Teacher Evaluation in South African Schools

This CDE publication is the third in a series on the lessons for South Africa from international and local research on teacher evaluation as a means of improving teacher effectiveness. The first CDE publication in 2012 examined the international experience of teacher pay for performance initiatives and found that there was no consistent evidence that they improved learning outcomes.

Accordingly, in 2014, CDE decided to investigate teacher evaluation more broadly across a wide range of countries to explore the connection between teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness, and student achievement. The key finding was that well-designed performance-based assessments, which assess on-the-job teaching based on multiple measures of teaching practice and student learning, can measure teacher effectiveness. An integrated teacher evaluation model which combines these assessments with productive feedback and professional learning opportunities can increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement (see CDE’s 2015 report, Teacher Evaluation: Lessons from other countries).

This report, the final in the series, examines teacher evaluation policy in South Africa and looks for best practice, using the international findings as a reference point. From interview research we present key stakeholders’ perspectives on the evolving policy framework and how school leadership in a small sample of public and independent schools experience teacher appraisal and professional development.

CDE’s analysis reveals that the current policy is deeply flawed, resulting in very limited implementation in those public schools interviewed. We identify some examples of best practice in the sample of innovative and well-resourced independent schools. These findings and CDE’s international research raise fundamental questions about the new performance-based teacher appraisal policy (the Quality Management System, or QMS) that is in the wings, as well as the new system for managing professional development. Are they good enough to significantly improve teacher effectiveness and learning achievement?
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**Introduction**

Research has identified effective teachers as the most critical factor in determining student achievement. Given the importance of high-quality teaching, countries around the world have focused on teacher evaluation as a process that can be used to both measure and improve teacher effectiveness, through strengthening accountability and supporting the professional development of teachers.

In South Africa, despite the efforts of government and private sector interventions, the general quality of teaching is poor as evidenced in the worryingly low levels of learner performance in national assessments and international comparative surveys. Improving teacher effectiveness is thus a pressing national problem.

This report examines the evolving national policy framework for quality management in South African schools and presents key stakeholders’ perspectives and educators’ experience of teacher evaluation (referred to as teacher appraisal and professional development in South Africa) in a sample of public and independent schools. The findings are analysed against the international best practice model of teacher evaluation (see CDE’s 2015 report, *Teacher Evaluation: Lessons from other countries*). The implications for South African policy and implementation are discussed and key strategic issues are raised with regard to the effectiveness of a new Quality Management System (QMS) that is in the wings and the new Continuing Professional Teacher Development (CPTD) system.

**CDE’s Research**

A key motivation behind this research project was to look for best practice in teacher appraisal and professional development in a sample of public and independent schools, based on the findings of its international research project. CDE believes that successful practice can and should inform policy. Our hope was that if examples of best practice in schools could be found, they might usefully inform new government policy.

This ‘best practice’ focus is new in research on teacher performance management in South Africa. In public schools, the current Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) and educators’ experience of it have been well researched, but not with CDE’s purpose. In the case of independent schools, no research has been undertaken on teacher performance management, which is a very recent development in a minority of schools.

The research project began in late 2014 and included two components. First, a desktop review of the national policy was undertaken to understand the role it has played in determining current teacher appraisal and development in schools. Second, qualitative field research was conducted through in-depth, semi-structured interviews with two groups: key education stakeholders, and senior management in a purposive sample of public and independent schools.

The interviews with representatives of key education stakeholders were conducted to determine their perspectives on the national policy on quality school management and its implementation. The stakeholders included the Department of Basic Education (DBE), the South African Democratic
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Teachers Union, (SADTU), the National Professional Teachers’ Organisation of South Africa (NAPTOSA), the Suid-Afrikaanse Onderwysunion (SAOU), the South African Council for Educators (SACE), and the Independent Schools Association of Southern Africa (ISASA).

School Sample

The sample of ten schools in Gauteng was small and consisted of five public schools and five independent schools. CDE decided to look at public schools that achieved good learner results, where examples of best practice were most likely to be found. To this end we consulted with the Gauteng Department of Education (GDE) to obtain advice on which public schools to approach. With additional input from other researchers and foundations, we developed a list of schools.

A poor response from public schools to our invitation to participate resulted in a sample of three suburban ex-Model C primary schools and two township schools, but no no-fee school. This suggests that the better-resourced public schools may have more capacity to participate in research and/or are implementing the policy to a greater extent than poorly-resourced schools in disadvantaged communities.

As there is no legal requirement that independent schools undertake teacher performance assessment and professional development, CDE had to identify those that were voluntarily doing so. The result was a sample of well-resourced schools, with four charging high fees and one mid-level fees. All the schools are large: three are not-for-profit ones with pre-primary, primary and high schools, usually on one campus, and two are for-profit chains of schools on various campuses. Thus they all have large staff complements, suggesting enough capacity to undertake performance appraisal and professional development.

Although they are increasing rapidly, we were unable to identify low-fee independent schools that were implementing formal teacher performance appraisal and development, so our sample was not adequately representative of the independent school sector. However, it is likely that only very few low-fee schools, which are typically small and under-resourced, are implementing formal teacher appraisal: of the 132 member schools that have participated in ISASA performance appraisal workshops since 2011, only 8 have been low-fee schools, suggesting that they do not have the capacity, time and resources to do so.

The sample of 10 schools is too small to be a scientific one, which means that the findings of the research are not generalisable to either the public or independent school sectors. Nonetheless, the interview responses produced rich qualitative data, reflected common themes and perspectives, as well as some interesting differences that serve to illustrate the realities, challenges and potential of teacher performance appraisal and professional development in South African schools.
Policy Framework for Teacher Appraisal and Professional Development

There are a number of acts and policies governing teacher performance appraisal and professional development for public schools (see Appendix A) that are outlined below within their historical context.

Systems to evaluate teachers and public schools have had a chequered and politicised history in South Africa for many decades with perennial problems and challenges that have not yet been overcome.

During the apartheid era, there was a system of school control, inspection and appraisal of teachers that was “overtly focused on accountability, in that teacher development and school improvement were neglected”\(^6\). Its top-down, judgmental approach did little to develop a climate of support and collegiality in schools.\(^7\)

The late 1980s and early 1990s were a period of great political turbulence in South Africa with widespread resistance against apartheid authorities in schools. This frequently took the form of inspectors being denied access to schools by militant pupils, and teachers refusing any form of evaluation of their own work or their schools.\(^8\) Because the school inspection system was seen as part of the apartheid state’s mechanisms for political control, it became completely dysfunctional.\(^9\) Although inspection policy remained in place until the late 1990s, in practice it was not implemented.

