Teacher quality, appraisal and development: The flaws in the IQMS[1]

FRANCINE DE CLERCQ

FRANCINE DE CLERCQ is presently head of the Division of Education Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS) in the School of Education, University of the Witwatersrand. She teaches, researches and publishes in the area of education policy, district and school change, teacher accountability and support. She also does some consultancy for the national and Gauteng Departments of Education.

Abstract

This article addresses the issue of how to monitor and develop the quality of teaching in schools by identifying the international lessons of teacher appraisal, monitoring and support systems and by interrogating the recently introduced South African Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). The aim is to show why teacher monitoring and appraisal systems work differently, depending on their purposes, forms and conceptual framework about how they contribute to teacher development.

The article argues that the educator component of the IQMS makes problematic assumptions about educator quality and improvement in South African schools. It is not aligned with the status and work of most educators, and over-estimates the implementation readiness of the majority of schools as well as the appraisal and support capacity of senior school and district management. The challenge is to make educators behave and be treated as professionals, as well as to manage the inevitable tensions of appraisal systems. It concludes that a systemic approach to teacher monitoring and development is not sufficient because it also requires changes in the beliefs and attitudes of educators and appraisers alike. A more realistic system of educator appraisal is needed. Education departments should fund and implement a professional development plan, which involves educators and is supported by a high quality professional development staff.

Keywords: Teacher quality; appraisal for improvement; professional development and collaborative culture

Introduction

Many recent evaluation research studies as well as education department documents have indicated that teacher performance in South African schools remains low and contributes significantly to the poor learners' results in the last decade (Taylor & Vinjevold, 1999; DoE, 2006a). Studies of factors contributing to poor learner achievements in developing countries

1 I am grateful to the anonymous *PiE* reviewers and Dawn Butler for their helpful comments in the re-writing of this article.

include factors such as the socio-economic background of learners and their communities, the context of schooling, inadequate leadership and quality resources; however, they also point to the importance of quality teaching. The school effectiveness and improvement literature concurs that, at school level, teaching quality is one of the most important variables which influences learner achievement (Hopkins, Ainscow & West, 1994; Scheerens, 2000). What is less agreed upon is how teachers are best monitored and assisted to improve their teaching and thereby enhance learners' achievements.

Systems of teacher appraisal in Anglophone countries (such as the United Kingdom (UK), United States of America (USA), Australia, New Zealand and Botswana) have been debated and revised on the ground that a carefully crafted approach is needed to yield positive results in this era of change (Bartlett, 2000; Cardno & Piggot Irvine, 1997; Monyatsi, Steyn & Kamper, 2006). South Africa has recently revised its appraisal system and introduced in schools the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) (ELRC, 2003). This system brings together different forms of monitoring and appraisal in the hope that the new integrated system will overcome obstacles encountered in previous systems.

This article examines the relationship between quality teaching and teacher monitoring and development and explore which appraisal strategies work best in different contexts. It works from a "political" perspective to policy analysis, which analyses policies (in this case, appraisal systems) as the product of various socio-political forces which produce an unstable system, fraught with tensions. It questions what is understood by effective teaching competences, how these can be enhanced in different contexts. It then analyses different approaches to teacher appraisal and development; in doing this, it examines their assumptions and tensions about teachers' status, beliefs, practices as well as teachers' impact on learners. The article uses the lessons derived from various teacher monitoring and development systems to examine the educator component[2] of the IQMS, its content, dilemmas and likely impact on the quality of teaching in South African schools. It argues that, although the IQMS addresses some problems of previous educator monitoring and appraisal systems, it also creates new problems and tensions. This is because of its problematic conceptual understanding of educators, their status, work, and what needs to be done to improve teaching practices. On the basis of working backwards from where the majority of South African educators are, and what challenges they face, it suggests another approach to monitoring, supervising and supporting educators.

Effective teaching: Changing teacher work, knowledge and competences

The meaning of effective teaching is difficult to define as it is complex and context-based, and schools differ widely in their dynamics, organisations and learner populations. It is however accepted that teachers need different competences such as subject knowledge, pedagogical and societal knowledge; the latter enables them to understand their learners, learning and the learning environment, as well as the appropriate nature of curriculum and resource materials. The World Bank study on Secondary Education in Africa (World Bank, 2005) states that the most important preconditions for effective teaching are competent and knowledgeable teachers, effective curriculum and resources, as well as the way in which teachers use these in the learning environment.

