that produce superior academic results over the 12 years of schooling. There are desperately poor schools with very little to show in terms of academic performance. In the past, the former category of schools tended to be white and the latter black. With the opening of schools to all children, increasingly the privileged schools tend to enrol white and black middle class students while the latter schools tend to remain all black. The resilience of these inequalities underlines the long shadow of history on all our schools.

For the same reason the reticence within much of the professional teacher community to inspection by external agencies is clearly a legacy of the destructive role of the officials of apartheid education whose place in the surveillance and control of black schools and teachers casts a long shadow. At the same time there are a minority of schools with well-established practices of monitoring and evaluation with high levels of teacher participation. Once again, these two dispositions towards external evaluation reflect a divided and contested history in the politics of education.

This is not to suggest, at all, that schools and teachers today are simply victims of such powerful historical forces. On the contrary, there is ample evidence in post-apartheid society that South African educators have exercised agency in taking on the worst legacies of education and acted in the interests of a democratic education for all children; the active agency of principals and teachers in professional development is but one example of teacher-led action in the field.

Even so, social, economic, cultural and political legacies do not dissipate with the installation of new governments or new policies. Consciously or otherwise, attitudes, beliefs, values and choices in education and society are informed by what came before.

This report should therefore be read with a consciousness and sensitivity to the long shadow that history casts over schools, teachers and learners even as the active agency to rise above the received legacy should be recognized and encouraged.

D. Review of national policies, structures and processes of school evaluation

Introduction

This section responds to one of the critical tasks specified in the Ministerial Brief to the Committee on a National Education Evaluation and Development Unit i.e. to review current South African policies, mechanisms, structures, processes and tools designed to evaluate and develop schools and teachers.

The focus of this review of national policies falls primarily on the principal instrument for school evaluation and teacher appraisal, the Integrated Quality Management System (or IQMS) since it integrates three major policy initiatives on appraisal and school development, namely, the Development Appraisal System (or DAS), Performance Management (or PM) and Whole School Evaluation (or WSE).

In conducting this task, the national study acknowledges the relevant policy reviews and evaluations of the Department of Education on the subject, as well as a surprisingly rich collection of South African research publications on the issue of school evaluation and teacher appraisal (see Reference list at the end of this Report).

The evaluation context and legacy is first presented, followed by an analysis of DAS, WSE and the IQMS resolution to understand what is successful, problematic and/or limited in the impact these measures have on the South African school system. The national review concludes by focusing sharply on what can be learnt from the positive lessons of "what is in place," and to guide our other main task—namely, to situate the work of an independent National Education Evaluation and Development Unit in conceptual and operational relationship to other existing quality assurance agencies in the country.

Background

The new Department of Education after Apartheid (1994) prioritized legislative and policy reforms to overhaul the fragmented and discriminatory nature of education provision, and to establish a unified, non-racial system of education and training. Since then significant changes have been introduced at every level of the education system from curriculum and assessment, to professional growth and development, to teaching and learning, and to the management and administration of schools.

Much progress has been made in moving the system away from the precepts of Apartheid education. More children attend school and more attend without the burden of school fees. More children participate in school nutrition programmes and in an expanded curriculum. More teachers and principals are exposed to inservice development than ever before. And more provision has been made to improve the infrastructure of schooling especially in rural areas of the country. That massive challenges remain is widely acknowledged; that qualitative changes in education have been effected cannot be denied. Much of this transformation of the school system was made possible through the intense participation by stakeholders in matters of education policy generally, and in policies regulating the development of teachers in particular.

The 1993 Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC), a statutory body designed to provide bargaining and negotiation mechanisms on matters of education, led to the main teacher organisations being directly involved in the formulation of policies relating to their professional status and development. Negotiations in the ELRC over the terms and conditions of service of teachers, as well as their workloads and responsibilities, were never easy.

Still, by 1998 a raft of agreements and legislation on teachers and teaching was in place. For example, the *ELRC Resolution 7 and 8* of 1998 stipulated the workloads, duties and responsibilities of school-based educators, while The *Employment of Educators Act* (Act no.76 of 1998) established the terms and conditions of employment of teachers and provided for the establishment of the South African Council for Educators (SACE), a

statutory body designed to regulate the teaching profession, and composed mainly of education department and union representatives.

Of all the legal and policy reforms that impacted on teacher and school evaluation and development, the five most important were The Development Appraisal System (DAS), Whole School Evaluation (WSE), Performance Management (PM), Systemic Evaluation (SE, though its major focus remains learner achievement), and the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). Each of these policy instruments is now briefly reviewed and assessed.

The Development Appraisal System (DAS)

The aim of the Development Appraisal System (DAS), finalized in the *ELRC Resolution 4* of 1998, was to facilitate the personal and professional development of individual educators, and to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management through the principle of lifelong learning and development (ELRC Manual for Development Appraisal, 1998). DAS represented a radical shift from previous teacher evaluation exercises in South Africa in that it was a stakeholder-driven, transparent form of appraisal targeted at school- and office-based educators (Gallie, 2006). The process of peer appraisal, or peer evaluation for development, was informed by the job functions and the so-called "seven roles of educators", roles which were formalised in the 2000 *Norms and Standards for Educators*.

Several studies criticized the DAS for its ambitious, complex and time-consuming content and instruments (Gallie 2006; Barnes 2003; Barasa and Mattson 1998). The South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) and other unions were keen on DAS to remedy the poor teacher education provisions available to black teachers in the Apartheid era and wanted departmental support to *precede* any attempt to monitor their work and performance.

From their side, education departments were also keen to monitor how teachers implemented the new curriculum and assessment reforms, and to have information on the strengths and weaknesses of teachers in order to understand where and how to allocate state resources.

The DAS policy, on the other hand, worked from the assumption that teachers were professionals with sufficient professional competences, and in particular reflexive competences, to conduct a self analysis of their own work, identify personal strengths and weaknesses, as well as prioritize their needs in a personal development plan.

In this regard Barasa and Mattson (1998) argue that because most educators do not possess these competences, they should be allowed to acquire such skills “**before** they can be required by policy” (our emphasis). The policy further assumes that most teachers recognize the need for, and the responsibility to, improve themselves professionally.

Studies find, however, that many teachers expressed concern that despite DAS being in place, the department did not have the professional capacity to implement such a system-wide professional development plan. As Barnes (2003) and Gallie (2007) argue in their DAS research, teachers complained that the department did not provide them access to genuine and effective development support on the implementation of curriculum and assessment policies, let alone on what they needed to be functional in the workplace and to appraise themselves.

The Whole School Evaluation Policy

By 2000, the Department of Education also wanted to assume more of the monitoring and evaluation powers given to it by the National Education Policy Act (NEPA). The Department believed that, beyond access, equity and redress, “the issue of quality cannot be sidelined” (DoE, 2001:39). Following Section 3 (4) of *NEPA*, the national policy on *Whole-School Evaluation* (WSE) (Govt Gazette Vol.433, No. 22512, July 2001) was passed to monitor and improve schools. The aims of the *WSE policy* were as follows:

- to inform the national government, provinces, parents and society in general about the performance of schools and the standards of learners' achievements against nationally agreed criteria.
- to provide substantiated judgments about the quality of education to inform decision-making, policies and planning within the province and at national level.
- to identify key factors that, if developed, will improve school effectiveness.
- to lay a basis for school improvement through a process of internal and external evaluation and the identification of good and problematic practices.

(DoE, 2001:39)

The WSE policy made clear that there was a need to build strong, stable and more robust schools with a positive institutional culture, as this was crucial to producing a stable and well-qualified teaching force. Teacher professional development remains a recurrent theme in this policy.

The WSE policy promotes school self-evaluation which should culminate in a school improvement plan (SIP) to then be used by the districts/circuits in their own District Improvement Plan (DIP), for which the province would secure funds. Provincially-appointed supervisors in turn visit schools in a three-to-five year cycle. After familiarizing themselves with the relevant school documents, a team of 4 or 5 supervisors use the same nationally agreed evaluation schedule to assess and rate the schools' areas of strength and improvement as well as make recommendations, which the schools would incorporate in their next SIP. The focus of the WSE policy was partly influenced by the need to ensure that the reform of school policies were implemented to enhance education quality in all schools.

The WSE policy stipulates nine standardized performance areas covering the following school inputs, processes and outcomes:

- basic functionality
- leadership/management and communication,
- governance and relationships,
- quality of teaching and educator development,
- curriculum provision and resources,
- learners' achievements,
- school safety, security and discipline,
- school infrastructure, and
- links with parents and the community

There has been post-graduate MEd and PhD research on the WSE and its impact on schools (Lucen, 2003; Risimati, 2007; Silbert, 2008). Silbert's (2008) study offers an interrogation of the WSE policy and its selected nine areas which, in her view, omits important post-1994 constitutional requirements about learners' rights. Lucen's (2003) study provides a critical analysis of WSE implementation in a school but which does not stretch to include an analysis of the complexities, tensions and challenges which are the sources of most policy implementation problems. These studies point to several tensions in the WSE policy, enumerated below.

The first concern derives from the nine selected areas and the implicit model of school effectiveness and/or improvement on which WSE relies. It is debatable whether these nine areas are the most relevant for schools seeking to improve teaching and learning, especially since a few of the nine areas are about monitoring the implementation of school policies. But the nine areas do not give an idea of what exactly works or not inside the school environment. The nine areas are presented as a list of organisational input and process factors which are not explicitly related to the school's core functions of teaching and learning.

The second challenge is the balance between school self-evaluation and external school evaluation. In a country like South Africa, with a lack of professional evaluation capacity and a history of distrust towards school evaluation, there would be problems with school self-evaluation especially from defensive and poorly resourced schools which may not want to conduct an authentic evaluation. Yet, an external evaluation, even by well-qualified professional experts, may not in itself resolve quality problems because of the deep fear of victimization on the part of poorly resourced and struggling schools, and their experience that follow-up support is rarely a reality.

The third tension derives from how the WSE accountability framework articulates with other forms of school pressure or accountability. School inspection is only one piece in the accountability framework as there are other accountability measures in play. Schools are usually also subjected to national curriculum standards or learning outcomes, school testing (grade 12 but also in grades 3, 6 and 9), school-specified targets in their improvement plans, as well as performance management for staff.

But many government officials at district level have bemoaned the lack of school bureaucratic accountability. Taylor (2002)(2007) and Fleisch (2002, 2006) note that many poorly performing schools do not have any internal system of bureaucratic authority and accountability and that is why these schools cannot be stabilized and rendered functional.