The resistance to apartheid education also led to the emergence of a new radical teacher union, from which the South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) developed, today the largest teacher union in the country.

Political transformation in South Africa in 1994 saw the introduction of a new legislative framework for education, including new statutory bodies and a range of new national policies. The old inspection system was replaced by new quality management programmes, which developed into the current Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), but the legacy of apartheid remains and many teachers have a fundamental mistrust of the process of teacher evaluation.

The Integrated Quality Management System

Prior to the implementation of the IQMS in the mid-1990s, three separate quality management programmes operated in public schools focusing on the appraisal of both teacher performance and development, and whole school evaluation.\(^10\) The three programmes had minimal linkages between them and, in addition, were seen to promote “a blaming culture”.\(^11\) Consequently, through a collective bargaining process in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC), it was decided to combine them into one quality management system.\(^12\)

The outcome was the IQMS, which was designed to promote better integration between all components of the quality management process.\(^13\) Its purpose is to: determine teacher competence, assess strengths and areas for development, provide support and opportunities for development to ensure continued growth, promote accountability, and monitor an institution’s overall effectiveness.\(^14\)
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The IQMS makes the school principal responsible for initiating the system in a school, and for convening a meeting to elect members of a school development team (SDT). The implementation process follows an annual cycle that includes a very lengthy process of 20 stages (see Appendix B). The IQMS instrument is also extensive and in two parts. One part (with four performance standards) is for lesson observation, and the second part (with eight performance standards) is related to teachers’ performance outside of the classroom. Recommendations for development are based on the ratings obtained for performance. The instrument takes into account the fact that contextual factors can influence a teacher’s assessment rating.

The implementation of the IQMS was hampered by a combination of factors, including the inadequate advocacy programme of the national Department of Education (DoE) in introducing the IQMS to schools, poor training in some provinces, inadequate leadership by principals, and teachers’ resistance to the process.

Ongoing problems

Despite efforts to strengthen the implementation of the IQMS, schools have struggled to work with it. As a result the DoE commissioned a review of its implementation in 2007. The review identified two main challenges:

- a skewed emphasis during IQMS training on performance measurement for pay and level progression in order to get buy-in to the system by teachers, with the result that professional development was not understood as part of the process; and
- the lack of professional development opportunities for all teachers and a lack of quality assurance of development programmes.

Consequently in 2008 the DoE initiated a process to appoint external moderators in the provinces to monitor the implementation of the IQMS processes and procedures in the schools. Many problems emerged:

- Inadequate coordination and integration; inadequate training of both teachers and education officials on IQMS processes; perceptions that the IQMS mechanisms are confusing and time-consuming; lack of quality assurance of development programmes; lack of capacity to manage the IQMS processes at various levels, and lack of budget; resistance by teacher unions to certain parts of the IQMS; a lingering memory of apartheid mechanisms; lack of feedback to teachers after evaluation and failure to meet their development needs; focus by teachers on financial rewards rather than professional development and the inflation of evaluation scores.

Similarly, a Ministerial Committee on the National Education and Evaluation Development Unit (NEEDU), which was established in 2008, reviewed the IQMS and identified fundamental problems.

It found no evidence that the IQMS would be able to serve as an effective mechanism for accountability, because most teachers do not know how to conduct an effective analysis of teacher performance or how to prioritise teacher development needs; and the outcomes are heavily weighted in favour of the teachers’ self-assessment.
performance or how to prioritise teacher development needs; and the outcomes are heavily weighted in favour of the teachers’ self-assessment. The committee reported that the criteria for evaluating teacher performance do not include measures identified in the research literature as constituting effective teaching. It further noted that “the existing list of performance standards is cumbersome and time-consuming, generating considerable volumes of paperwork for heads of departments, and does not capture adequately the most important core function of schooling, namely the level of learning achieved by learners.”

The Teacher Development Summit of 2009

Continuing problems with the implementation of the IQMS, among other issues, led to the two national departments, the DBE and the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), calling a multi-stakeholder Teacher Development Summit to examine all the challenges relating to teacher development and propose strategies to address them.

In relation to the IQMS specifically, the view taken was that it was not effective and had many problems and inconsistencies. Strong arguments were advanced for the separation of appraisal for development purposes from appraisal for remuneration purposes. It was argued that the IQMS locates teachers as both referees and players, with no systems in place to monitor implementation. The Teacher Summit concluded that the linking of the IQMS with pay progression has “distorted its development purpose and value.”

The participants resolved that a new, strengthened, integrated national plan for teacher development be developed to include a clear, coherent policy and regulatory environment for both teacher appraisal and teacher development. It was decided that teacher development appraisal be delinked from issues of remuneration, the IQMS be streamlined and rebranded, and all standards and criteria around teacher competence and performance, and assessment instruments, should be reassessed to determine their relevance.

The Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa 2011–2025

As a result of the Teacher Summit, the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development (ISPFTED) in South Africa 2011–2025 (also known as the Plan) was officially launched by the ministers of Basic Education and Higher Education and Training on 5 April 2011. The primary outcome of the Plan is “to improve the quality of teacher education and development in order to improve the quality of teachers and teaching.”

The Plan advocates the creation of new structures, including a National Institute for Curriculum and Professional Development (NICPD), District Teacher Development Centres, Professional Learning Communities, Teacher Education Institutions, and Teaching Schools and Professional Practice Schools, to provide teachers with support and access to development opportunities. It also formally delinks teacher appraisal for development from appraisal for remuneration and salary progression. The ELRC was tasked with the responsibility to streamline and rebrand the IQMS.
The Quality Management System

Accordingly, a new Quality Management System (QMS) was developed by a task team of the ELRC. “The purpose of the QMS is to evaluate the performance levels of individual school-based educators in order to improve accountability and achieve high levels of school performance. It provides a mechanism for assessing educators, taking into account the context within which they operate, and is the basis for paying salary progression, rewards and other incentives. Most significantly it does not include a professional development component.

The QMS places responsibility for implementation and management on the school management team (SMT) together with the principal, who is accountable for ensuring consistency of application in the school and verifying the appraisal processes. Circuit managers are responsible for evaluating principals’ performance and the moderation of school appraisals. Grievance committees are also to be set up in schools and circuits.

The process of developing the QMS has not been smooth and there have been many revisions. Government originally wanted to include learner achievement as one of the criteria and the unions objected. They raised issues of validity and fairness: the nature of the evidence that would be used to determine learner achievement; how teachers could be fairly assessed if most of them had been ill-educated and inadequately trained in the past; the lack of effective professional development to help teachers acquire the necessary competencies; and the adverse teaching and learning conditions that many teachers worked in.