Strategies to improve teacher quality on the ground have often been criticised for not confronting all the factors and dynamics involved in effective teaching; a further criticism is the

[2] The school component of the IQMS has been analysed in another article by the same author (de Clercq F, 2007).

piecemeal manner in which they have targeted aspects of the complex and context-sensitive teaching and learning issues (Hopkins *et al*., 1994). This is why O'Day and Smith (1993) argue for a systemic approach to reforms on teacher quality, development and monitoring. This approach is based on a conceptualisation of teachers' work, monitoring and development which is coherent with similar assumptions about the nature and role of teachers' work and responsibilities. Cohen (1995) adds that a structural approach to change is not sufficient but that systems of education and teachers must be challenged in how they view and think about teachers' work, status and relationship to learners.

Kelley (1997) and Hargreaves (2002) propose useful typologies to trace change overtime in schools and teachers' work and status. Kelley (1997) explains that the traditional view of teaching in the USA up to the 1970s, was that teachers had to transmit predetermined knowledge to learners through standardised prescribed teaching procedures and methods. In this pre-professional era (Hargreaves, 2002), teachers were treated as workers who had to deliver a teacher-proof curriculum content with specified syllabi and textbooks. Gradually, as schools were challenged to produce better quality education for learners, teachers were expected to work as autonomous professionals, who knew how to choose pedagogical and content knowledge relevant to their specific context, constraints and learners (Kelley, 1997). According to a constructivist approach to teaching, teachers were expected to act as facilitators or mediators of learners' learning, and enrich the curriculum for their learners. In this new professional era (Hargreaves, 2002), teachers were seen as professionals who were committed to quality teaching; they were required to have the educational, professional and pedagogical content knowledge to analyse learners' context and devise teaching content and strategies suitable for different learners. Later, in the 1980s and 1990s, according to Kelley (1997), teachers were increasingly asked to improve learners' achievements by reflecting with professional colleagues on how to use their learners' results to improve their context-specific teaching practices. Hargreaves (2002) describes this collegial era as teachers networking as professionals, using reflexive competences to work together as colleagues to improve their practices. Although Kelley and Hargreaves present these features of teaching and the different demands made on teachers as belonging to different eras, it is understood that these can also co-exist within a schooling system at a moment in time.

When it comes to South African teachers, it can be argued that, because of the apartheid legacy of unequal education systems, most educators approached their work as workers or civil servants rather than as professionals. With the ambitious policy reforms promoting a new approach to teaching and learning, and the difficulties to support their implementation in schools, I would argue that most educators are overwhelmed and continue to work in a similar manner. These educators comply with the bureaucratic rules and regulations and transmit the curriculum in the only way they know. They do not see themselves as fully responsible for learners' results, and, together with their unions, they argue that learners achieve poorly because of the inadequate school resources and socio-economic contextual factors. In their view, the ambitious educational policies are beyond their control and they cannot be expected as educators to compensate for all this (SADTU, 2005). Gallie (2006) argues that these educators work mostly in non-functioning and low-functioning schools, which, according to Taylor (2006), comprise around 80% of the schooling system.

However, there are also some educators (usually in functioning schools) who behave as professionals taking responsibility for improving the teaching and learning interaction. These educators are committed to reflect on their own practices and ways in which they can motivate more effectively learners to overcome the difficult obstacles which militate against their learning and achievements. This ability and commitment require some "reflexive" competence, which professional teachers necessarily have, in addition to having content, pedagogical and societal knowledge. Expectations of such teacher professionalism and competences are interestingly

promoted by the Department of Education (DoE) policy document, *The Norms and Standards for Educators* (DoE, 2000), which spells out three kinds of "Applied Competence" to develop in future teachers: "Practical, Foundational and Reflexive Competences".

Changing teacher development

Research on learner achievement in the USA (Darling Hammond, 1989) shows that many American states, which extensively invested in teachers, either via pre- and in-service teacher education, teacher licensing or teacher salaries, have produced improvements in teachers' classroom work and learner achievement. But the central questions to address are: what is effective professional development? What kinds of professional development do different teachers need?

According to Kelley (1997) and Reitzug (2002), teachers who are viewed as workers need basic content and pedagogical knowledge through pre- and in-service education, but such education is decided and driven from outside schools, with little teacher involvement. Many of these training activities, which take place off-site at teacher centres or district offices, expose teachers to ways of improving day-to-day classroom activities through generic lectures and/or workshops on various pedagogical or administrative issues.