Scholars have debated the balance between external and internal accountability. Experience shows that too great an emphasis on external accountability may lead to short term gains in test scores but at the expense of sustained quality in the medium term. Too great an emphasis on internal accountability, on the other hand, may be popular with teacher unions but it usually leads to uneven performance assessments across the system. Research and experience suggests that when there is a dynamic balance between internal and external accountability that the link between inspection and improvement will be optimal and the use of inspection to promote educational quality will be best achieved.

The fourth and related concern is about the school support promoted by the WSE component because it stipulates that the SIP of each school should specify its improvement priority needs. This approach could be said to promote a school- or teacher-driven form of professional development which assumes that there are quality evaluators in schools who have, or will develop, the expertise and knowledge from the school improvement research as well as the professionalism necessary to undertake authentic school self evaluation. Yet, such evaluation expertise does not exist in abundance in public schools. Taylor (2007) is relevant here when he states that no amount of support will benefit these schools unless their attitudes and commitment are directly confronted and changed by departmental authority.

The fifth tension lies in the balance between school support and accountability. The WSE policy states that it is an evaluation FOR school improvement because it promotes school self-evaluation and the development of an improvement plan. The external school evaluation is there to verify and strengthen internal evaluation and assist with recommendations for schools and districts to focus on. However, if the district does not manage to follow-up on WSE recommendations and assist schools with high quality support (something that is seldom the norm, according to many teachers interviewed), then schools will perceive WSE as yet another monitoring mandate that is not useful to them.

Performance Management

By 2002 other important evaluative measures were finalised in the ELRC concerning performance management. *ELRC Resolution 3* of 2002 on the Performance Management and Development System (PMDS) aims to evaluate and improve performance of all public servants against pre-specified goals. This is pursued by establishing a performance culture to improve an individual public servant's awareness and understanding of their work objectives, and the performance standards expected of them, as well as providing opportunities to devise plans to address their needs (ELRC, 2002). The administrative measures and agreements on performance management

borrowed from the new public management discourse which focuses strictly on what is produced and whether it is in line with what is expected.

Systemic Evaluation

Acting on the powers given to it by the *Assessment Policy in the General Education and Training Band (Grade R to 9) and ABET*, the DoE developed the 2003 *Systemic Evaluation Framework* to evaluate the system's progress towards its key transformation goals and the performance of learners.

The main criticisms of Systemic Evaluation is that while it provides valuable information on learner performance in grades 3, 6 and 9, the data is limited to what is available in a sampled selection of schools and learning areas (numeracy, literacy) and that the underlying factors that cause underperformance in these areas are not investigated. It follows, therefore, that there is little available in terms of change strategy to act on this data in either school improvement broadly, or specifically in altering teaching and learning to redress low performance.

Once again, the snapshot data and even the year-by-year comparisons of performance in the system is of considerable value as a check on the health of the school system; however, the repetitive nature of this data and the small gains or losses routinely recorded become relatively meaningless without a sense of the underlying causes and consequences that explain low levels of learner attainment.

The IQMS: the integration of complex evaluation systems:

The ELRC negotiations on the evaluation of educators dealt openly with sensitive and contested issues. The *ELRC Resolution 9* of 2002 and *Resolution 1* of 2003 outline the evaluation procedures, processes and performance standards for institution-based educators; and *ELRC Resolution 3* of 2003 stipulates the protocol and instrument process to guide the observation of educators in practice (namely lesson observation). These ELRC Collective Agreements provide a basis for decisions on salary progression,

rewards and others measures, and for a fair and transparent performance evaluation of institution-based educators, which seek to improve the quality of teaching and education management (ELRC, 2003).

However, teacher unions complained about the unnecessary duplication and complexity in having different structures and evaluation activities with DAS, performance measurement (PM), and the WSE policy.

It was finally decided to streamline these complex and complicated resolutions within *ELRC agreement 8* of 2003 which integrates into one system, the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), three different previous systems: DAS, WSE and Performance Management (PM).

The IQMS combines educator development appraisal and performance appraisal (or appraisal for accountability). These two systems are aligned by relying on the same conceptualisation of effective educators and the same 12 performance standards to evaluate teachers' work and performance. The first four performance standards, applicable to all educators, relate to classroom observation, and the other eight assess professional issues outside the classroom.

The performance areas are as follows:

- Classroom teaching, through the following four standards:
 1. The creation of a positive learning environment
 2. Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes
 3. Lesson planning, preparation and presentation
 4. Learner assessment.
- Other professional and school development activities, through the following:
 5. Professional development in field of work/career and participation in professional bodies.
 6. Human relations and contribution to school development.

7. Extra-curricular and Co-curricular participation.
8. Administration of resources and records.
9. Personnel.
10. Decision making and accountability.
11. Leadership, communication and servicing the governing body.
12. Strategic planning, financial planning and education management development.

Parenthetically, it is worth noting at this point that no criterion appears along with 1 – 4 relating to the response of learners to lessons, either in progress made, attitudes such as engagement, behaviour, or indeed their views e.g. of the learning environment etc. (“If you lead the horse to water in a well-planned way, does it matter if it does not drink?”) The second set, 5-12, appears to anticipate no responsibility for the improvement of teaching and learning or school-based professional development.

The first eight performance standards apply to post-level 1 (junior) educators, while the post-level 2 Heads of Department (HoD's) are subjected to all but the last one, and the principals and their deputies to all twelve (ELRC, 2003). Educators have to undertake their own self-evaluations with this appraisal instrument, and then have it verified by a development support group (DSG) consisting of their senior management and one chosen staff colleague. This evaluation records educator's strengths and areas in need of development and serves as a baseline to inform the personal growth plan (PGP) of educators.

All educator PGP's are then put together by the Staff Development Team (SDT) whose implementation and training becomes the responsibility of the district office (ELRC, 2008). The new 2008 ELRC Resolution amendment proposed by the DoE asks for a “reasonable correlation between teacher scores and their learners' achievements.”

Districts and schools are now for the first time in a relationship of reciprocal accountability, since they both have to account to a lower level of authority while being supported by a higher level of departmental authority. Such a transparent educator-

initiated system of appraisal for development could, in theory, break the vicious cycle of continuous blame by the various education stakeholders.

The DoE further commissioned research on the IQMS implementation (Class Act, 2007) which examines some tensions and inconsistencies in the instrument itself and show how these are partly responsible for the unreliability of the IQMS results and outcomes. Like with the WSE policy, there are tensions in the educator component of the IQMS.

The first set of tensions comes from the selected educators' performance standards which do not focus on the primacy of teaching and learning as crucial variables in the teacher effectiveness literature. Such variables include time on task, appropriate use of textbooks and materials, good communication, motivation, and the importance of positive feedback, etc.

Another related issue is that there is again no direct focus on learner achievement data as a basis from which to reflect on what needs improvement in the design and delivery of teaching (Katz *et al*, 2005). Yet, individual classroom observation or supervision was not agreed upon by SADTU (2005) on grounds that teachers of poor schools struggle with difficult teaching conditions and demanding school policies which are not backed up with sufficient support and resources from the education department.

The second set of tensions comes from the kind of teacher accountability the IQMS performance management process promotes. This is a mild form of internal professional teacher accountability. The major difficulty lies in the assumption that teachers are proactive professionals who are committed to improve their practices by using their professional reflexive competences. Yet, most teachers and their DSGs do not know how to conduct an effective analysis of teacher performance and prioritize their development needs (Class Act, 2007) and have not been given sustained high quality training and opportunities to meet these new expectations.

The third set of tensions revolves around the appropriate support available to teachers to improve their practices. Some Gauteng Department of Education district officials and NGOs complain that the support given to struggling teachers is rarely translated into practice because of their poor attitudes, culture and commitment to improve. Districts also mention teacher recruitment as a major problem as some teachers should never have been appointed in their jobs. Many schools and teachers, in turn, blame the district and the poor quality of some district officials. They also mention that the department underestimated the demands of these reforms and the amount of continuous support needed.

In 2004, a Ministerial Committee was appointed to design a teacher education framework and in 2007, the *National Policy Framework for Teacher Education and Development* was completed to give greater coherence to quality teacher education in the school system. This new policy framework acknowledges the statutory responsibility of the DoE for planning and funding teacher education and development, and also acknowledges that different forms of professional support are needed for different kinds of teachers.

This is why a professional development system, coordinated by the South African Council on Education (SACE), faces serious challenges of changing negative teacher attitudes and culture towards continuous professional development and learning.

The fourth tension comes from the combination of appraisal for development and appraisal for performance measurement. Firstly, educators can become solely interested by the sanctions or rewards attached to the performance appraisal component. Instead of identifying their weaknesses and developmental needs, teachers will try to manipulate the system to qualify for a pay increase or progression. Second, many officials and school management question the combination of self- or school-led teacher appraisal for development and performance appraisal on grounds that such an approach was too advanced for an uneven school system still under (re)construction. Thus, while performance appraisal should be separate from appraisal for development, there is still a need to introduce capability procedures to achieve either.

Another problem with the combination in one instrument of appraisal for development and appraisal for performance is that appraisees (whether school management or districts) are asked to take the position of referee and player as teachers' advisers and monitors. This poses the inevitable questions of objectivity and rigour in the appraisal exercise.

The DoE-commissioned review of IQMS implementation (Class Act, 2007) confirmed these problems of unreliability. Dissatisfaction with the first round of IQMS appraisals led the DoE to address reliability and validity problems by giving effect to Section 3.9 of the 2003 *ELRC Collective Agreement 8*, according to which the quality of the IQMS processes and outcomes had to be verified externally.

By mid-2008, the DoE trained a new layer of highly professional moderators (around 100) to verify and ensure fairness and consistency across the nine provinces (DoE, 2008).

Finally, there remains the major issue of trust, credibility and commitment to change which requires effective departmental and school strategies to change perceptions and attitudes of most schools and teachers towards external evaluation.

Some implications

From this analysis on the existing policies, mechanisms, structures and processes of school and teacher evaluation, the following emerges:

1. the importance of evaluating or appraising the appropriate functions of organizations (department and schools) and staff work responsibilities that relate directly to the core function of teaching and learning;

2. the need to appoint quality evaluators/appraisers with a high level of professionalism and autonomy (from the departments and schools), and who themselves are subject to the monitoring and assessment of their performance;
3. the assurance that school and departmental leadership can act with greater authority in their accountability work and with more effective strategies in their supporting work, *and be supported in these roles*;
4. the importance of separating organizationally the function of performance appraisal or management of organizations (schools, districts...) and staff (officials, school-based personnel), from the function of development evaluation or appraisal; these two tasks should be conducted by different agencies;
5. the value that comes from evaluating the underlying causes behind the poor school and teacher performance by linking results to their context and to the departmental structures responsible for enabling schools and teachers. In that sense, what should be evaluated are the various levels of the education systems (national, provincial and district/circuit) and the way they mediate policies and delivery to schools;
6. the significance of monitoring the appropriateness of support for schools and teachers with the view to improving it; and
7. the requirement of aligning all quality assurance (QA) bodies, structures and processes to ensure their coherence and effectiveness at the level of schools and teachers; and
8. the necessity of developing an effective data management system to ensure that the different levels of (and actors in) the education system can access such information for school improvement purposes.