Finally, the QMS was approved by the ELRC in November 2014. However, SADTU has not formally signed the collective agreement to enable its implementation, and is using its signature as a bargaining chip to obtain a 1.5 per cent performance-based increase for educators instead of the current 1 per cent. As a result schools have to continue to use the IQMS.

The stakeholder interviewees saw the QMS as an improvement over the IQMS: the process is simpler, there are grievance and moderation processes, and the job descriptions and appraisal criteria are more credible, especially for principals and deputy principals. Importantly, under the QMS educator assessment must be undertaken by a superior and peer-rating is only an additional option.

However, NAPTOSA has expressed the view that the QMS is unlikely to lead to greater teacher accountability or effectiveness that will produce learning gains.

Professional Development of Educators

Under the IQMS teachers are required to undertake self-evaluation and rate their performance and development needs to inform their personal growth plan (PGP), which should be produced at the commencement of each annual cycle. Teachers are the primary driver of their PGP but with support from their development support group (DSG).
The IQMS requires PGP plans to be consolidated by the school development team (SDT) into a school improvement plan (SIP), leading to district improvement plans (DIPs) and finally to provincial improvement plans (PIPs).

In practice, however, as the reviews of the IQMS have found, the professional development aspect of the IQMS has been neglected because schools have not had the time or skills to implement all the requirements.

A new system to strengthen teacher development in the public sector has recently been introduced. In 2007, SACE was given overall responsibility for the implementation, management and quality assurance of a Continuing Professional Teacher Development (CPTD) Management System. The aim is to enhance the quality of teaching in public schools through a process of recognising, supporting and tracking teacher professional development. The SACE Council approved the CPTD implementation plan in November 2012 and it has subsequently been implemented on a phased-in basis, beginning with principals and deputy principals in January 2014.

The CPTD system requires public school educators to accumulate 150 professional development points in every three-year cycle. Points can be accumulated through three types of activity: teacher-initiated activities, school-initiated activities, or externally-initiated activities by providers. Only the courses of a SACE-approved service provider will attract points. Educators must report their participation in professional development twice a year to SACE and maintain a Professional Development Portfolio according to SACE guidelines.

SACE has advised that for the first six years (from 2014 to 2019) no penalty will be imposed on teachers who do not achieve their 150 points target. The CPTD system is available to all teachers in South Africa but is compulsory for teachers in the public sector.

In addition to the CPTD system, in 2014 the DBE established the National Institute for Curriculum and Professional Development (NICPD), in line with the ISPFTED. One of its functions is to develop and manage an online system through which the development needs of individual teachers can be identified and addressed. A teacher self-assessment task, based on the British APTIS English Test, for English First Additional Language (EFAL) teachers has been piloted and is being rolled-out, while the self-assessment for the second subject area, mathematics, is due to be piloted mid-2015.

**Quality Assurance in the Independent School Sector**

Although the IQMS does not apply to the independent school sector, there are other quality assurance requirements. Registered independent schools must be accredited by Umalusi, the statutory Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training, responsible for the development of policy and criteria for the quality assurance of private education institutions. (All public schools are deemed accredited and thus do not undergo the accreditation process.)

Umalusi evaluates independent schools for accreditation through extensive processes, according to four sets of criteria. One of these focuses on teaching and learning, but there is no specific requirement.
for individual teacher appraisal and development. The nearest the process comes to this is in requiring schools to undertake regular self-evaluation “to develop and enhance an internal culture of quality management and ongoing improvement”.

Independent school associations, like ISASA, encourage member schools to implement teacher performance appraisal and professional development, but in practice it seems that only a small minority of typically well-resourced schools are actually doing so. However, as CDE’s research found, teacher performance assessment systems are implemented in large for-profit chains, such as the Crawford schools.

INTERVIEWEES’ PERSPECTIVES AND EXPERIENCE

The in-depth, recorded interviews of two hours and more with public and independent schools and the stakeholders produced a wealth of qualitative information. Their views and experiences of teacher performance appraisal and professional development have been grouped into the main themes below.

Identity of interviewed schools

As CDE undertook to preserve the anonymity of the schools, we have used a ‘P’ to denote public schools, followed by A, B, C and so on for the various schools. In the case of independent schools the same system is used, with an ‘I’ instead of a ‘P’ to denote them.

Purpose of Teacher Evaluation

The purpose of a teacher appraisal process critically affects its implementation and how schools experience it. An evaluation system designed primarily for accountability will look different from a system designed primarily for teacher learning and professional development.

The public school principals were generally sceptical about the IQMS. They did not see it as achieving either of its intended purposes of promoting accountability and enhancing teacher development. They complained that the onerous administrative burden of the IQMS reduces the practice of teacher evaluation to merely a compliance exercise. “The IQMS is a mammoth and tedious administrative task which requires nitty-gritty details,” said the former principal of School PD. School PE’s principal shared this view, adding that the ‘cost’ of administration is “five days out of the classroom”. In general, the administrative requirements of the IQMS were viewed as unnecessarily cumbersome, time-consuming and distracting attention from the purpose and “essence of the instrument”.

By contrast, the principals of independent schools shared the view that professional development is weighted more heavily in their school processes because teacher accountability does not need much
attention. This, they argued, is as a result of very careful recruitment and selection of teachers. The principals value the practice of teacher appraisal and development, and emphasised the importance of teacher professionalism.

**Appraisal for accountability**

The interviews across public and independent schools revealed that, in reality, poor performance has fewer consequences than might have been expected and rarely resulted in dismissal.

In public schools, if the teacher evaluation process results in an unacceptable rating (which is rare given the peer-based assessment) it will, at worst, translate into no performance increase. “It is virtually impossible to dismiss a teacher”, the former principal of School PD remarked. Although the mechanism for dismissal is in theory available, the process is laborious and the presence of the union and government officials makes dismissal extremely difficult in practice.

In addition, there is little evidence of coaching and mentoring as a way of addressing poor performance in public schools. Poor performers are often “reallocated” to different positions within the school, to teach different subjects, and/or to different grades where they can “inflict the least damage”, as SAOU put it. Similarly, good performers are frequently shifted out of their subject or phase specialisation to those ones that require more attention by the school. Poor teachers are commonly shifted to teach life orientation or physical education, and good teachers to English or mathematics. “Teachers are teaching subjects that they are not qualified to teach,” SAOU added. “In our experience, teachers are often not retained in their areas of specialisation.”

Holding teachers to account for performance in the sample of independent schools appeared to be more successful and the process quicker. “A complaint from a parent about a teacher’s performance will be investigated almost immediately,” the deputy principal at School Group IB indicated. Non-performing teachers in independent schools often leave of their own volition, because they are unable to take the pressure resulting from the school culture of high performance and the expectations of the parent body.