As teachers become, and act as, autonomous professionals, Reitzug (2002) explains that different kinds of in-service activities are needed, which take a school-based approach in the work setting. Such professional development involves on-site workshops, coaching by mentors and/or facilitators who model good practices, and encourage teachers to share and reflect on their own practices with colleagues working in similar contexts. The aim is to instil in teachers the reflexive competences to examine what they achieve, what professional development they need to improve their pedagogical delivery, and learn new practices.

The problem with this experiential collective inquiry approach is that teachers collaborating with one another cannot always go beyond their own practices; it is difficult for them to identify more effective ways of teaching and mediating the curriculum. Teachers need to be exposed to meaningful opportunities to question and learn from teacher experts who provide advice, give demonstrations and regular constructive feedback. This supervision of teachers by experts or "critical friends" is best, according to Darling Hammond (1989), at promoting valuable collective learning experiences. It can be provided through what Little (1993) and Reitzug (2002) call "teacher support networks" or "teacher/school clustering". This professional development is school-initiated and targeted at the needs, not of individual teachers but, of teachers' teams and curriculum units. Such a teacher development approach was used successfully by Alvarado in his New York Community School District #2 (Elmore & Burney, 1999), when he introduced high quality on-site professional support, followed by a tight system of teacher accountability for improvement. Thus, different forms of professional development are needed to address teachers with different needs and/or work demands and expectations. Interestingly, such a multifaceted approach is suggested in the recently released National Policy Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa (NPFTED) (DoE 2007, 18).

Changing teacher monitoring or accountability

The traditional form of teacher monitoring or bureaucratic accountability refers to line management supervision. It can be done either externally (by departmental subject advisors or inspectors) or internally (by the school management) and is usually conducted for control purposes. Such monitoring focuses on inputs and processes to ensure equity and standardisation in schools and monitors teachers' work processes, such as lesson planning and preparation, curriculum coverage and delivery, as well as teacher compliance with departmental rules, regulations and procedures (such as punctuality, attendance, class registers, assessment, etc.).

The methods of such monitoring are important. Appraisers, such as school management, can be effective in monitoring teachers if there is respect and dialogue between teachers and appraisers. Yet external appraisers (or inspectors) are rarely trusted and teachers become anxious and stressed about their visits which they often perceive as intimidating and threatening (Ali, 1998). These appraisers' recommendations rarely have a positive impact on teachers' practices because they are rarely followed up because these appraisers do not have an on-going relationship with teachers. Marshall (2005) argues also that such infrequent monitoring cannot capture the complex dimensions of teaching as it evaluates only a small part of teachers' work and relies on few sources of evidence, such as private discussions and a few classroom visits.

Thus bureaucratic teacher accountability is aligned to the earlier notion of teachers as workers who have to transmit a teacher-proof curriculum and have to comply with departmental procedures and regulations. It tends to reinforce the isolation of teachers, to stifle creative innovative practices and to undermine constructive dialogue among teachers on ways to improve their teaching practices. This approach assumes that teachers work within a fragmented school culture and are alone responsible for the transmission of the curriculum.

In contrast, professional monitoring or accountability, which refers to professional teachers evaluating their colleagues' work, encourages teachers to share and reflect together (often on-site) on ways of improving practices. This approach focuses primarily on teacher practices, and is based on the notion that teachers have the professional responsibility to improve their practices and make them relevant to their classroom-specific contexts. It is a flexible approach to monitoring which shifts away from a compliance orientation by school or district management towards a more dynamic context-specific process owned by teacher teams.

However, O'Day (2004) argues for a combination of bureaucratic and professional accountabilities, on the grounds that the two approaches offset one another's weaknesses. If bureaucratic teacher accountability is useful in ensuring equity of service delivery, it does not encourage staff collaboration and team reflection – which is what professional accountability does best. Professional accountability, however, only works fully with teachers who are knowledgeable professionals, who are committed to improving their practices and learners' achievements.

Forms of teacher appraisal

Evans and Tomlinson (1989) trace the interest in teacher appraisal to two sources: initially, a call for greater accountability and control of schools and teachers; and later, as teachers' work and responsibility evolved, appraisal became an essential ingredient of school development. It provided a framework to identify teachers' strengths and weaknesses, and facilitated the identification of personal and professional development plans within the broader aim of school development (Bartlett, 2000). Schools in Scotland and New Zealand developed their own internal systems of teacher appraisal, which encouraged a self-critical self-developing approach to teacher and school improvement (Bartlett, 2000; Cardno *et al.*, 1997).