E. What we know from the international research on school evaluation and teacher appraisal

Is there a role for school and teacher evaluation in their improvement process? What are the links between school evaluation/teacher appraisal and improved student learning? Can school and teacher evaluation serve the purpose of monitoring as well as of developing schools and teachers? What are the similarities and differences of school/teacher evaluation for monitoring and for development and should they be performed by the same authority? If school/teacher evaluation is necessary for development and monitoring, then what should be evaluated, by whom and how? These questions are central to the concern of governments, policymakers, education change agents, and academic researchers concerned with transforming schools and boosting learning achievements throughout the world. And the same questions underpin the quest of the South African government to improve education quality after Apartheid.

What follows, then, is a brief survey of the international literature on school evaluation, teacher appraisal and student learning in response to one of the tasks assigned to the Ministerial Commission on the National Education Evaluation and Development Unit, namely, "to recommend mechanisms through which the evaluation and development of schools can be undertaken." The seven key questions selected for examination through the literature represent key tensions and concerns within the South African school and teacher evaluation and development context.

1. Internal or external evaluation?

School self-evaluation has the advantage of being a process which can mobilize school partners by reflecting on their own strengths and weaknesses and working together towards their development (McBeath, 1999). While it is true that school self-evaluation generates a sense of school ownership, it can also be of poor quality, especially if schools are complacent in their zones of comfort and play down their more difficult challenges, or if they do not have on-site professional evaluators (Grubb, 2000). This is where

external evaluation can be useful in verifying and enriching self-evaluation through a more professional and objective evaluation process.

External evaluation can provide a mirror in which the school sees a reflection of its own self. If the evaluation is not firmly evidence-based, the reflection is likely to be a distorted image. No national system of rigorous internal evaluation which includes not only general school performance, but also the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning, is known to exist in the absence of a criterion-based external evaluation process. Under such conditions, the external evaluation provides a model for the internal evaluation.

To secure mutual trust and professionalism within the school community, external evaluators should be brought onto an internal school evaluation panel, if applicable, for a short time period. Such combination capitalizes on the respective strengths of internal evaluators with their deeper understanding of the school-specific issues and challenges, while the external evaluator(s) act as mentors and add professional, comparative and objective evaluation expertise. It also provides an opportunity for school-based staff to develop greater professional evaluation expertise (Grubb 2000).

2. Evaluation of performance or evaluation for improvement?

Many school inspections systems are designed to audit the strengths and weaknesses of schools and to generate a process of school improvement. It is assumed that schools benefit from an evaluation of their performance because this is a generative process of school improvement. Yet Hopkins (1995) and his colleagues argue that it is important to distinguish between two different kinds of school evaluation.

The first kind is the evaluation **OF** school performance, which collects information on the school's performance, its pockets of excellence, strengths and weaknesses. Such school evaluation is often based on a standardized evaluation instrument, with pre-specified performance areas and explicit criteria to allow for a comparison of school performance across the system.

The second kind of evaluation is **FOR** school improvement and aims to identify the institution-specific priority problems to assist with that school's improvement goals and strategies. It is difficult to combine the two in one system as each of these evaluations has a different purpose, logic and instrumentation.

It might be helpful to view the first category as monitoring (how good the school is) and the second as evaluation (why it performs as it does and how it could improve). Evaluation values the school and carries not only judgmental but explanatory authority.

The Ofsted system of school inspection in the United Kingdom has often been criticized for claiming to be about 'improvement through inspection' (Hopkins *et al*, 1995). However, after many years of changing and improving the Ofsted inspection schedule, by 2004, significant evidence of improvements exist in the observed quality of teaching and learning, educational standards, and leadership and management, especially in the weaker schools which had been inspected (Matthew and Sammons 2004).

The same authors confirm that one of the biggest levers for school turnaround, as well as one of the most significant factors associated with school failure, is the quality of the principal (Matthews and Sammons 2005).

3. Evaluation for school support or performance monitoring?

It is often the case that high-performing school systems have split the two functions of school support and monitoring between different authorities and people, with the support pillar being done at district level and the accountability/monitoring pillar at provincial or national level (Middlewood and Cardno 2001). Such separation, however, led to problems of coherence between the support and monitoring interventions, especially when recommendations of the inspection units were found to be largely ignored by the departmental units in charge of school support. Working too often in silos, developmental units would organise their own support activities targeted at different aspects of school/teacher performance (Hopkins *et al*, 1995, Fitzgerald, 2001).

As a result, resentment and frustration with this situation spread among schools and teachers who felt confused by the different messages and focuses of the two units.

There are different ways of dealing with this challenge. The first is to improve the collaboration between the people/units in charge of school/teacher monitoring and school/teacher development and ensure a correspondence between the two, as one could easily dominate the other (Darling-Hammond, 1998). Thus, it was not the separation *per se* of these functions in different departmental units which was seen as the solution, but rather a better coordination and balance between the two.

However, another way to deal with the tension was put forward by scholars such as Middlewood and Cardno (2001) and Piggot Privine and Cardno (2005) who argue that the fusion of school/teacher accountability and development functions in one system with one instrument could enrich and complement one another and have a greater impact on schools and teachers (Bartlett, 2000). However, they also acknowledge that further tensions were likely to arise with such a fusion and that the leadership (at school or district level) had to ensure they could manage and mediate these tensions and ensure that accountability and support work together to assist schools to improve.

For example, a typical tension in this combination derives from school monitors/supervisors at district and school level being expected to act as both players and referees at the same time. This could lead to some form of collusion which could, in turn, undermine the rigour of the school evaluation processes. Only with highly professional evaluators could such a system work effectively.

In an unequal and immature schooling system, such as in South Africa, one could argue that such combined system presents predictable problems as it is too advanced for the dire operational realities and existing capacities of schools and districts (de Clercq, 2008). An additional problem in combining teacher appraisal for development and performance monitoring in one system is that some teachers would be tempted to comply with the sole desire of satisfying the rewards system attached to the performance appraisal component. Teachers could manipulate the system to qualify for

a pay increase or progression, instead of identifying their weaknesses and developmental needs.

This is why in any evaluation system it is important to monitor the evaluators and the professionalism of their work, as well as the school cultures within which such evaluation is to unfold.

4. Focus versus coverage?

An important consideration in appraisal and evaluation is what exactly is to be evaluated. A comprehensive evaluation schema usually consists of a series of inputs, processes or outcomes, the selection of which often reflect the main evaluation purpose. Evaluation areas are not ends in themselves but serve a purpose. They also are important because of their relationship to, and impact on, other school variables. Too often evaluation items make up a long list of variables or checklist which does not provide much insight on what is going on [or not] in a school.

The international literature is also clear that school evaluation should not be cumbersome and time-consuming but should focus directly on the essential factors that explain how and with what effects schools teach their students. Hopkins and McGilchrist (1998) argue that the school improvement research (Henneveld and Craig, 1996) shows that the core function of schooling—teaching and learning—needs to be the main focus of evaluation. Sinnema (2005) confirms that effective school evaluations are those which encourage teachers to examine classroom practices and learner activities by having explicit evaluation questions about the link between teaching and learning. Katz *et al* (2003) go further and recommend that school evaluation should start with learners' achievement results and that teachers should use these as a basis from which to reflect on and assess what exactly in their teaching needs improvement in order to impact positively on academic results.

Current practice in England requires the school to maintain a self-evaluation process and record the findings on a 'school evaluation form' (SEF) which is updated annually.

Not only do all staff contribute evidence-based evaluations to this composite picture, but the views of students and parents must also be sought. The SEF provides the basis of the SIP and plays an important role when the school is inspected. Most schools now consider the SEF to be a useful management tool.

The discussion of what to monitor in schools cannot be complete without an understanding of the possible causes for poor performance. Schools and their teachers are located inside a nested system and are not alone in influencing student learning. Although they are most directly responsible for learning achievements, there are also other factors that have a bearing on learning attainments such as the parent community, the district and province, and the national education department. An evaluation schedule or instrument should therefore be comprehensive enough to allow evaluators to assess these spatial variables that impact on academic achievement in the classroom. In other words, evaluation is not about simply accounting for achievements up and down the chain of influences on classroom behaviours; it is about relating the chain of influences to that single most important variable: learner achievement.

5. Expertise or inclusion?

The success or failure of school evaluation depends on the professional quality and rigour of the inspectors and their reports (Matthews and Sammons, 2006). This touches on the important dimension of the credibility and legitimacy of an evaluation report. Schools are likely to accept the evaluation and its results if they respect and recognize the professionalism, competences and authority of the evaluators.

External evaluators have the advantage of having accumulated evaluative experiences across different schools, whereas internal evaluators will understand more rapidly the context of the school and its learners. As indicated earlier, by allowing external and internal authorities to operate side by side, it is more likely that these evaluations will have an impact on schools (Grubb, 2000).

Inspections in England currently include some dual observations of lessons involving the principal or other senior staff and the inspector, the latter taking responsibility for the quality and accuracy of the teachers' observation. Inspection is depersonalised as far as possible, focusing on teaching rather than teachers. Wherever possible, processes such as teaching and leadership are evaluated in terms of their impact on learning achievement rather than for their own sake. Schools who use the same criteria for self evaluation are becoming increasingly adept at making good judgments about teaching and learning.

6. Accountability or Support?

Another important question concerns what kind of mix of accountability and support schools need to change and improve (Fullan, 1991, 2003). The idea of school evaluation is never a practice that is easy for schools and teachers to embrace. This is because school evaluation is often perceived as a form of external accountability and departmental control.

It is therefore important to impress on schools the need to account for what they do and offer to students by showing them the concrete benefits that could derive from accountability-based improvement. Schools should be shown that such monitoring or evaluation is not simply about their employers checking on what they do and produce.

Schools should be convinced that evaluations are there to be followed-through with some kind of support or mobilisation of support capacity to assist schools in the identified areas in which they need to develop and improve. As Barber and Phillips (2000) argue, there should be an appropriate balance of school accountability and support. Too often, school evaluations or inspections claim to be generative of school improvement processes but often stop there because they do not conceptualize follow-through support as a critical element of the accounting plan. Apart from learning about their strengths and weaknesses, schools should be able to see how evaluation can lead to more appropriate and focused forms of school support.