Nonetheless, it seems that independent schools still have some way to go in holding teachers to account. Unless something serious has occurred, not usually in relation to poor performance but more often a case of misconduct, a teacher will not be dismissed before remedial action is undertaken. The interviewees suggested that the practice of “reallocation” of teachers to subjects perceived as less important also happens in independent schools.

**Appraisal for professional development**

The interviewees in the unions and public schools were unanimous in their view that professional development was neither effective at the school, the district, nor the national level. The schools focussed on their experience of professional development in terms of the IQMS and not the CPTD system, which is very new and only affects principals and their deputies. However, the stakeholder interviewees also commented on the CPTD system.
The IQMS requires teachers to be the primary driver of their PGP but with support from their development support group (DSG). NAPTOSA expressed the view that a major problem in this process is that while PGPs encourage the process of self-reflection by teachers, schools do not know what to do with the results of the process. In other words, the development appraisal process does not guide the nature of professional development.

Most schools shared the sentiment that the concept of PGPs is a good one, but that teachers do not have the time to complete them with adequate thought and reflection, nor do they have the set of skills needed to express their development needs.

In the case of the SIPs, some schools admitted that they do not have the time or the capacity for more than basic compliance. Participants at the 2009 Teacher Development Summit observed that “SIPs are diluted when aggregated upwards by districts and provinces, and as a result the development that follows is often not appropriate.” They expressed the view that officials did not understand development and that there was no prioritisation of needs, and that districts did not have the commitment or the capacity to support schools with what they need.

Most principals were frustrated that they did not have sufficient time or enough staff to allow teachers to go on training. Some principals indicated that their teachers are overcommitted during school time and unwilling to attend training out of school time. The former principal of School PD said that at her school they took a decision that there would be no sport scheduled for Saturdays and this was the day allocated for development. “You have to have trade-offs for teachers to make it more acceptable,” she said.

With reference to the CPTD system, NAPTOSA spoke about ‘feel good’ courses/workshops that qualify for points but are highly unlikely to improve teaching quality. Moreover, teachers self-report their activities for CPTD points, and very basic ones, such as reading NAPTOSA’s online magazine or attending a staff meeting, earn points.

SADTU argued that the system does not meet the individual needs of teachers and that professional development needs to happen in the schools, where teaching takes place. “We have an ‘on-the-shelf’ environment when it comes to professional development in South Africa,” SADTU’s professional development spokesperson said. “They are setting up the system to say ‘We have a product here. Buy the product and your professional development problems will be sorted out.’ Professional development doesn’t work that way. We are looking for more sustainable efforts when it comes to professional development to improve the quality of teaching.”

In contrast to interviewees’ perspectives in the public school sector, professional development was viewed across the interviewed independent schools as the most important component of teacher appraisal. The schools’ approach to professional development is similar and in line with international practices. They use a combination of the following practices:

- ongoing coaching and mentoring as a continual practice throughout the year;
- in-school dedicated development and training time each week;
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- participation in external training courses and conferences;
- financial support for further formal educational qualifications;
- collaborative teaching; and
- peer-evaluation.

Notably, the independent schools’ leadership saw professional development as the biggest drawcard for attracting and retaining teachers.

School Group IC dedicates 250 hours per year to professional development. “Professional development is the biggest driver for our staff. This is part of our retention policy, together with our brand,” explained the director of leadership development. “Every single member of staff is on a development programme in the network. We have six new leadership development programmes currently under development and these will be implemented across our network of schools in the near future.” Three hours every week are dedicated to in-school training in this group of schools and the focus is on specific needs identified within a specific school. In another independent school, Tuesday afternoons are dedicated to in-house development.

Collaborative and team teaching takes place in a few of the schools and is used as a further tool in professional development. Team teaching is common in IA2 where class teachers often teach together with an academic support teacher, or a subject specialist. In addition, as the deputy head explained, “We often collapse the walls between our Grade 5 classrooms so that the three class teachers can teach together in that environment. This has been a positive learning experience for teachers who are forced to move out of their boxes.”

Peer-evaluation is less common but it is recognised as a potential tool for further professional development. School Group IC has developed a system of peer-evaluation where staff are trained in how to observe peers and give critical feedback to them as members of a team. “We walk alongside our staff in the beginning, we teach how to observe, we calibrate, we give feedback,” said the director of leadership development. She pointed out that to succeed, peer evaluation has to be a developmental and supportive process. “The ultimate test,” she says, “is whether you can go down to the pub on a Friday night with your colleague having given some critical feedback.”

Resources for Teacher Appraisal and Development

Principals across the public and independent sample shared the view that for teacher performance appraisal and development to be implemented effectively and achieve its purposes, schools require sufficient capacity: adequate numbers of staff as well as specific training for those staff involved in undertaking it. Training is needed, both on the mechanics of the particular system in use and for coaching, mentoring and providing feedback.

Three of the five public schools interviewed employ additional teachers over and above the GDE allocation of teachers from fees and funds raised by the school’s governing body. “If you have a well-resourced school and the time to build in planning and put all the requirements into practice,” the former principal of School PD commented, “the IQMS can be a workable tool.” However, she emphasised
that the time invested in understanding the instrument was considerable. “It took us all some time to get our heads around the document. The only way teachers were going to understand the IQMS was if it was broken down into manageable chunks, which is what we did in the end.”

The remaining two public schools that have to rely solely on GDE-appointed teachers indicated that they do not have the resources to do more than meet the minimum requirements of the IQMS. “The best we can do is tick the boxes,” the principal of School PE stated. When the principal of School PC was asked if the IQMS contributes towards enhanced teacher practice in his school, he responded with “The only thing that has improved in this school is our competence in compliance.”

SADTU made the point that it is very difficult to assess a teacher’s competence when classroom conditions are not conducive to teaching. Many public schools have teachers managing classes of far more than 40 learners. “This is not teaching,” SADTU contends, “it is crowd control. You can’t assess competence in these circumstances.”

The independent schools interviewed have much lower learner to teacher ratios (LERs) than those of public schools. As large schools with good complements of staff and specialised skills, they have more capacity for teacher appraisal and development.

In fact, in four of the schools, human resources (HR) managers have been appointed, with responsibility for driving effective teacher appraisal and development processes, amongst other functions. This is a recent trend in the high-fee independent school sector and attests to their recognition of the need for dedicated and specialist skills in this area. The HR managers are responsible for the design of a customised performance management/evaluation system to meet the needs of a particular school, but also the provision of the necessary training on the system, including coaching and mentoring. Most critically, they play a monitoring role, ensuring that the process takes place on a continual basis and is consistently applied across the school.