Today these two interrelated teacher appraisal purposes tend to co-exist uneasily. The developmental purpose assumes that teachers trust one another and want to improve their performance by reflecting together as professionals on their development needs (Bartlett, 2000). The performance purpose – also known as the accountability model – provides management with information on teachers' performance for their job confirmation, promotion or dismissal (Monyatsi *et al.*, 2006). This is often seen as a managerial, judgemental and control-oriented exercise which undermines teachers' professional autonomy and inevitably causes teacher anxiety, stress and defensiveness (Bartlett, 2000; Cardno *et al.*, 1997). As Winter (1989) argues, a conflict can easily develop in a procedure designed to be used to assist in professional development and as a management tool to identify those whose performance is above or below

par. Teachers are unlikely to trust such a procedure which is rarely perceived as a rational process with a common goal, based on objective standards and procedures. Conflict develop out of the contested views about important teacher attributes and competences, about the criteria and activities used for evaluating these attributes, and about the aspects of the teaching and learning process which need to be changed (Darling Hammond, 1989, 290).

Moreover, when two teacher appraisal systems co-exist separately, a dominant form develops and is inevitably privileged over the other. Bartlett (2000) argues that, in the UK today, the desire for accountability, standardisation and control of teachers takes precedence over the aim of professional development.

But what are the inevitable tensions which need to be acknowledged in any teacher appraisal? It is somewhat paradoxical to monitor educator's individual performance for the improvement of a school's organisational effectiveness in achieving its goals. Another tension is to expect teachers to act as autonomous professionals and then use an appraisal system based on comparative standardised criteria of performance, as if educators' performance can be assessed outside of specific contexts and circumstances. To ask senior management (and colleagues) to act as evaluators and advisors at the same time is also a challenge. Combining appraisal for development and performance management with a common appraisal instrument also sends ambivalent messages to school staff who can be tempted to use the instrument for the sole purpose of securing rewards. Because of these various dilemmas, some scholars advocate the use of separate instruments and separate appraisers to assess for development and for accountability (Bartlett, 2000); while others argue that these dilemmas have to be managed by appraisers through strong strategic school/departmental leadership (Cardno *et al.*, 1997).

An example of managing these tensions is for principals or heads of department to promote a genuine dialogue with teachers in a collegial climate. This is done through frequent classroom visits, having authentic conversations and giving regular constructive developmental feedback (Marshall, 2005, 732). Another way is to focus not on individual teachers but rather on the work of teacher teams or curriculum units to search together for new ideas and practices for teacher and school-wide improvement.

These tensions also suggest that a structural systemic approach to teacher appraisal cannot alone drive teacher improvement because it is inevitably mediated by many different school conditions and human factors (Cardno *et al.,* 1997). For this reason, it is also necessary to involve and convince teachers, by working on their values, beliefs and attitudes, that they and their learners stand to benefit from teacher appraisal.

IQMS and educator appraisal in South Africa

The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) was concluded by two Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) agreements in 2003, with the aim of enhancing and monitoring the performance of schools and educators. The IQMS brings together the Whole School Education (WSE) policy, the Development Appraisal System (DAS), and the Performance Measurement (PM), the last two making up the IQMS educator component. This educator evaluation system, introduced in schools in January 2005, combines educator monitoring and appraisal for development and is based on an instrument with standardised performance areas. The first part of the instrument is used for lesson observation with four individual-based teaching performance standards, and the second part is used to assess professional issues outside the classroom with three performance standards. A further four standards are used to assess senior management. (ELRC, 2003). Educators do their on-going self-evaluations on the basis of this instrument, which are then verified by a development support group (DSG), consisting of a head of department and selected staff colleague. This evaluation records an educator's strengths and areas in need of development. This DSG evaluation serves as a baseline to inform an educator's

personal growth plan (PGP). All educators' PGPs inform the School Improvement Plan (SIP), which is intended to guide the district and school on educators' identified targets and areas requiring support. At the end of every second year, a summative Performance Measurement (PM) evaluation is done, giving educators an overall score, which may or may not lead to rewards. The IQMS stipulates that contextual factors should be taken into account, and that total scores can be adjusted to reflect educators' difficult school contexts and work constraints (ELRC, 2003). However, such adjustments are seldom made (Marneweck, *Class Act*, 2007). The scores of educators are then internally moderated by the SMT/principal and externally verified by district officials. In 2008 a further layer of nationally-appointed moderators will ensure that the system is fairly and consistently implemented across the nine provinces.