Various kinds of evaluation follow-up action apply in the United Kingdom. In Scotland, inspectors re-visit the school a year later to assess progress against recommendations made. In England, all schools indicating concern are followed up by an HMI² every six months until they are deemed to have improved to at least a satisfactory level.

Support interventions, which are the responsibility of the education department, have to be designed with the schools' main issues in mind. Since no 'one-size-intervention-fits-all-schools' (Hopkins and Levine, 2001), the support will have to target each school with the right mix of variables for turning around poor academic performance.

7. Tradition or change?

Reviewing the quality assurance systems in selected countries, different legacies, cultures and traditions are evident. Cyprus, for example, with its centralised state education system, has a teacher evaluation scheme, or an annual process conducted by inspectors together with the head teachers, which aims at teacher promotion rather than teacher improvement (Kyriakides and Campbell, 2003). In Hong Kong and New Zealand, where the education system is quite decentralised, the education department guides and trains school leaders, while requiring each school to design its own staff appraisal system whereby teachers are evaluated for their administrative duties for promotion rather than for improvement of their classroom teaching practices.

In other relatively decentralised schooling systems, such as the Netherlands, the teacher functions are split: teacher evaluation is performed by principals while the inspectorate is in charge of school evaluation (Reetzigt *et al*, 2003). In the UK, teacher evaluation is also done by head-teachers as an internal process, although there have been attempts in the last decade at introducing nation-wide teacher evaluation schemes, some of which link teacher evaluation to pupil outcomes (Reynolds *et al*, 2003).

Thus, in most of these developed countries, teacher evaluation systems are mainly designed for accountability or promotion purposes and are therefore not explicitly

² Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools

linked to teacher improvement. This could be a consequence of different histories and struggles located within national cultures. Teacher trade unions usually resist the links between teacher evaluation and improvement and some scholars even argue that such a link between the two is tenuous because teaching is a craft that does not lend itself to quick scientific measurement and resolution.

What is clear from this literature is that changes to existing evaluation and monitoring systems is enabled or constrained by the history of such practices within particular national cultures. This does not mean radical or transformative changes cannot happen; it simply means that leadership plays a crucial role in terms of what is possible in shifting evaluation and monitoring cultures in radically different directions.

Conclusion

These tensions must be read within the context of a broader set of literatures on what makes schools effective. Indeed, a wealth of school effectiveness research in the last 20 years has illuminated factors which contribute most to school improvement and the achievements of learners.

In a major review of the literature commissioned by Ofsted, England, Sammons (1995) and his team identified eleven key factors:

1. Professional leadership (leading professional, participative approach, firm and purposeful)
2. Purposeful teaching (efficient organization, structured lessons, adaptive practice, clarity)
3. Concentration on teaching and learning (maximizing learning time, academic emphasis, focus on achievement)
4. Learning environment (an orderly and attractive working environment)
5. Shared vision and goals (unity of purpose, consistency of practice, collegiality and cooperation)
6. Positive reinforcement (clear and fair discipline, feedback)

7. High expectations (for all – educators and learners, communicating expectations, providing intellectual challenge)
8. Pupil rights and expectations (raising learner self esteem, positions of responsibility, control of work)
9. Monitoring progress (monitoring learner progress, evaluating school performance)
10. A learning organization (school-based staff development)
11. Home-school partnership (parental involvement)

This line of research has been internationally influential. For example, a vigorous drive to raise educational standards in Victoria, Australia, adapted the eleven characteristics and assigned priority to professional leadership, a focus on teaching and learning and purposeful teaching.

McKinsey's (2007) authoritative and topical international review of what makes the difference between the performance of different education systems recognized that "in many cases, extraneous factors hold back change and these problems need to be tackled first to enable the school system to implement policies and processes that will improve student performance."

But the McKinsey review identified three guiding principles on which to base change:

- '1. the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers;
2. the only way to improve outcomes is to improve instruction; and
3. achieving universally high outcomes is only possible by putting in place mechanisms to ensure that schools deliver high-quality instruction to every child.'

This suggests that the quality of teaching and learning, school leadership, and the capacity to improve, should be at the heart of whole school evaluation.

Some education systems, such as those of South Korea and Singapore, have focused on these principles and turned their schools around in a remarkably short time; others have made little impact. Change is not, however, simply a matter of levels of investment in education. Singapore spent less on primary education than 27 of the 30 countries in the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) states. The USA, by contrast, increased public spending per student by 73% after allowing for inflation and reduced class sizes substantially; yet here the reading scores of 9 year-olds, 13 year-olds and 17 year-olds remained the same in 2005 as they had been 25 years earlier (McKinsey).

Conclusion

Having offered a critical description and review of national policies concerned with school and teacher evaluation and development, and having placed this discussion in comparative and international contexts, the Report now turns to the key findings to emerge from the evidence collected in the course of this study.

F. KEY FINDINGS

This short but intense investigation into education evaluation and development yielded a wide range of data on the state of the education system in South Africa. Unfortunately, not all this information—the submissions, the interviews, the documentary evidence—can be represented in this Report. The Committee restricts itself therefore only to those findings that have a direct bearing on the Brief: to advise the Minister on the establishment of a National Education Evaluation and Development Unit. In this regard, the Committee tables 14 key findings.

- 1. that there is broad recognition of the crisis in education and the limitations of existing evaluation instruments to, in themselves, remedy the situation*

Throughout the country, in each of the provinces, from government officials, unionists, and teachers alike, the Committee heard the strongest expressions of concern, often in very passionate terms, that there was an indisputable crisis in education, and that it needed to be resolved as a matter of urgency. The unanimity of the response lent courage to this report; indeed, it would be a serious mistake to underestimate the depth and intensity of concern among all education stakeholders.

The crisis in education cannot, of course, be simply linked to the limitations of existing evaluation strategies; nor can the various instruments for monitoring and assessment, in themselves, resolve this crisis. Still, whatever is being done through monitoring and evaluation, it has not shifted education performance in the desired direction at a systemic level.

This means that whatever is proposed by this Committee in terms of an accounting system on the status of schooling, such proposals must be read in the context of systemic collapse of schooling, at least for the bottom half of the education system. This does not mean that schools do not operate on a daily basis with some degree of functionality; it simply means that whatever is happening (or not happening) inside

schools, it has not altered the unmistakeable fact that the academic achievement of learners as a whole does not match the levels of investment in the school system.

This does not mean, also, that there are not pockets of excellence within the school system, among districts, and even within provincial structures. The Committee found striking evidence of exceptionality. Such observations, on the one hand, give cause for hope but on the other hand give cause for concern—since the school system cannot be transformed as a system on the basis of exceptional performance among the few. It is fundamental to the vision of government that all schools succeed and that all learners achieve. But having excellent models of good schools—especially in disadvantaged communities—is a priceless resource when trying to lift the standard and improve the practice of the rest of the education system.

The proposals that follow in this report take full account of the systemic crisis around public schools, and seek to convey a measure of realism about what is possible under such conditions with respect to evaluation and monitoring. At the same time, the proposals convey an urgency in which the significance of monitoring and evaluation under such conditions are clearly spelt out.

- 2. that there is widespread consensus on the need for stronger accountability measures alongside developmental support to be introduced into the school system*

The Committee finds that the present system for school accountability is weak, uneven and limited in scope. The accountability system is weak because of a pervasive culture of resistance to strong measures of accountability within schools. The deep negativity towards the apartheid inspection system should not be ignored in the way government crafts a new and comprehensive system of accountability touching all schools.

Stakeholders interviewed testified readily to resistance among organized teachers to classroom visits and observation by officials from the provincial departments of education. The Committee found that in some provinces, and in some districts of other provinces, such external observation was allowed and sometimes even welcomed. Often

the nature of local school politics and the skills of a particular department official could make access to classrooms easier or more difficult. But what this means is that in terms of access to schools and classrooms, there is considerable unevenness in the national system.

The Committee also found that while teachers were often singled out for attention in public and media criticism of failing schools, the accountability net stretches wider than individual teachers. The Committee heard harrowing stories of incompetent and incapacitated district officials. The Committee heard repeated stories of the lack of coordination of support at the level of provinces. The Committee also heard of the confusion generated by the plethora of policies that placed heavier and heavier administrative demands on teachers that drew professionals away from the classroom into never-ending paperwork.

What this means is that proposals for new systems of accountability must of necessity account for performance at all levels from the teacher, to the principal, to the governors, to the district, provincial and national department authorities. While the teacher is undoubtedly the most important influence on learning in the classroom, the extent to which the act of teaching is nested within other supporting contexts cannot be overstated.

The current system for accountability relies heavily on terminal examinations, in the case of Grade 12 learners, and on systemic evaluation which targets only selected grades (3, 5 and 9) and that on a sampling basis i.e. it is not an account of every school, classroom and learner. A national system of accountability including learner assessment data but also other kinds of data (such as teacher knowledge and classroom support) must form part of the proposed comprehensive system for monitoring and evaluation of schools.

3. *that there is reluctance in some quarters to change existing monitoring and evaluation initiatives not only because of the potential disruption but also because recent measures (such as IQMS) have not yet had enough time for expression in educational practice*

The Committee found a pervasive sense of reform fatigue among South African teachers. Whether it was curriculum change or assessment reform or new educator regulations, teachers were tired of “yet another” round of changes to their work.

This sense of being overwhelmed by never-ending external demands on their work predisposes teachers towards apathy, at best, and resentment, at worst, in the light of what is interpreted as another round of changes through NEEDU. Teachers felt strongly that teaching time was eroded by the distractions of countless policy changes.

In this context, there was a need expressed that existing and still relatively new measures, such as the IQMS, be allowed to run its course in all schools before changing the earlier attempt to streamline three previous reforms (DAS, PM and WSE) into a single measurement instrument. In other words, to introduce another form of appraisal just as teachers were becoming familiar with IQMS would send the wrong signal to practitioners.

In this respect it was clear to the Committee that despite firmly expressed views on the limitations of IQMS, this policy enjoyed political support through the ELRC agreement, and that this consensus process had to be taken into account. Moreover, it appears that in some provinces the core staff working with schools on IQMS was establishing some operational rhythms in the implementation and was understandably reluctant to change again.

It would not complete the picture, though, if the Committee did not also report confusion and incapacity in other provinces where IQMS has hardly got off the ground. In fact, it is reported that the recently appointed “moderators,” whose work it is to judge the adequacy of implementation, have been able to visit more schools in certain provinces than the IQMS district/circuit personnel.