In the case of public schools, there is a dedicated branch for Teacher and Professional Development in the DBE whose mission is to support the provinces in the implementation of teacher performance management systems in order to strengthen professionalism and accountability. However, there is no dedicated HR person at the school level. A number of the public schools indicated that a dedicated resource would be a great help because they do not have the time or the specialised HR skills to implement the IQMS to any effect.

The Importance of School Culture

In the sampled schools there was unanimity about the critical role that school culture plays in implementing meaningful teacher performance appraisal. Principals stressed the importance of creating a strong school culture of trust and support. “If there is no trust or mutual respect within the school community,” the principal of School PB indicated, “your chances of introducing evaluation as a positive process are zero.”
As discussed earlier, the apartheid system of inspection and the political resistance to apartheid authority in public schools in the 1970s and 1980s has left a legacy of mistrust of any form of performance appraisal among public school teachers.

Even in the case of professional development, a senior manager at SACE felt that the biggest challenge for professional development in the public sector is its current culture. “From what we have seen,” she says, “very few individuals take accountability for their professional development. It is seen as something you do in order to earn money. Professional development is not seen as an inherent part of being a professional.” She blamed this culture in part on the old notch system where every additional qualification gained by a teacher resulted in a salary notch increase, promoting “a culture of expectation of money around development”. SACE indicated that the quality of reporting from teachers about their professional development needs is poor and shows a lack of teachers in driving their own development.

Visits to schools by SACE have had a positive impact in shifting mind-sets, but resources are limited and the reach is small. “We have been shocked by how little the senior management teams within schools know. They don’t even know that the IQMS is being changed and when we tell them about the CPTD system, they think this is the system to replace the IQMS.”

Teacher performance appraisal is also a recent development in the independent school sector. The older and more traditional independent schools indicated that teacher appraisal historically had not been part of the culture of the school and that it had taken time for the practice to gain acceptance. Introducing formal practices met with resistance, and even more so when teacher evaluation was called “performance management”. “Anything that sounds corporate is regarded with suspicion,” the HR director at School Group IC commented, adding that informal ‘fireside chats’ have been the predominant form of teacher evaluation in the independent school sector. The HR director of School IA concurred: “It takes time to change the mind-set. One of the things I put to the teachers, is their hypocrisy in resisting being assessed when they do so much assessing of others!” On the other hand, newer schools tended to establish a culture of evaluation immediately and as a result had little or no resistance.

Changing the mind-set and culture of teachers who have been entrenched in the ‘old way’ of doing things is difficult and the experience of schools that had introduced teacher performance appraisal is that it can be five years before it takes a hold: “Only then can you start to see the culture incorporated into everyday behaviour,” explained the HR director at School IC.

An HR practitioner working with independent schools raised another factor influencing teacher resistance to performance management. “Schools don’t understand strategy,” she stated, “and they don’t understand that performance management is aligned to strategy.” She invests considerable time on strategy training in her performance management workshops. Before they buy into the concept of performance management, “You have to get teachers to see the bigger picture,” she explained.

School leadership is a critical factor in driving the practice of teacher performance appraisal; embedding the practice in the everyday life of teachers is only possible with full buy-in from the
There is a major difference in the freedom that public and independent schools have in recruitment and this affects their ability to attain high levels of teacher performance. Independent school leaders have full autonomy in selection decisions, except in the case of the principal and certain senior positions, when the governing body of the school will be involved. In the public schools, on the other hand, the principals felt they had little control over the selection process and final decision.

The public school principals indicated that the recruitment process is prescribed by the DBE and selection is frequently based on departmental priorities, such as finding positions for displaced teachers and the placement of newly qualified teachers with state bursaries, rather than the needs of the school in question. In these cases the recruiting school has very limited say in the teacher that is assigned to them and this often translates into a poor fit between the school and the candidate, particularly in relation to the culture of the school. By contrast, the independent schools interviewed were able to prioritise the values and fit between the applicant and the particular school as one of the most critical competency requirements.

In the sample, a new innovative chain of schools stood out as a forerunner in a comprehensive approach to teacher appraisal and development that integrates it into the recruitment process. These schools are built on strong values and a belief in the importance of character as much as academic achievement. Given this, and their distinctive blended learning model, they have to ensure a good fit between new teachers and their mission, culture and methodology.

The chain prefers to hire young, less experienced teachers who have not been moulded into ‘the system’ and have key attributes. “We can teach our teachers how to teach in our methodology, but we can’t teach them to have certain behaviours,” said their director of leadership and development.

The hiring process is long and requires dedicated and skilled resources. Three interviews are involved: an initial telephonic one, then two formal ones – with the chief executive and operations officers, and then the director of leadership and development. Applicants are also required to participate in two twenty-minute observation blocks and conduct two fifteen-minute lessons.
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Classroom observation thus starts in the recruitment phase and becomes a regular practice within the school culture. New teachers participate in three weeks’ pre-service training before they begin to teach. Each teacher is assigned a dedicated coach who observes them in the classroom once a week and provides weekly feedback and support. “Teachers here are completely comfortable with being observed,” said the principal. “It is standard practice. It is not seen as a threat; neither is it evaluative. It is just evidence-gathering. I don’t want anyone teaching our students who is not being closely monitored and supported for progress.”

Assessing Teacher Performance

South Africa has not developed a framework of professional teaching practice standards for teachers that lead to learner achievement gains. Without these – as was repeatedly evidenced in the public school principals’ responses during interviews – there is no common understanding of the professional responsibilities of a teacher, the required competency profile, or what constitutes effective teaching practice leading to learning gains. The official review of the implementation of the IQMS (2007) identified vastly differing interpretations of the rating descriptors within the IQMS and raised serious questions about the validity of the assessment.

In South African schools two tools dominate the teacher performance assessment process: classroom observation and self-appraisal. Classroom observation is the main source of evidence for measuring performance, but it is not without its challenges, and both the public and independent schools in the sample had encountered resistance to this practice. The principals indicated older teachers are generally more resistant to classroom observation as they tend to have the perception that “they have been doing this long enough to know what they are doing,” and at this stage in their careers they are not interested in feedback on their practice, personal growth, or development opportunities. Younger teachers, although initially anxious, are generally more responsive and open to classroom observation and professional development.

Performance measurement in public schools

Classroom observation is a compulsory annual process within the performance measurement (PM) component of the IQMS. It is used to assess a teacher’s performance in the classroom against performance criteria and the final rating determines whether a teacher will obtain a performance increase. Over and above the annual pay increase negotiated in the public sector bargaining chamber, teachers can qualify for an annual performance increase of 1 per cent.