There are positive aspects to this educator component of the IQMS. It makes an important distinction between formative and summative evaluation. The formative evaluation, or appraisal for development, informs the professional growth plan and the summative evaluation, or performance measurement linked to a grade and/or salary progression, assesses the progress which educators make after receiving the professional support specified in their PGPs from their DSGs and/or the district. Teachers' unions, and SADTU in particular, insisted that educator support precedes performance appraisal, and that districts and senior management adopt a developmental attitude in providing support to educators, in line with their identified areas of development (SADTU, 2002 & 2005). The existence of PGPs ensures a transparent educator-initiated system of appraisal for development, for which district officials and/or school management are expected to account.

But there are also problematic issues concerning 1) the IQMS unrealistic assumptions regarding teachers' work, status and competences given how the majority of South African educators are treated, function and view themselves at work; 2) the awkward combination in one system of internal and external bureaucratic (with a standardised appraisal instrument) and professional monitoring (with peer contextual appraisal) for development and accountability which leads inevitably to tensions; and finally 3) the poor leadership capacity, at district and school level, to effectively implement the appraisal system, and to manage its inherent dilemmas.

IQMS assumptions

The first IQMS assumption is that a certain level of professional competence, openness and respect towards colleagues exists among school staff. Its form of internal peer appraisal assumes that most schools have a professional collaborative climate and culture where staff work and reflect together on how to improve teaching and learning. Yet, several recent research studies (Taylor & Vinjevold, 1999; JET, 2005) have shown how unsatisfactory the professional qualifications of many educators are, as well as their mastery of subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Research (Taylor, 2006) points out that a poor culture of teaching and learning subsists today in the majority of poorly functioning schools, and that South African learners' achievements are among the lowest in the world for comparative countries (Fleisch, 2008). These poor results influence educators' values and attitudes, making them defensive towards any form of performance monitoring.

This defensiveness is worsened by the extensive challenges posed by the ambitious educational policies and regulations of the post-apartheid government. Most educators, especially those from disadvantaged schools, struggle to implement, *inter alia*, the Revised National Curriculum Statement (RNCS), the assessment protocol and alternative discipline to corporal punishment. According to Parker and Harley (1998), the Outcomes-based curriculum represents a major change in educators' work status, identity and demands. Most educators, who were treated and acted for years as workers transmitting a teacher-proof curriculum, struggle to negotiate effectively these challenges. Thus, the curriculum and assessment policies require

educators in poorly functioning schools in particular to acquire much higher levels of professional competence and to do much more administrative paper work (from increasing learner assessments) (Chisholm *et al.*, 2005).

SADTU (2002; 2005) argues that, under these circumstances, it is unfair to hold educators accountable for effective curriculum implementation and poor learners' achievements. Both the difficult teaching conditions and the recent policies, which are beyond educators' control, greatly influence learners' poor attitudes, low levels of interest and achievements. For these reasons, many educators resist this formal appraisal process (and more specifically its classroom visits), which they see as unfair, inappropriate to their work circumstances, and more about accountability than development (SADTU, 2005).

These assumptions of the IQMS do not match educators' experiences and perceptions of their work, occupational identity and competences. As mentioned earlier, most educators do not behave as professionals, who are committed to reflecting with colleagues on their practices to improve. Without doubts, well-performing functioning schools are better equipped to manage and mediate these IQMS expectations in a productive way. In these schools, the IQMS process can contribute to the improvement of educators' performance, but in other low-functioning schools, the process is seen as a cumbersome, time-consuming and fruitless exercise, which does not bring any benefit and is therefore not treated seriously (Wadvalla, 2005).