The judgment of this Committee is that there is no evidence, at this point, that IQMS in its present form will be able to serve as an effective mechanism for accountability; on the other hand, there might be a case for continuance with further refinement and refocusing of IQMS with particular attention to learning achievements. This will also offer some confidence to teachers and officials concerned about the withdrawal and replacement of IQMS.

4. *that there is considerable variation in the capacity of provinces and schools for the interpretation and implementation of existing evaluation and development measures*

For historical reasons that are well-understood, the better resourced provinces are better able to *technically* administer Whole School Evaluation, IQMS and other monitoring and evaluation policy instruments. However, the technical capacity to administer national policy does not necessarily translate into the managerial capacity to bring about change and improvement in all schools.

Still, the Committee was on the one hand impressed with the craft and capacity available in some provinces, the strengths of the professional teams, the quality of the documentation, the institutionalization of policy processes, the strategic thinking orientation of the leadership in the bureaucracy, the intellectual scrutiny applied to school evaluation and teacher support, and the general dedication of key staff.

The Committee was on the other hand concerned about the lack of skill and capacity in other provinces, the weakness and uncertainty among designated staff, the incomplete and inadequate documentation, the confusion about policy and planning processes, the crisis management ethos in the department, the lack of opportunities to stand back from operational work, and the sense of lethargy in parts of the system.

It is clear to the Committee that the now overused adage used to criticize policy positions and planning strategies—that one-size fits all—applies not only at the level of schools but also at the level of districts and provinces. In order to attain uniformity of

educational outcomes across the country, it will be crucial that a phased and strategic approach be followed that recognizes both the diversity and the inequality still resident in parts of the education system and its capacity to respond to the needs of teachers and their schools.

The problem also calls for greater proportionality between expectations on schools and their capacity to meet them. School improvement planning depends on an accurate assessment of strengths and areas for improvement, and this in turn requires training, practice and experienced support or mentoring. It is also a characteristic of schools not used to internal evaluation that they find the ordering of priorities difficult, particularly when asked to prioritise measures which will be of greatest benefit to the achievement of learners and the standards they meet. Similarly, external evaluators are prone to listing too many recommendations in weaker schools which lack the capacity to deal with them.

Once again mentoring can be invaluable; in the experience of the Independent Quality Assurance Agency (IQAA) in South Africa,

[the] approach is one of mentored internal evaluation for purposes of development. The [trained] school personnel form the nucleus of an internal evaluation team and once a school has booked an evaluation a mentor is appointed to work with them as they undertake their evaluation...The IQAA method depends largely for success on the quality, commitment and enthusiasm of the mentors, as well as on their manner and tone while in the schools

What these observations reinforce is the critical role of dedicated and skilled professionals if any form of monitoring and evaluation is going to work in South Africa's fractured school system. It is especially important that those charged with the delivery of vitally needed training and support be consummate professionals with the capacity to advise and direct teachers and schools, and win their respect on the basis of such capacity and credibility.

This is the single most important lesson that must guide the appointment of key personnel for the proposed National Education Evaluation and Development Unit. Where the appointments processes are sloppy, and where people are appointed for political or other irrelevant reasons, the entire monitoring and evaluation infrastructure for schools is compromised. It is also important that the proposed unit draws on the expertise and capacity within the relatively well-resourced provinces and bring such professionals to the centre of the national monitoring and evaluation function.

5. *that both authority and expertise at all levels (teacher, HOD, principal, school, district, province, national) remain important requirements for effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation*

The Committee finds that in order for an effective and credible system of accountability with respect to schools to be established, both authority and expertise is needed.

Expertise should provide the backbone of the NEEDU proposal requiring, as explained earlier, highly trained, competent and experienced professionals to take charge of the monitoring and evaluation of schools and teachers.

However, expertise will mean little unless the experts are endowed with the authority to observe classrooms, evaluate teachers and principals, advise on support strategies, propose penalties to act on bad behaviour, and make judgments about schools. Without such authority, experts would not be able to impact on the school system in a constructive manner. This point was made repeatedly in written submissions to the Committee, such as the following sentiment by Khulisa Management Services:

... one of the key concerns that we have noted working as evaluators and auditors of the DoE is the need for authority. When the Consortium goes into schools, it has only minimal authority vested in us through the DoE letter, which is not always recognised or accepted by the schools (for example: principals refusing access and in one memorable case, abducting and holding a fieldworker)

The Catholic Institute in its submission is strident in its recommendations on the question of authority and independence: "An independent unit for evaluation should be granted wide powers of oversight and monitoring. In making the unit accountable to the Minister, we run the risk of future executive interference."

The insistence on authority does not, of course, mean that anything goes when approaching schools. Visiting times would have to be negotiated; structured feedback could and should be demanded; evidence for judgments should be shared professionally; accounts should be sensitive to matters of context and resources in particular; and developmental follow-up can and should be required. But none of these conditions should be allowed to stand in the way of, even deny, access of designated experts to schools and classrooms.

In this regard, it is important that any observation-based evaluation takes due account of barriers to, and enablers of, effective teaching.

Such authority for officials to enter schools can only partly be secured through legislation. It also has to be established through political agreement with the unions, on the one hand, and through authoritative support from government, on the other hand. There is evidence in the recent history of monitoring and evaluation agreements between unions and government that despite consensus achieved through negotiations, access can still be denied or delayed at the school gate or the classroom door.

This Committee recommends a *political compact* between unions and government that lend authority to monitoring and evaluation experts to enter schools and classrooms in every province and district of the country.

Authority and expertise exist in a symbiotic relationship inside schools. Experts gain their authority on the basis of superior knowledge and professional approach. This implies a programme of thorough training for experts so that their ability to advise and transform schools through their actions gains them credibility in the eyes of local practitioners.

6. *that deeper and more fundamental problems (e.g. curriculum organization, time on task, school dysfunctionality) undermine sophisticated efforts to monitor and evaluate school and teacher performance*

Monitoring and evaluation, as indicated earlier, cannot resolve systemic collapse. The Committee received consistent reports from schools about confusion, suspicion and at times outrage about the underlying dysfunctionality of schools.

Teachers and principals report on time lost because of absentee teachers, incompetent principals, and under-prepared district officials. The culture of teaching and learning has, for all intents and purposes, disappeared from especially rural and township schools.

The crucial variable of time is lost through inattentiveness to instruction, on the one hand, and the distraction of administrative work, on the other hand. The Committee finds ready confirmation of the simple fact that schools are highly unequal in terms of their attention to instructional time in classrooms.

It was instructive for the Committee to listen to the principals of turnaround schools. Over and over again school leadership emerged as the critical force in transforming schools from dysfunction into productivity. Whatever it is that NEEDU does, its critical interventions will have to hinge on the school leaders, especially principals, if schools are to deliver education quality.

There also appears to be continuing problems around curriculum. There is still suspicion about outcomes based education and whether or not it is the policy-in-practice of government. There remain, in some provinces, very articulate expressions by school managers and teachers about the failure of curriculum implementation to address the basic competences of literacy and numeracy in schools. The Committee heard harrowing stories about official instructions to raise test scores across the board to compensate for curriculum failure.

The Committee also felt that the lack of clarity around the specific learning outcomes and achievements at the end of each phase (e.g. the foundation phase) might also contribute to the lack of curriculum effectiveness in schools.

In other words, there are both external (in terms of district support, for example) and internal (such as curriculum organization) factors that would make it difficult for *any* system of monitoring and evaluation to be effective.

7. that the system for evaluating teachers and schools is still considerably immature, with the incapacity for self-scrutiny among many (though certainly not all) professionals

The Committee found that internal evaluation was simply unlikely to produce valid and reliable results especially when such evaluation was part of the chain of data for decision-making about teacher compensation and advancement. As was the case with continuous assessment, when schools are left to make their own judgments about scholastic performance, those results are often out of sync with more objective, external measures of the same achievements.

The ideal of internal evaluation must be upheld. It advances professionalism and promotes democratic participation when teachers and indeed schools are allowed to participate in evaluations of their own performance and capabilities. It should in fact be the aim in every school to build a culture of monitoring and evaluation – by teachers, peers and leaders – which is developmental in purpose. In such a culture, teachers learn from each other, share and consult on their planning, and observe lessons among themselves. Here the views of learners are also sought and the school grows as a learning community.

However, this ideal is not attainable in an immature education system which is highly uneven in resources and capacity. In this regard the Umalusi submission warns against “instruments [that] are developed to address homogenous school communities” and in a separate submission, the experienced educationist Professor Richard van der Ross

similarly cautions against “the narrow interpretation of equity” that makes the same demands on diverse communities and school cultures.

For internal evaluation to work—that is, where teachers and their peers make judgments about their own labour—it requires the capacity for self-criticism and for objective judgment. This does not exist in the South African school system (and we suspect outside of it in the broader society) for a complex of reasons. In this respect the Committee does not believe that this problem is primarily one concerning the technical expertise of teachers for self-evaluation.

First, there are real questions of solidarity. A culture has developed in South African schools in which teachers gravitate readily towards a defensive position of support and camaraderie especially in relation to perceived external threats. Given the lingering sensitivities around the external evaluation of teachers and teachers’ work, teachers work to protect their colleagues and to seek maximum advantage for their peers. To act “professionally” in making judgments about your peers based on detached, objective assessments of what a colleague can/cannot do, is frowned upon in this culture of solidarity.

Second, there are questions of collegiality. Should colleagues criticize each other? Is there not a collegial bond that prohibits such judgment by another colleague or peer? Are there not professional bonds in the working environment that preclude judgment by others? Just as solidarity imposes a political constraint on peer judgment, collegiality imposes a professional constraint on the same.

In the short-term, the only way to moderate internal evaluation is to balance it with a strong sense of external evaluation. In the long-term, the task should be to reconstruct notions of solidarity and collegiality by foregrounding the primary interests of the child.

As schools engage in self-evaluation, their efforts should be supported by training and guidance. Credit should be given to self-evaluation reports which are frank and open about what the school does well, and what it needs to do better; evidence-based,

accurate self-evaluation reports, which include the views of stakeholders, should be acknowledged. At the same time, self-evaluation reports that tender excuses, cover up, engage in blame, and breed complacency, should be discredited.

The Commission feels that it is important not to lower expectations of teachers, any more than one would of learners. But, equally, teachers need to be given the tools, training and opportunities to meet those expectations.

There is also an urgent need for a nation-wide strategy for the re-professionalisation of education provision which is not confined to teachers but which includes administrators and officials responsible for the support and development of teachers and principals, among others.