Classroom observation is experienced by many of the teachers as “a very judgmental process,” which, according to a SADTU representative, is reinforced by the “language of judgment” and the top-down design of the IQMS in particular. If the educators undertaking the appraisal are inadequately trained in providing constructive critical feedback to teachers that includes developmental support and guidance and follow-up, the process can deteriorate and be experienced as an overtly critical rating exercise. The evaluators need to be trained to identify evidence in support of their rating decisions, with the emphasis on corrective action, development and improvement.
The public sector interviewees felt that teachers’ negative experience of classroom observation is exacerbated if it is practiced as a once-off annual event. In this case, teachers experience the purpose of classroom observation as only judging their performance and securing their increase and “it loses any value that it may have had in terms of professional development”. But, as the principal of School PE said, “We just don’t have the spare capacity to make this a regular practice. We do what we have to do (in terms of the IQMS) and even that is a stretch.”

The performance assessment of a teacher is undertaken by the DSG, which comprises the teacher’s superior and another teacher selected by the appraised teacher. They assess the quality of a teacher’s performance using a prescribed four-point rating scale and their ratings have equal weight. The interviewed principals called into question the objectivity of the assessors. “Teachers invariably nominate a friend onto the DSG who gives the teacher (their friend) a high rating even if they know they don’t deserve it.” “Score felony” is how the principal of School PE referred to the process. “The final rating is always a compromise and rarely a true reflection of a teacher’s competence. There is no accountability in this process,” she added. Although a dispute procedure is in place to resolve substantial differences in scoring between members of the DSG, the process is long and protracted. “In the end,” School PD’s former principal said, “we opted for a compromise so as not to destroy relationships within the school. Ultimately we give the mark that is going to do the least amount of damage.”

Performance ratings, as reflected in the consolidated national results reported in the IQMS Annual Report of 2011/2012 indicated that the majority of teachers were rated in the upper limits of the evaluation scores. These high ratings are not consistent with research findings or South African teachers’ ranking as near the bottom of international comparative surveys, particularly in mathematics (see CDE’s 2013 report Mathematics Outcomes in South African Schools: What are the facts? What should be done?). The DBE acknowledges that performance ratings have been inflated, and although during the 2012/2013 year the ratings decreased marginally, this remains a concern.

Performance measurement in independent schools

Most independent schools interviewed have developed their own performance measurement processes and instruments, which often include a formal performance contracting process with identification of performance standards and indicators and at least one formal assessment a year with feedback.

School IC had recently developed a competency framework to guide their process. “Evaluation used to be more quantitatively based,” the HR director of this school commented, “but we have now shifted towards a more qualitative values-aligned process with greater emphasis on mentoring and feedback.”

School IC had recently introduced a master-level category in their staffing structure to allow teacher progression in terms of salary, without them having to pursue a management option to improve their remuneration. This was a common practice across the independent school sample. The job description of the master teacher includes a strong mentoring component and it is hoped that once mentoring is embedded in school practice it will result in higher performance. Many independent schools use regular mentoring to provide ongoing support to teachers throughout the year. At School Group ID,
for example, every teacher is observed weekly by their mentor in the classroom and has individualised coaching sessions.

At School IA2, the deputy principal indicated that excellence is the standard expectation of their teachers. “What we are now looking for (when we measure performance) is beyond excellence,” she added. “What role does a teacher play in servant leadership, curriculum development, writing papers for the Independent Education magazine, or presenting at a conference?”

**Performance incentives**

Neither the principals of public schools nor those of independent schools saw the remuneration of teachers as an incentive to join the profession or perform well. They felt that their remuneration was poor and not competitive with jobs of an equal level in other sectors. Those in the high-fee independent schools perceived their salary levels to be higher than those employed in low-fee independent and public schools, but still not competitive with salaries in the wider commercial market.

All schools shared the sentiment that teachers, at the existing levels of remuneration, are not driven by pay. The common view of the interviewees was that linking annual increases to performance was often counterproductive and could lead to teacher resistance.

The trend in independent schools and the better-resourced public schools is towards rewarding exceptional performance through a once-off bonus or incentive. “Incentives are an excellent retention strategy, and go some way to acknowledge the commitment of our teachers,” the principal of School PA noted. Most public schools do not have the financial resources to exercise this option. Those schools that have the financial capacity are required to apply to the Provincial Education Department (PED) for Section 38A status which grants them the ability to award incentive bonuses to staff.

Although unusual in the independent school sector, two of the interviewed schools, one a part of a large for-profit chain, and the other of a not-for-profit group of schools, share a reward philosophy based on a competitive ranking approach to performance. The IE school chain, for example, categorises teacher increases into percentages: 22 per cent of the staff are eligible for top increases, 70 per cent for average increases, and the final 10 per cent have to be given less than a 5 per cent increase. This is a typical business model.

The IA schools have recently introduced a new performance management system that results in a ranking process where the four top-performing teachers in the school qualify for a “distinguished performer award” of a substantial bonus. This has received a mixed response from teachers. Some teachers expressed concern about the impact of ranking staff performance but also recognised that the performance management process has “immense value, particularly around the performance conversations and developmental aspects”.

The trend in independent schools and the better-resourced public schools is towards rewarding exceptional performance through a once-off bonus or incentive.
Summary of Findings

The main findings below are grouped into those arising from the school interviews, followed by the results of CDE’s analysis of the evolving policy framework.

Schools’ Experience

Although the sample of schools was too small to produce generalisable findings, the interviews produced valuable insights in how the schools experienced teacher performance appraisal and development. Their views reflect a number of commonalities and some marked differences, mainly between public and independent schools. However, some differences between the schools in the same sector were also identified.

• **Public sector interviewees’ experience of performance appraisal and professional development was very different from that of the independent schools.** While in the public schools, performance appraisal, linked to the annual performance increase, dominated at the expense of professional development, the independent schools weighted professional development over performance management. The public sector interviewees felt that the IQMS did not result in meaningful accountability, performance improvement or effective professional development, but the independent schools affirmed the value that teacher appraisal plays in promoting professional development, which enhances teaching quality and is a drawcard in attracting and retaining staff.

• **Sufficient capacity in terms of staff, time and evaluation skills is critical.** A lack of capacity in the public schools had reduced the IQMS to largely a compliance exercise with limited or no professional development. In the large, well-resourced independent schools there were more staff and specialised skills to implement teacher performance appraisal and development effectively.

• **A positive culture for teacher appraisal, whether for performance assessment or professional development, emerged as critical.** All interviewees stressed that strong school leadership and teacher buy-in is essential to create a positive culture. The legacy of apartheid and teachers’ previous experience of poor appraisal practices and ineffective development had produced a negative culture in the public schools. When teacher appraisal was introduced in the well-established independent schools in the sample, it met with resistance and could take as long as five years to embed in the everyday work of the school. The new chain of schools made it part of its culture from the outset.