Educator monitoring and the IQMS

Another problematic issue is the lack of capacity for educator monitoring which might develop with training, expertise and moderation. The system requires authoritative evaluators, capable of making data-informed professional judgements. They need to have an understanding of how to uphold and raise evaluation standards, criteria, work with techniques of observation, and develop effective diagnosis and report. Yet, not many South African schools have experienced effective internal appraisers and yet, according to Newman and Rigdon (1997), the experience of effective internal appraisal is necessary for effective external accountability. Apart from the ineffective previous external inspections (Chetty, Chisholm, Gardiner, Magan & Vinjevold, 1993), internal appraisals by principals or heads of departments were often done in a formal bureaucratic manner. They gave little genuine feedback and did not encourage dialogue between staff and appraisers (Wadvalla, 2005). By 2006, it was clear that most schools and districts still did not have the capacity and resources for such an ambitious appraisal exercise (Marneweck presentation, *Class Act* 2007).

The question remains whether the system can develop the capacity to produce these knowledgeable, well trained professional appraisers who have access to sufficient data information to interpret effectively the appraisal instrument, to reflect adequately on educators' practices and areas of development and compile meaningful PGPs?

There is also a problem in expecting appraisers to use one standardised instrument to evaluate educators both for development and for rewards or sanctions. An important condition for effective developmental appraisal is that performance standards should be contextual and negotiated with educators. The combination in one instrument of monitoring for development and for performance management exacerbates the already difficult power relationship between appraisees, school-based appraisers and district appraisers. These parties have different interests and agendas in this evaluation, thus threatening rigorous, reliable and valid evaluation. A DoE-commissioned review of the implementation of the IQMS (Marneweck presentation, Class Act, 2007) confirms this by pointing to the unreliable and invalid process through which most educators were assessed and given ratings, irrespective of the level of learners' achievements.

Educator support and the IQMS

The capacity of the South African education system to provide appropriate professional support to schools has a poor record, whether such support is funded and managed by international donors, NGOs, or by the departments of education. Taylor (2006) criticises many NGO support programmes for their limited impact on educator performance and learner achievement; he attributes their lack of success to inadequate conceptualisation and design of these interventions. Shalem (2003) argues that professional development programmes are inadequate at providing meaningful opportunities for educators to learn. Most programmes are top-down, department- or NGO-driven, with little educator involvement in their design and delivery.

Educators and their unions have repeatedly complained about the lack of effective district or senior management support for the implementation of curriculum and assessment policies (SADTU, 2005). Outcomes-based education (OBE) requires educators to negotiate the significant changes in their work – from transmitting a syllabus-based curriculum to facilitating and developing a learner-centred curriculum, which is sensitive to learners' context. According to Parker and Harley (1998), the professional support needed for OBE is many-fold: to assist educators in changing their teaching methods and practices, to make them acquire different professional identities, behaviours and beliefs, and to develop higher professional competences and collegial support relationship (DoE, 2006). In many Anglophone countries which introduced some form of OBE, the change in teacher work, professional identity and status was incremental, over a few decades (Kelley, 1997; Hargreaves, 2002), and there were strong support systems and reasonable material and human resources. The situation in South Africa, however, is very different.

The school support capacity rarely exists in low-functioning schools and is made worse by a tradition of poor collegiality and lack of respect among staff in many schools. It is interesting to note here that the IQMS performance standards do not encourage educators to break from their isolation from one another and develop team work and collegial collaboration. Even when these obstacles do not exist, Marneweck (2003) shows in her research that educators of poorly functioning schools, who reflect in school clusters on how to improve their practices, can often share and spread ignorance and poor practices. Narsee (2006) indicates that many educators have a poor experience of school clustering, which they perceive as a restricted way of providing professional support because of the limited or unequal school competences which cannot address their professional development needs.

Departmental or district support capacity is also stretched by the new OBE system because the majority of provincial/district officials are themselves not familiar with OBE and the competences, values and culture required to implement it. According to Narsee (2006), this inadequate district school support is likely to remain in the near future, because of the lack of human, social and organisational capital). Rather, I wish to argue that South African schools should have access to costly high quality support from expert educators, as in the case of Alvarado's New York Community School District #2 (Elmore & Burney, 1999).

What is interesting is that by promoting an educator-driven professional development plan, with detailed information on areas and targets for educators' development to be addressed, school and district management is now expected – for the first time – to account for the support they provide or cannot provide for educators. Contestations are likely to arise about what educators, versus appraisers, identify as appropriate professional development priorities and support opportunities. There is already some evidence of this in well-functioning schools where educators are defensive about what they see as priority development needs. Ryan (2007) shows in her research that educators do not perceive a need to improve their instructional competences to respond to the challenges of curriculum and changing learner population. Their priorities focus rather on managerial/administrative work and on developing their personal

careers. Thus, the challenge for DSG members and district officials is to reach consensus on how educators can access appropriate and differentiated support for personal and school development.