8. *that the issue of excessive complexity in existing evaluation instruments is still not resolved inside the crowded ecology of evaluation, appraisal, and development policies, plans and processes*

The introduction of IQMS was supposed to address a common complaint about the main monitoring and evaluation instruments at the time: the Development Appraisal System (or DAS), the Whole School Evaluation (or WSE) policy, and Performance Measurement (PM). Yet despite the fact that the IQMS was to “streamline” evaluation instruments, there is still considerable confusion among practitioners in the field about the status of these various policies and how they relate to each other.

For example, IQMS did not replace WSE for there are still “units” in some provinces conducting WSE in a weak relationship to the IQMS processes. It does not help that WSE's founding document claims that this policy “does not interfere with” any other evaluation-related policies.

There is still not sufficient clarity of distinction between DAS and PM, a point raised also in other review reports (see Class Act 2007). There is still confusion between SIPs

(School Improvement Plans) and SDP's (School Development Plans), and the corresponding plans for districts.

The policy language in IQMS remains abstract and ambiguous lending itself to multiple and conflicting interpretations across the education system e.g. the meanings of rating descriptors and performance standards.

The purposes and locations of these different policies contribute to the confusion. At national level, for example, IQMS and WSE fall under different directorates (though officials rush to say this is being corrected). Similarly, at provincial level these monitoring and evaluation functions fall under a range of different units and directorates each with their own logic, resources, capacities and meanings. The Committee also found that some provinces are quite adept at interpreting and re-interpreting IQMS for their own purposes (for example, the moderation instruments) so that what the policy looks like in one province might be very different in another province.

The complexity resides not only in policy design across these various instruments, but also in their implementation. Once again the variable capacity in the provinces for making sense of these various instruments leads to a wide range of implementation approaches and outcomes. In some provinces and districts, Development Support Groups function well, while in others IQMS is simply another burden for which there is simply no time or capacity. In this regard teacher unions like the Suid Afrikaanse Onderwysers Unie were adamant in its submission that "The implementation of NEEDU must under no circumstances imply an additional administrative burden for educators."

It is not the lack of uniformity but the lack of common purpose that is in question in this confusing array of monitoring and evaluation policies and plans. The goal should be "simplicity and significance" argues Professor Maureen Robinson in her submission to this Committee, rather than "a complex infrastructure."

9. *that the existing system for evaluation and appraisal faces a growing credibility crisis because of the functional breakdown between school/teacher evaluation and developmental follow-through actions to effectively address problems identified*

The Committee found a generally positive attitude among teachers and principals towards monitoring and evaluation through interventions like IQMS and WSE. In some provinces professionals testified openly about the value of expert visits, the opening-up of educational work to outside scrutiny, the positive advice shared, and the first opportunities to engage with peers about teaching and learning inside the school.

What disturbed these school staff was that after having their expectations lifted, the intervention would come to an abrupt halt. There would be no follow-up visits. There was no action on the data collected. Having sacrificed the time and resources to provide documentation and evidence for their work, the school and its staff would not hear again from the visitors. In some provinces, this emotional disconnect with monitoring and evaluation was expressed strongly.

At this point the blame game begins. The school blames the evaluators. The expert staff who did the visit blames the districts. The districts blame the provincial authorities. The provinces blame the national department. The fact remains, the schools feel they were "set up" and that there was no development benefits to their participation in these processes.

The Committee feels strongly that for future monitoring and evaluation to enjoy credibility among educational professionals, it must be followed-up strongly and quickly with concrete development gains for the schools and teachers concerned. There is already a despondency and deflation among teachers and principals because of the added demands on their work; not to demonstrate positive gains for their participation in external evaluations is to completely lose the attention and motivation of those on the ground.

Credibility rests with identifying not only observed strengths in place but also the barriers to effective learning. Follow-up action must lead to a mechanism for referring those problems that reside outside the school's control and providing support and guidance for those that problems that can be resolved within the authority of the school.

Such problems are not unique to South Africa, but have been successfully confronted elsewhere by strategies such as:

- assessment of the performance of the local authority responsible for schools;
- co-option of a representative of the school staff onto WSE teams;
- follow up visits by an external evaluator after a set period of time to assess the extent to which recommendations have been implemented, and the factors which enabled or acted as barriers to implementation;
- joint observations of lessons with the principal or other staff so as to assess the capacity for internal evaluation; and the
- increased use of experienced and effective principals as mentors to those facing significant challenges.

The Committee's proposals will further show that it is important to separate inspection and evaluation from development and support; that is, those who make judgments about school or teacher performance cannot be the same persons who provide the development function. Yet separating these functions carries the risk of non-delivery unless there is a functional or organizational mechanism that binds these two tasks.

Whichever route is followed, the Committee wants it to be clear that the credibility of evaluative interventions in the future depends crucially on the evidence of practical support and follow-up among those evaluated.

10. that the co-mingling of developmentally-focused evaluation and remuneration-focused appraisal compromises the validity of measures of school or teacher performance

The Committee found that where evaluation measures were related to remuneration, it provided less valid or reliable information for decision-making. That is, the pressure to boost compensation within the system distorts any value that evaluation-for-development measures might have. This is what was referred to earlier as an immature system where the chances of objective, evidence-based information are reduced because of compensation pressures.

Teachers and schools focus more attentively on matters of development and change when the only outcome of interest is how to improve the conditions of teaching and attainments of learning. There is far less pressure, with such a focus, to artificially boost achievements for non-educational purposes.

The Committee therefore strongly recommends that the two important functions be separated: data used to make decisions about levels of teacher remuneration, and data used to make decisions about development support. This does not mean that the system is already mature enough to respond credibly and accurately to development-driven inspection or evaluation; it simply means that an additional pressure to boost achievements artificially is now removed.

The complete separation of the two data sets is, of course, not achievable in (or recommended for) practice. Those working with school improvement will be interested in aggregate as well as individual teacher performance data in order to transform teaching, learning and managing in a particular school environment. Those making decisions about remuneration would invariably draw on performance data (among other kinds of evidence) in making compensation judgments.

Provided the “drawing down” of teacher data happens under two separate authorities, and provided teachers are clear what the data is being used for (development versus

compensation), there should be no conflict of purposes where the goal is remuneration, on the one hand, and improvement, on the other hand.

The evidence-based remuneration function rightly belongs within the national Department of Education from which base the necessary salary negotiations with unions and other parties would proceed. The evidence-based developmental function is ideally located within the provincial departments of education from where training and support interventions are launched in the schools. The Committee will recommend that such a capacity for separate development support is crucial to the work of the proposed NEEDU.

11. *that in practice the evaluation instruments do not monitor the impact of policy on teaching and learning; they monitor policy compliance*

The Committee heard that many schools and teachers perceive some of the IQMS school and educator performance standards to be directed at the monitoring of policy implementation. These teachers felt that the evaluation items are designed to give the department more control over whether schools and teachers comply with the new policy directives. Given the long history of teacher suspicion of external interference in schools, the policy monitoring function of government officials does not help change attitudes.

The Committee was told that the existing list of performance standards is cumbersome and time-consuming as it generates considerable volumes of paperwork for heads of departments, and that it did not really capture adequately the most important core function of schooling, namely the level of learning achieved in schools among their particular learners.

Teachers also felt that there should be performance standards that are quicker and easier to deal with, and that what should enjoy greater attention in monitoring and evaluation is their work with learners and the reasons why academic underperformance continues in the schools responsible for these learners.

District and provincial officials also confirmed that the evaluation instruments made it difficult for them to monitor the quality of teaching and learning occurring in different schools, quite apart from the causes for such low levels of education quality.

The evaluation instruments focus on useful aspects of the work of schools and teachers but do not allow officials to identify and probe into the real causes behind the level of performance.

The monitoring of policy implementation and the establishment of compliance with government policy are, of course, important bureaucratic and administrative functions.

But where concerns with policy fidelity become the sole or overriding preoccupation of government officials working with the schools, there are two negative consequences. One is that teachers begin to feel “probed” rather than assisted more effectively by the provincial departments to improve their practice; the other is that the policy (*policy* understood for the moment as *a formal declaration of official intent*) itself escapes scrutiny as a possible problem contributing to school, teacher or learner failure.

The lesson for a new National Education Evaluation and Development Unit would be, of course, to keep these two ambitions in balance—monitoring compliance and facilitating improvement at the school level.

12. that the failure to separate curriculum support and advisory roles from curriculum monitoring roles constrains the credibility of both

The Committee heard many schools and teachers complain about some curriculum advisers who, when they visit schools, do not manage to provide adequate support to teachers. And yet when teachers are monitored for their work performance by the same district officials, they are accused of not implementing properly what they were asked to do.

These schools and teachers felt that there was a problem with districts being expected to support and monitor teachers at the same time, as they were then acting as both players and referees in the education drama. If some of these district officials do not support teachers properly, it is not fair for teachers to be monitored by them.

What was missing in the system, it was said, is an independent authority which could evaluate the supporting work of these district officials in schools. If not, then officials should in turn be evaluated by the schools and teachers they serve

However, the Committee also heard from some district officials that there are some teachers who do receive support but who are reluctant to change and implement what

they were trained or taught on back in their classroom. The reasons include the lack of support in the school environment for those returning from training; and of course the risk and the discomfort of disturbing familiar and comfortable pedagogical, curricular and administrative routines.

This double role of advisers and monitors did not exist in the case of the WSE. Indeed, the Committee heard that the WSE supervisors monitor schools but are not expected to support them except through the recommendations made in their report. District officials, together with the schools, are expected to act on the reports of the supervising monitors, and support schools in specified areas of concern. This situation felt more acceptable to many of our respondents.

The implications of separation are, of course, not this simple. By separating the two functions (monitoring and support) there is the threat of distancing these roles. By combining them there is, as shown, the threat of confusing the two roles in the experiences of teachers.

The proposed National Education Evaluation and Development Unit will have to recognize this tension, and work around it so as to address both the governmental function to monitor and the professional obligation to improve schools and teachers.

13. that there is an unspoken complicity between school and district that compromises the monitoring of IQMS educator performance

The Committee investigated the problem of reliability in the IQMS ratings, as reported also in the Class Act report. It heard from many schools and teachers that it was very difficult to make an objective interpretation of school or teacher performance out of context. Although the IQMS acknowledges that contextual factors can influence the final ratings, the scoring process remains a very difficult one because of the high amount of subjectivity in the interpretation of scores.

Some district officials also mentioned that at this stage of the reconstruction of the education system, it was not a good idea to have internal teacher appraisal, especially appraisals that combine professional development and performance management. This explains why teachers were keen to assign high scores in order to receive the payment reward. District officials also mentioned how difficult it was to moderate teacher scores as educators and their development support groups often argued that they did the best they could under poor school conditions and the challenging circumstances from which the learners come.