• **Teacher performance and accountability begin with teacher recruitment and the freedom of schools to choose the best teacher for their needs is an important factor.** While the public school interviewees felt that in practice they had little control over appointments, the independent schools have the freedom to select the teacher that matches their values and high expectations, and accountability becomes less of a challenge.

• **Dismissal of poorly performing teachers is very rare in public schools and a last resort in independent schools.** Interviewees spoke of teachers in public schools and some independent schools being ‘re-allocated’ to subjects seen as less important, while good teachers are moved to critical subjects.
Pay was not seen as an incentive for performance in either the public or independent schools. Once-off bonuses for good performance were used in the independent schools and well-resourced public schools. Competitive ranking and reward for exceptional teacher performance have been introduced in two of the school groups.

Overall, CDE’s research identified key elements of international best practice in the sample of independent schools, but not among the sample of fee-charging public schools with good learner results. This suggests that the design of the IQMS and its multiple requirements that demand significant school capacity is the main problem. The sample of well-resourced independent schools had the freedom and capacity to develop their own models, but they are front-runners in the sector, where only a small minority of schools have introduced a formal system of performance appraisal and development.

The Public Policy Framework

CDE’s analysis of the evolving policy framework for teacher performance appraisal and professional development in South Africa has revealed some serious weaknesses and ongoing challenges, especially when compared with the findings of our international survey of teacher evaluation (see CDE’s 2015 report Teacher Evaluation: Lessons from other countries).47

- The current IQMS is a deeply flawed policy that does not achieve its aims as government, the unions and other key stakeholders all recognise and CDE’s research has confirmed. Insufficient training has been provided, it is hardly implemented, even in ‘good’ public schools, and has increased educator scepticism of performance management and professional development. This reality gives rise to the question: Is it doing more harm than good?

- The lack of professional teaching standards in South Africa, which define what teachers should know and be able to do to support learning gains is a serious deficiency. The vast majority of countries surveyed by CDE have such teaching standards, and the few that do not, recognise that it is difficult to conduct teacher evaluation in the absence of a common, accepted and reliable set of standards that describe what constitutes effective teaching practices for pupil learning. This was also seen as a major problem by public sector interviewees.

- International best practice indicates that the separation of teacher performance assessment from professional development in the proposed new QMS is highly problematic for achieving learning gains. Internationally, an integrated teacher evaluation model that combines performance assessment (based on evidence from a range of instruments) with productive feedback and individualised professional learning opportunities has been shown to increase teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

- The new centralised system of CPTD does not contain the essential features of professional development that improve teacher effectiveness as identified by international research. These flow from constructive feedback after the performance assessment and provide individualised high-quality support, including mentoring for teachers needing assistance, coaching and opportunities to share expertise through collaborative peer-learning. By contrast, the QMS and centralised CPTD management system are totally separate systems that remove professional development from schools, which have no responsibility for providing educator support, and leave it to the initiative and self-reflection of the educator.

The lack of professional teaching standards in South Africa, which define what teachers should know and be able to do to support learning gains is a serious deficiency.
The implementation of the IQMS was rendered ineffective by not securing the buy-in of educators, providing sufficient training in its use, increasing school capacity, and adequately addressing the unproductive teaching and learning environment in the public school sector. Unless these factors are addressed and changed they will bedevil the implementation of any future system.

Concluding Remarks

The failure of the IQMS points to the importance of developing a new policy in South Africa. The QMS is waiting in the wings for implementation and separates performance assessment from professional development, as advocated at the Teacher Summit of 2009. The reasons for this separation appear to arise more from the legacy of the past and the flawed design and implementation of the IQMS rather than best practice examples in other countries and international research evidence.

The QMS is seen by government and the teacher unions as an improvement on the IQMS, but in light of CDE’s international research findings and the public schools’ experience, is it good enough?

CDE’s international and local research suggest that it is highly unlikely that the QMS or the CPTD system will lead to greater teacher effectiveness and increased learner achievement. CDE therefore would raise four strategic questions for policy makers and key stakeholders to consider:

- Should the QMS be implemented when it is unlikely to achieve quality teaching and learning gains?
- Will the cost and effort of implementing a new system be worth it?
- Given the negative history of quality management might it do harm?
- Should the CPTD system be fully implemented or re-designed for greater effectiveness?

In CDE’s view South Africa cannot afford to implement another system of teacher performance appraisal that does not contain the essential elements for its success, or a professional development system that will be ineffective. Given the pressing need to improve teacher effectiveness and learning achievement, only systems that have the potential to make a real difference to teaching quality and learner achievement in the country should be designed and implemented. To that end, the development by accomplished educators of professional teaching practice standards that are shown to support learning gains and are agreed to by all key stakeholders is an essential first step.
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APPENDIX A: PROFILE OF SCHOOLS

As part of the research methodology interviews were conducted in ten schools in Gauteng (five public and five independent schools). The principals of the schools were interviewed except in school PB.

Public schools

The sample of public schools consisted of three ex-Model C primary schools for white learners during apartheid that are now racially integrated, and two township schools, one secondary and one primary where the learner enrolment is black. While the three ex-Model C schools charge mid to high-level fees, the township schools charge low fees. The school that charges only R100 a year is applying to become a no-fee school. All achieve good pupil results.

The public schools asked that their names be kept confidential, so they have been given an identifier with the ‘P’ denoting a public school.

Table 1: Public schools interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>School fees per annum</th>
<th>Fee level</th>
<th>Total learner enrolment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nature of learner enrolment</th>
<th>Learner achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>R20,200 (Grade 1-3)</td>
<td>Mid-fee</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Parkview</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>R 23,650</td>
<td>Mid-fee</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>76% - Maths 79% - Language (2014 ANAs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>R 1,700</td>
<td>Low-fee</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>Lenasia</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>R 10,300</td>
<td>Low-fee</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>Roodepoort</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>86% - Maths 87% - Language (2014 ANAs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>R100</td>
<td>Low-fee</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>Soweto</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>89.4% (2014 Matric results)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent schools

The majority of independent schools in the sample were high-fee schools located in suburbs in Sandton and Johannesburg. All are large schools: three are composite schools with pre-primary, primary and high schools on one campus, and the other two are chains of school on many campuses. Interviews were typically conducted with the principal/deputy principal who spoke for the policy and practice that applied to all the schools on a campus, and in the case of school chains, a director/CEO of the whole operation. In two schools HR managers were also interviewed.
These schools are also given identifiers where the ‘I’ denotes an independent school. Except for 1D that is a new, mid-fee chain of schools operating in different areas of Johannesburg, they are well-established schools. All provide high quality education.