The different professional development needs of educators, and the need to move them from where they are to where they have to be, require a multipronged approach to professional development (Metcalfe, 2008).This approach recognises that curriculum and assessment policy implementation support is not always the most important for educators, as the majority need first professional support to acquire the basic subject and pedagogical content knowledge to be in control of what to teach (Narsee, 2006).

At the time of writing, the DoE released the National Policy Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa (NPFTED) (DoE, 2007). Similar to the preceding Report of the Ministerial Committee on Teacher Education (DoE, 2005), this policy document acknowledges the need for educator development, but remains unspecific about how to plan and mobilise sufficient high quality professional capacity to provide differentiated professional support. Such an educator development plan should be funded and coordinated by the department, supported by NGOs, donors and other partnerships at local level, and staffed by professional experts who can assist identifying and addressing the reasons for ineffective teaching in schools. Only with such planning, professional support capacity and resources in place can the IQMS gain some legitimacy and counter the perception that its professional development aspect is *de facto* being subsumed into an accountability exercise.

Conclusion: Another way?

This article has argued that although the lessons from teacher appraisal, monitoring and support worldwide are valuable, no teacher appraisal system can be borrowed and transplanted *verbatim* into another context. This is because countries differ in their school system, in the extent to which teachers view themselves as professionals, whether they work in a collegial school culture, and whether school-based collective sharing and data-based reflection on learners' results and teaching practices is productive. Above all, a teacher appraisal system should be based on valid/realistic assumptions about the specific teaching realities and the available professional appraisal and support capacity in the system. It should engage with the way teachers and departmental officials perceive teachers' work and responsibilities and strive towards reaching some basic consensus.

Too often policy analyses and departmental policy reviews recommend building system and school capacity, but omit to examine whether the policy, – or in this case, the IQMS – needs to be changed so that it reflects the local context, where educators and schools are at, and how they need to change and improve. The Minister of Education has recently hinted at the need to establish a National Education Evaluation Assessment Unit with well trained national or provincial officials who will moderate the IQMS findings. It is argued here that such tweaking with the present system will not address the core problems of the IQMS. A more realistic educator appraisal/evaluation system in South Africa is needed.

I am suggesting that two separate evaluation systems are required with their own instruments: an external standardised system (which can monitor educator performance across the system) and a district-moderated school-based developmental and performance appraisal system, which relates to the national system but is contextual and is backed up by more effective appraisers and support capacity. Appraisal will have legitimacy and positive results only when adequate support resources and capacity are mobilised and sensibly targeted at the differentiated educators' needs. To start with, the department needs to take stock, with the use of professional evaluators, of *the different work demands* made on educators, especially in poorly resourced low-functioning schools, and then devise ways of meeting the needs of schools and districts to

support these educators. Such support intervention should also explicitly target a change in department officials' and educators' perceptions, attitudes and beliefs about teaching to transform individualised fragmented institutional cultures into collective open collaborative cultures. This needs to be backed up with incentives and produce positive experiences about the value of educators working together. It is only then that meaningful assistance is likely to assist educators, who should then account for their changed practices.

Finally, one cannot but emphasise the importance of departmental and school leadership in learning how to read and negotiate the inevitable tensions and dilemmas which arise among different school stakeholders when implementing ambitious and complex curriculum, assessment and appraisal policies.

References

Ali I 1998. *Supervision for teacher development: A proposal for Pakistan*, Ch. 2. Paris: International Institute of Educational Planning.

Bartlett S 2000. The development of teacher appraisal: a recent history. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, **48**, 24-37.

Cardno C & Piggot Irvine N 1997. *Effective performance appraisal: Integrating accountability and development in staff appraisal.* Auckland: Longman.

Chetty D, Chisholm L, Gardiner M, Magan N & Vinjevold P 1993. *Rethinking teacher appraisal in South Africa.* Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand.

Chisholm L, Hoadley U, wa Kivulu M, Brookes H, Prinsloo C, Kgobe A, Mosia D, Narsee H & Rule S 2005. Educator Workload in South Africa. Report prepared for the ELRC, Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Class Act. 2007. IQMS implementation review, a DoE commissioned report. (Whose findings were only presented during a Wits School of Education seminar, October 2007). Johannesburg: DoE.