In the end, many district officials agreed that they did not change many of the original scores of teachers. It was the interpretation of the Committee that, because districts and schools felt both overwhelmed by policy demands and paper work, they felt it easier to accept teachers' initial scores. Such acceptance of teacher's scores was also a way to prevent critical attention being visited on the districts and their officials because of the low scores of schools and teachers under their control.

14. that leadership is critical at provincial and school level to make the best out of the complexity of evaluation and development efforts and instruments

The issue of evaluation and development will always be a complex and contested issue in schools. However, through its work with the principals who manage to turn-around struggling schools, the Committee found that strong and credible leadership on the ground can mediate and manage interventions such as external evaluation in ways that advance school improvement.

Because of the reluctance of many teachers to change in relation to new demands on their work, it is clear that leadership assumes critical significance. In such cases, the role of leadership is to manage fear and anxiety, on the one hand, and move teachers and other stakeholders towards change, on the other hand. The leader has to convince followers that change works in their best interests as teachers, and advances more effective teaching and learning in the school.

Such leadership can be developed and sustained at provincial and school-levels by ensuring that networks of provincial officials and school staff develop to promote and disseminate good practices in evaluation, monitoring and development.

G. Core Recommendations

Introduction

The Ministerial Committee accepts that the decision to establish a National Education Evaluation and Development Unit has already been made, and that its task was, per the Brief, to advise on the character and content of this unit. The recommendations that follow do not therefore question or challenge the proposal for a unit to be established, but offers focused advice on the nature and purposes of the unit based on evidence collected from the various sources accessed for this inquiry.

The Committee spent some time in deliberations on what this body should be called so that it signals the kind of policy focus and intent for the unit in an unambiguous manner. Several suggestions were made by members, including The South African Inspector General for Education (SAIGE, pronounced Sage); the Independent National Evaluation and Monitoring Agency; the South African Council for Educational Evaluation and Monitoring; and many others, including of course the National Education Evaluation and Development Unit.

The majority of Committee members felt that any reference to "inspection" or "inspector" or, for that matter "inspector general," would be a very sensitive matter among most education practitioners and that such naming could distract from (and even undermine) the essence of the recommendations in this report.

In addition, naming such a body should also be sensitive to other existing agencies concerned with quality assurance.

The Committee therefore does not take a position on the naming of the body. It should be clear though that while the naming of the body could be a sensitive matter, the contestation over the appropriate name does not, in the view of the Committee, diminish or weaken the functions and objectives of this new initiative as spelt out in this report.

For simplicity of communication, the body will be referred to in the rest of the report as the UNIT.

Recommendations

Authority

1. The Ministerial Committee strongly recommends that the UNIT function as an independent, statutory body operating at arms length from government but with direct reporting authority to the Ministry of Education.
2. The authority of the UNIT should be established in legislation with two goals in mind. First, to ensure that the UNIT has the legal authority and the political mandate to conduct its work; and second, to clarify the mandate of the UNIT in relation to other statutory bodies such as UMALUSI and of course the national Department of Education itself.
3. The UNIT officials must be endowed with legal and political authority to enter classrooms for purposes of monitoring and evaluation. Without such authority, it is impossible for the UNIT to deliver on its mandate of accounting for education quality in every South African school and classroom.
4. The UNIT will operate as a unitary structure at a national level with functional responsibilities in the provinces; in other words, the provincial offices of the UNIT will not enjoy a statutory status or authority of their own.

Governance

5. The Unit will be governed by a Board consisting of not less than seven and not more than nine individuals appointed by the Minister. The composition of the

Board must be based on expertise and not stakeholder-driven. The Committee therefore recommends that these individuals must be appointed on the basis of their knowledge and expertise relevant to the scope, functions and objectives of the Unit and not on the basis of the interests of stakeholders in the education system. The operational side of the UNIT must be headed by a CEO who must be an *ex officio* member of the Board and the DoE should also be represented on the Board. However, the majority of the members of the Board must be independent and appointed on the basis of their demonstrated competence as individuals.

Scope

6. The scope of the UNIT is the school system as a whole, including independent schools; the UNIT will not therefore be concerned with other components of the education and training system, such as ABET and FET Colleges.³
7. The UNIT will not be responsible for the development or management of schools, nor would the unit have any executive authority. However, in accounting for the state of schools, the UNIT will make recommendations to the relevant education authorities accountable for action on proposed recommendations.
8. The UNIT will absorb the Whole School Evaluation function of the national and provincial departments of education as it currently stands, while the IQMS function will continue to be honoured as an ELRC agreement operating under the authority of the Department of Education.
9. The UNIT will, however, as part of its founding mandate have the authority to recommend changes to IQMS (and other evaluation indicators, as well as to

³ The Committee recognizes the ongoing attempts to clarify the relationship between FET Colleges and the FET phase of schools, but believes that pedagogically and culturally these two spaces merit separate treatment in evaluation and monitoring

Systemic Evaluation) to ensure an overall alignment with the monitoring and evaluation function across government and within the UNIT itself e.g. the focus on learning and learning achievements as foundation for all other monitoring and evaluation activities. In particular, the UNIT strongly recommends that the two IQMS educator functions of appraisal for performance monitoring and appraisal for development should not be done and verified by the same people, whether within the school and the district.

10. In order for the UNIT to have optimal impact on development, the provinces through their districts will have to carry responsibility for focused school development support functions to enact the recommendations of the unit in a responsive and effective manner.
11. The focus of the UNIT will only be on accounting for the state of teaching and learning in South Africa and not on the evaluation of teachers for purposes of remuneration; while the teacher performance data might be used as part of the evidence for decision-making about personnel remuneration, the UNIT is not at all to be involved in teacher compensation issues, which is the mandate of the Department of Education.

Functions

12. The UNIT will have the following core responsibilities:
 - 12.1 to provide the Minister of Education with an authoritative, analytical and accurate account on the state of schools in South Africa and, in particular, on the status of teaching and learning in all schools
 - 12.2 to *recommend* minimum performance standards for schools, mindful of the different histories, missions and capacities of South African education

institutions; evaluation in these circumstances must be seen to be fair, contextually sensitive and credible.

- 12.3 to account for the attainment (or otherwise) of those standards by all schools through a sophisticated monitoring and evaluation system
- 12.4 to identify on a system-wide basis the critical factors that inhibit or advance school improvement
- 12.5 to make focused recommendations for redressing the problem areas that undermine school improvement and, in this respect, to recommend appropriate developmental interventions to support schools
- 12.6 to propose appropriate sanctions to ensure that schools offer effective education for all learners
- 12.7 to strengthen internal evaluation capacity within schools in ways that reliably inform and complement external evaluation
- 12.8 to monitor the different levels of school support (governors, districts, provinces and the national department) and the extent to which there is considered action on proposed interventions, whether in the form of developmental support or in the form of disciplined action
- 12.9 to review and assess existing monitoring, evaluation and support structures and instruments on a regular basis to ensure clarity, coherence, and complementarity in the ways schools and teachers are measured and supported
- 12.10 to provide schools with evidence-based advice on how to pursue school improvement in their particular contexts

- 12.11 to promote school improvement through the dissemination of good practice

Expertise

13. The UNIT will employ only the most skilled professionals drawn mainly from education, but also supporting professions (the management sector), and who have established reputations as credible and effective evaluators, managers and turnaround specialists in the field of education and allied fields. It is proposed that such highly skilled professionals be retained on performance-based contracts rather than absorbed as permanent appointees. There may also be a case for introducing the idea of professional partners, e.g. mentors who are reasonably successful principals of other schools. It is very important to this Committee that the professional expertise of the UNIT not be determined on the basis of party political affiliation or loyalties.
14. The UNIT must have an in-house research and evaluation capacity to conduct the mainly *qualitative* accounts on the state of schools as well as the assessment of existing instruments and data in other parts of the system e.g. directorates in government departments.
15. While the UNIT must have an in-house research and evaluation capacity of high quality, the large-scale, systems-wide and mainly *quantitative* monitoring and evaluation of the school system (akin to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP, in the USA)⁴ should be outsourced to an external agency such as the Human Sciences Research Council. The sheer weight of such a task could, if housed within the UNIT, limit the flexibility and adeptness of the new

⁴ NAEP is a nationally representative and continuing assessment of what students know and can do in various school subjects. Since this assessment is done annually and administered uniformly, it is an authoritative account of education performance across that country. It not only makes for informed policy decision-making, it also is used to guide practice in the individual states—quite apart from the rich database for further research on schools and school improvement.

body to respond to immediate and regular accounts on the state of schooling in the country.

Approach and Methods

16. The UNIT will provide advice to the Minister of Education on the state of the schooling system in South Africa. The advisory reports of the UNIT will be uncompromisingly **evidence-based**, drawing only on the best available empirical data for its public declarations on the state of schools in South Africa. Unvalidated internal accountability and assertions about effectiveness by untrained educators carry little reliability.
17. In line with outcomes based education, the single most important measure of school effectiveness to be adjudicated by the UNIT should be learning outcomes i.e. the quantity and quality of learning achieved by every learner in the school. Other factors such as teaching, resources, leadership will only be assessed in terms of their capacity to produce and sustain high levels of learning for all children.
18. The UNIT will have the authority to use the most appropriate and effective methods to conduct the monitoring and evaluation of schools, mindful of and sensitive to the particular context. Such methods include
 - 18.1 the observation of classroom teaching
 - 18.2 the assessment of teacher knowledge
 - 18.3 the assessment of learner knowledge
 - 18.4 the evaluation of school leadership practice
 - 18.5 the capacity of school governing bodies
 - 18.6 the efficacy of district, provincial and national support

19. The sheer size of the schooling system (26,000 units) makes it impossible for the UNIT to monitor and evaluate performance standards in all schools even on a 3-5 year cyclical basis, even with optimal funding. It is proposed therefore that the UNIT phases in its work over a number of years e.g. Phase 1 could limit the monitoring and evaluation ambit to the weakest 25% of schools in all provinces as a priority for action. While phase 1 could include a disproportionate number of the weakest schools, it should also include a stratified sample of the rest of the schools in order to benchmark the system as a whole.
20. The UNIT will have to ensure that there is clarity and consistency about the defined role descriptions and task specifications of principals and other leaders in schools and districts. They can only be held accountable through evaluation in relation to clearly-defined expectations.
21. The approach of the UNIT would not be to apportion blame to any one level or stakeholder in the education system, but rather to provide focused analyses on what stands in the way of education quality as expressed in learning achievements, and on what can be done to remedy such problems. Moreover, apprehension and fear will be reduced by evaluating teaching rather than individual teachers.
22. The UNIT activities should place a high premium on reducing the administrative demands on teachers and school management as a result of this intervention; for this important reason, the UNIT has to define its work in relation to other and ongoing evaluation and monitoring activities in schools. The combination and streamlining of all monitoring and evaluation work will enjoy priority as part of the oversight work of the UNIT.