Table 2: The sample of composite independent schools and school chains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School group</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Lowest school fees per annum</th>
<th>Highest school fees per annum</th>
<th>Fee level</th>
<th>Total learner enrolment</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group IA</td>
<td>IA1</td>
<td>R 64,391</td>
<td>R 69,396</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>2,589</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IA2</td>
<td>R 79,376</td>
<td>R 89,505</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IA3</td>
<td>R 75,804</td>
<td>R 82,115</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IA4</td>
<td>R 104,770</td>
<td>R 104,770</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IA5</td>
<td>R 104,770</td>
<td>R 104,770</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IB</td>
<td>IB1</td>
<td>R 42,560</td>
<td>R 45,745</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>Bedfordview</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IB2</td>
<td>R 50,665</td>
<td>R 79,790</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>Bedfordview</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IB3</td>
<td>R 93,655</td>
<td>R 102,400</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>Bedfordview</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IC</td>
<td>IC1</td>
<td>R 68,552</td>
<td>R 91,823</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC2</td>
<td>R 65,394</td>
<td>R 82,403</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC3</td>
<td>R 90,360</td>
<td>R 95,439</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain ID</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>R 15,750</td>
<td>R 15,750</td>
<td>Mid-fee</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Not available yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain IE</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>R 12,870</td>
<td>R 107,130</td>
<td>High-fee</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: LEGISLATION RELATING TO TEACHER APPRAISAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Only those acts, statutory bodies and policies that have affected current teacher appraisal and professional development evaluation are outlined below:

- **The Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC)** was established in 1994 as a bargaining council to serve the public education sector. It includes representation by both employers (representing the state) and trade unions. A number of agreements reached at the ELRC impact on teacher evaluation practices in public schools, and most significantly the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). The IQMS is informed by Schedule 1 of the Employment of Teachers Act (76 of 1998), where the minister is required to determine performance standards for teachers in terms of which their performance is to be evaluated. Independent schools are not represented in the Council and are not bound by ELRC Resolutions. Collective agreements reached through the Council, unlike acts or policies, are not enforceable by law, although technically the national Department of Education (DoE), since 2009 known as the Department of Basic Education (DBE), can enforce the agreement. However, to sustain a healthy relationship with all teacher unions so that members cooperate with provincial officials to facilitate smooth implementation, the DBE would only exercise this option as a last resort. Independent schools do not sit on the ELRC and are thus not bound by its resolutions.

- **The South African Council for Educators (SACE)** is the professional council established in terms of the SACE Act (31 of 2000), responsible for the registration of teachers, for managing a system for the continuing professional development (CPD) of all teachers and to ensure teachers’ adherence to the Code of Professional Ethics. SACE’s mandate was broadened by the National Policy Framework on Teacher Education and Development (NPFTED) of April 2007 to include overall responsibility for the implementation, management and quality assurance of the Continuing Professional Teacher Development (CPTD) Management System.

- **The CPTD Management System** obtains its mandate from the NPFTED (2007), the SACE Act (31 of 2000 as amended by the Basic Education Laws Amendment Act 15 of 2011). It is supported by the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development (ISPFTED) South Africa 2011-2025, as well as the education section of the National Development Plan (2012).

- **Umalusi Council** is responsible for accreditation and quality assurance in general and further education and is constituted by the General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Act (58 of 2001 amended in 2008) (GENFETQA). Independent schools are required to be accredited by Umalusi. Public schools, however, are exempt from this process.

- **The Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011-2025** was launched in 2011. The Plan is a high-level strategy that frames the quantitative and qualitative challenges for teacher education and development, and outlines a 15-year plan for improved and expanded teacher education and development opportunities with the primary outcome as “to improve the quality of teacher education and development in order to improve the quality of teachers and teaching”.
APPENDIX C: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The IQMS process

The school principal is responsible for initiating the IQMS in a school, and for convening a meeting to elect members of a school development team (SDT).

The IQMS follows an annual cycle that includes a lengthy process of 20 stages.

Stages of the IQMS process

- Formation of the SDT which is responsible for oversight of the IQMS, including an implementation plan and development of the school improvement plan (SIP)
- Self-evaluation by the teacher
- Formation of the development support group (DSG) which consists of the direct supervisor and a member nominated by the staff member, such as a colleague
- Pre-evaluation discussion between the teacher and the DSG
- Baseline evaluation, using the approved instrument, for first-year teachers only
- Post-evaluation meeting to give feedback
- Development of personal growth plans (PGPs)
- Development of the SIP
- First development cycle
- Self-evaluation and revision of PGPs and the SIP
- Second development cycle
- Second self-evaluations against PGPs and the SIP
- Revision of the PGP and the SIP
- Summative evaluations
- Final discussions, with the opportunity to raise a dispute
- Completion of composite score sheets
- The final report
- Internal moderation
- The development of a district improvement plan
- External moderation.

The IQMS instrument is in two parts. One part, made up of four performance standards, is for lesson observation. Those performance standards are: The creation of a positive learning environment; Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes; Lesson planning, preparation and presentation;
and Learner assessment. The other part, made up of eight performance standards, is related to aspects for evaluation that fall outside of the classroom. Those performance standards are: Professional development in field of work/career and participation in professional bodies; Human relations and contribution to school development; Extra-curricular and co-curricular participation; Administration of resources and records; Personnel; Decision making and accountability; Leadership, communication and servicing the governing body; and Strategic planning, financial planning and EMD.
APPENDIX D: Quality Management System

The QMS has been developed to replace the current IQMS but it is not yet in effect in the public school system. It has been designed to evaluate the performance levels of individual school-based educators in order to improve accountability and achieve high levels of school performance. The QMS does not include the school-based development component of the IQMS, and this become the responsibility of individual educators (see diagram below) within the national system of Continuing Professional Teacher Development (CPTD).

It incorporates the following:

- Measuring the performance of educators in line with their respective roles and responsibilities.
- Providing a basis for decisions on rewards, incentives and other salary related benefits for the current year.
- Providing a basis for decisions on mechanisms to recognise good performance and address under-performance.
- Consideration of the relevant contextual factors in conducting assessments.

The purpose of the QMS is to:

- determine levels of competence;
- enhance educator efficiency, effectiveness and good performance;
- improve accountability levels within schools;
- provide a basis for decisions on mechanisms to recognise good performance and address under-performance;
- ensure that educators perform their duties with integrity, and maintain a positive, vigilant attitude towards all learning activities;
- provide a basis for paying salary progression, rewards and other incentives; and
- provide mechanisms for assessing educators, taking into account the context within which they operate.

Figure 1: Proposed relationship between appraisal and development in QMS document