Cohen D 1995. What is the system in systemic reform? *Educational Researcher*, **24**(9), 11-17.

Darling Hammond L 1989. Accountability for professional practice. *Teachers College Record*, **91**(1), 55-80.

De Clercq F 2007. School monitoring and development: a critical examination of the Whole School Evaluation. *Education as Change* **11**(2), 97-113.

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

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

Department of Education 2006. Towards Quality Education in General Education and Training, Policy Brief 1.

Department of Education 2007. *The National Policy Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) 2003. Collective agreements 3 (Protocol) and 8, Integrated Quality management System.

Elmore R & Burney D 1999. Investing in teacher learning. In *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice,* Darling Hammond L & Sykes G (eds). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Evans A & Tomlinson J 1989. *Teacher appraisal: A nationwide approach*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Fleisch B 2008. *Primary education in crisis: Why learners underachieve in readings and mathematics*, Johannesburg: Juta.

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.

Hargreaves A 2002. Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching: History and Practice*, **6**(2), 151-182.

Hopkins D, Ainscow M & West, M 1994. *School improvement in an era of change*, London: Cassell.

Hopkins D, West M & Beresford J 1998. Creating the conditions for classroom and teacher development. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* **4**(1), 115-141.

JET 2005. Consortium for Research on School Quality. Second Meeting, Johannesburg: JET, April.

Kelley C 1997. Teacher compensation and organisation, *Educational Evaluation Policy Analysis*, **19**(1), 15-28.

Little JW 1993. Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation Policy Analysis*, **15**(2), 129-151.

Marneweck L 2003. Implementation of OBE Curriculum: the case of six schools in the Limpopo province. Unpublished doctoral thesis (PhD), Johannesburg: School of Education, University of the Witwatersrand.

Marshall K 2005. It is time to rethink teacher supervision and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, **86**(10), 727-735.

Metcalfe M 2008. Why our schools do not work. *Sunday Times* 13/01/2008.

Monyatsi P, Steyn T & Kamper G 2006. Teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher appraisals in Botswana. *South African Journal of Education,* **26(**3), 426-441.

Narsee H 2006. The common and contested meanings of education districts in South Africa. Unpublished doctoral thesis (PhD), Pretoria: Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria.

Newman F & Rigdon M 1997. Accountability and school performance: implications for restructuring schools, *Harvard Educational Review*, **67**(1), 41-74.

O'Day J & Smith M 1993. Systemic reform and educational opportunity. In *Designing coherent education policy: Improving the system,* Fuhrman S (ed.). New York: Jossey-Bass.

O'Day J 2004. Complexity, accountability and school improvement. In *Redesigning accountability systems for education*, Furhman S & Elmore E. New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Parker B & Harley K 1998. Curriculum and teacher development in an outcomes-based National Qualifications Framework: a study of South Africa in the 1990s. Paper read at the *10th World Congress of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies,* Cape Town.

Reitzug U 2002. School reform proposals: Professional development, [On-Line], Available url: http://asu.edu/educ/epsl/EPRU/epru_Research_Writing.htm. Reviewed on 22 May 2006.

Ryan E 2007. The value of school-driven professional development in South African schools. Unpublished Master Report. Johannesburg: School of Education. University of the Witwatersrand.

SADTU 2002. Comments on discussion document: "Performance standards for teacher appraisal and teacher development" February.

SADTU 2005. Quality teachers for quality education training for a stronger teaching force. October Scheerens J 2000. The school effectiveness knowledge base as a guide for school improvement. In *International Handbook of Educational Change*, Part One, Hargreaves A, Lieberman A, Fullan M & Hopkins D (eds). London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Shalem Y 2003. Do we have a theory of change? Calling change models to account. *Perspectives in Education*, **21**(1), 29-49.

Taylor N 2006. Equity, efficiency and the development of South African schools, paper presented at the Umalusi conference, April.

Taylor N & Vinjevold P 1999. *Getting learning right*, Wits: JET.

Wadvalla I 2005. The implementation of the IQMS in two different schools in Gauteng, Unpublished BEd Hons project. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Winter R 1989. Problems in teacher appraisal: an action-research solution. In *Rethinking appraisal and assessment*, H Simons & J Elliott (eds). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

World Bank 2005. *Secondary Education in Africa* (SEIA). Washington. Africa region: Human Development working papers series.