Resources

23. The UNIT cannot function effectively unless it is adequately and amply resourced within the national budget. The capacity to deliver will depend crucially on what kinds of resources are available. The Committee feels strongly that the real test of the legitimacy, viability and capacity of the UNIT to deliver on its mandate will be the extent to which it is adequately prioritized and budgeted for in the national government.
24. The Committee did not make detailed estimations about costs and the appropriate financing model since it was unclear what kind of organizational arrangements and resource commitments are anticipated by government. However, one estimation was that in an annual cycle a fully staffed Unit would cost approximately R420 million.⁵

Deliverables

25. The Unit will be required to
- 25.1 publish regular reports on the state of schools in South Africa such report including empirical findings, recommended actions, and accounting measures to assure responsiveness to identified problem areas. One form of reporting could be a quarterly or annual published statement called *The State of Schools in South Africa*
 - 25.2 present written analytical reports should the Minister require urgent information on the state of schools in the country

⁵ This estimation works with 26,000 schools covering a period of 29 school weeks per annum with 892 assessors required to assess one school per week with associated professional and administrative costs and infrastructure. A more detailed breakdown of these costs are available if requested.

- 25.3 provide individual schools with status reports on teaching and learning achievements as well as barriers to achievement and strategies for school improvement

H. Next Steps

The Committee believes that the time is right for urgent action on the recommendations in this Report and would like to advise on the most important and immediate steps that could be taken towards implementation:

1. it is important to introduce the UNIT into legislation as soon as possible. As the report makes clear, the UNIT will require legislative authority (akin to that enjoyed by Umalusi) as well as organizational clarity within the ecology of quality assurance-related bodies concerned with schools.
2. it is important to identify senior, key people in the meantime who could develop and elaborate the UNIT concept beyond what was possible in this Committee Report.
3. it is important to create a programme of initial training for key personnel using the best available expertise nationally and internationally to ensure that from the start the UNIT is launched on a solid foundation of professional expertise.⁶
4. it is important to resource the immediate work of the UNIT by securing large-scale funding commitments without which the work of this body will be undermined from the beginning.
5. it is important to found an Interim Steering Committee to move the UNIT to deal with the legislative, bureaucratic and political issues that must be negotiated en route towards implementation. The Interim Committee should also work towards a realistic and comprehensive budget.

⁶ One recommendation from a senior management firm working with schools was that professional staff be certified as ISO 9000 "Quality Management Systems" people; they claim that "the effectiveness of this training in establishing and maintaining management systems was demonstrated in the exemplary work conducted in Gert Sibanda FET College in Mpumalanga."

References

- Barasa, F. and Mattson, E. 1998. The roles, regulation and professional development of educators in South Africa: a critical analysis of four policy documents. *Journal of Education*, **23**, 41-72.
- Barber, M. and Phillips, V. 2000. Should large scale assessment be used for accountability: the fusion of pressure and support? *Journal of Educational Change*, **1** (3), 277-281
- Barnes, A. 2003. Policy at the chalk face: a case study of the implementation of the DAS in a primary school: Unpublished minor MPhil dissertation. Cape Town, University of Cape Town
- Bartlett, S. 2000. The development of teacher appraisal: a recent history. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, **48**, 24-37
- Class Act. 2007. IQMS implementation review, a DoE commissioned report. Johannesburg: Class Act
- Darling-Hammond, L. 1989. Accountability for professional practice. *Teachers College Record*, **91** (1), 55-80
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hightower, A., Husbands, J., LaFors, J., Young, V and Christopher, C. 2003. Building instructional quality: Inside and outside in perspectives on San Diego's school reform. Centre for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved from
<http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/InstructionalQual-09-2003.pdf>
- De Clercq, F. 2008. Teacher Quality, Appraisal and Development: the flaws of the IQMS. *Perspectives in Education*, **26** (1), 7-18

Department of Education. 2007. *The National Policy Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa*. Government Gazette no. 29832. Pretoria: Government Printer

Department of Education. 2005. *The Report of the Ministerial Committee on Teacher Education* (COTEP). Pretoria: Government Printer

Department of Education, 2003. *Framework for Systemic Evaluation*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Education 2001. *The National Policy of Whole-School Evaluation* Pretoria: Government Printer

Department of Education. 2000. *Norms and Standards for Educators*. Pretoria: Government Printer

Department of Education. 1998. *The Employers Educators Act*. Pretoria: Government Printer

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) 2008. Draft of employers' amendment to Collective agreement 8 of 2003, Integrated Quality Management System. Centurion: ELRC

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) 2003. Collective agreements 1, 3 (Protocol) and 8, Integrated Quality Management System. Centurion: ELRC

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) 2002. Collective agreement 3 and 9 of 2002. Centurion: ELRC

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) 1998. Collective agreement 4 of 1998. Centurion: ELRC

Fitzgerald, T. 2001. Potential paradoxes in performance appraisal: Emerging issues for New Zealand schools'. In Middlewood, D. and Cardno, C. (Eds.) *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance: A Comparative Approach*. London: Routledge Falmer Press, 112-124.

Fleisch, B. 2002. *Managing educational change: the state and school reform in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Heinemann Publishers.

Fleisch, B. 2006. Accountability in the Education Action Zone. *South African Journal of Education* 26 (3), 369-382.

Fullan, M. 1991. *The new meaning of educational change*, New York: Teachers' College Press

Fullan, M. 2003. *Change forces with a vengeance* New York: Routledge Falmer

Gallie, M. 2006. The implementation of the development appraisal in a low functioning South African school. Unpublished doctoral thesis (PhD), Pretoria: Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria

Grubb, N. W. 2000. Opening classrooms and improving teaching: lessons from school inspections in England. *Teachers College Record*, 102 (4), 696-723

Heneveld, W. and Craig, H. 1996. *Schools Count: World Bank Project Designs and the Quality of Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa*

Hopkins, D. 2006. Quality Assurance and Large Scale Reform: Lessons for Chile: Synthesis report from the International seminar on 'Regulatory Models and Quality Assurance Systems'. OECD and Ministry of Education, Chile

Hopkins, D. & Levine, B. 2000. Government Policy and School Development. *School Leadership and Management*, 20 (1), 15-30

Hopkins D. and McGilchrist B. 1998. Development planning for pupil achievement *School Leadership & Management*, 18(3), 409–424

Hopkins, D., West, M. and Skinner, J. 1995. Improvement through inspection? A critique of the Ofsted inspection system. *School evaluation in England and Wales. ZsE*, 1:5. Jg :337–350

Jansen, J.D. 2004, Autonomy and accountability in the regulation of the teaching profession: a South African case study, *Research Papers in Education*, vol. 19, issue 1, pp. 51–66

Katz, S., Sutherland, S. & Earle, L 2005. Toward an evaluation habit of mind: Mapping the journey. *Teachers College Record*, 107 (10), 2326–2350

Kyriakedis and Campbell. 2003. Teacher evaluation in Cyprus: some methodological and conceptual issues arising from teacher and school effectiveness research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. 17 (1), 21–40

Lucen, A. 2003. Tracing the implementation trajectory of an educational policy: the case of the WSE, Unpublished Ph D dissertation, Pretoria: University of Pretoria

Matthews P., Moorman H. and Nusche D., 2008. *Building leadership capacity for system improvement in Victoria, Australia* in *Improving School Leadership*, Volume 2, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development: Paris

Matthews P. and Sammons P. 2005. *Survival of the weakest: the differential improvement of schools causing concern in England*, *London Review of Education*, 3, 2, pp159–176.

Matthews, P. and Sammons, P. 2004. Improvement through inspection: an evaluation of the impact of Ofsted's work, London: Institute of Education and Ofsted

McBeath, J. 1999. *Schools must speak for themselves*, Routledge, London

McKinsey & Company, 2007. *How the world's best performing school systems come out on top*. www.mckinsey.com/clientservice/socialsector/resources/pdf/Worlds_School_systems_final.pdf

Middlewood, D. and Cardno, C. (eds.) 2001. *Managing teacher appraisal and performance: a comparative approach*. London: Routledge/ Falmer Press

Piggot-Irvine, E. and Cardno, C. 2005. *Appraising performance productively: integrating accountability and development*. Auckland: Eversleigh Publishing Ltd

Sinemma, C. 2005. Teacher appraisal: missed opportunities for learning. Unpublished doctoral thesis (Ed D), Auckland: University of Auckland

Reezigt, G., Creemers, B. and de Jong, R. 2003. Teacher Evaluation in the Netherlands and its Relationship to Educational Effectiveness Research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. 17 (1), 67-81

Reynolds, D., Muijs, D. and Treharne, D. 2003. Teacher evaluation and teacher effectiveness in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. 17 (1), 83-100

SACE. 2005. Supporting educators in compiling Professional Development Portfolios, June, unpublished document (South African Council for Educators)

SADTU 2005. Quality teachers for quality education training for a stronger teaching force. October, unpublished document (South African Democratic Teachers Union)

Sammons P., Hillman J. and Mortimore P. 1995. *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: A review of school effectiveness research*, London, Office for Standards in Education and Institute of Education

Silbert, P. 2007. Understanding influences in policy-making. Whole-school evaluation and discourse. Unpublished minor MPhil dissertation. Cape Town: University of Cape Town

Taylor, N. 2002. Accountability and support: improving public schooling in SA, JET.

Taylor, N. 2007. Equity, efficiency and the development of South African schools, In Townsend, T (ed). *International handbook of school effectiveness and improvement*. Dordrecht: Springer

Teddlie, C., Springfield, S., and Burdett, J. 2003. International comparisons of the relationships among educational effectiveness, evaluation and improvement variables: an overview. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 17(1), 5-20

Teddlie C. and Reynolds D. 2000. *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research*, Routledge/Falmer, London:New York

List of organisations that made written submissions

Catholic Institute of Education
CfBT Education Trust, UK
Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Pretoria
Department of Education, Free State province
Department of Education, Western Cape
Hough & Horne Evaluators and Consultants
Independent Quality Assurance Agency
Khulisa Management Services
National Professional Teachers Organisation of South Africa
South African Democratic Teachers Union
Suid-Afrikaanse Onderwyersunie
UMALUSI

List of Individuals that made written submissions

Professor Richard van der Ross, Cape Town
Professor Maureen Robinson, Cape Peninsula University of Technology
Dr AHC Uys, University of the North West

The above list does not include the more than 150 people interviewed individually and in groups in each of the nine provinces