

https://dspace.org/

Politics, professionalism and performance management: a history of teacher evaluation in South Africa

Pillay, Devi

2018

https://hdl.handle.net/10539/27210

Pillay, Devi (2018) Politics, professionalism and performance management: a history of teacher evaluation in South Africa, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, <http://hdl.handle.net/10539/27210>

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Politics, professionalism and performance management: a history of teacher evaluation in South Africa

Devi Pillay

A dissertation submitted to the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfilment of the degree Master of Arts in History by dissertation.

Declaration

I declare that this is my own original work. It is submitted in fulfilment for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

_____

Devi Pillay

19 July 2018

Abstract

Why has South Africa failed to institute a teacher evaluation system that produces meaningful results? I aim to contribute to an understanding of why and how various South African post-1994 teacher evaluation policies have failed to become institutionalised and have failed to ensure either robust teacher accountability or professional development. In this dissertation, I examine the history of teacher evaluation in South Africa, in order to understand the evolution of these policies and systems over time. After discussing the legacy of apartheid-era evaluation, I assess three post-1994 policy phases: the 1998 Developmental Appraisal System (DAS), the 2001 Whole School Evaluation (WSE) policies and the 2003 Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS).

This historical approach allows me to analyse the successes and failures of these policies in depth and context. Each of these policies has been shaped by, has tried to respond to, and has ultimately failed to confront the challenges of the past. They must also be understood to be a part of a continuous policymaking process, each one building upon and responding to the last. This dissertation contributes to an understanding of why these evaluation policies, despite massive investments of time, energy and resources, and complex and tough negotiations, have repeatedly failed. I argue that a flawed policy process consistently reiterates the same tensions and false assumptions in each new policy, and does not address these fundamental weaknesses.

These appraisal policies reflect negotiations and contestations between teacher unions and the state, while the policies themselves and their outcomes further complicate those union-state relationships. The tensions and contradictions within these policies are the product of a policymaking process that tries to cater to mutually exclusive interests. The history of these institutions – teacher unions, the state, collective bargaining bodies – and the relationships between them must be understood in order to grapple with the policymaking environment fully. Further, even as these policies have been renegotiated and redeveloped, they have all failed to engage with the actual realities of teachers and classrooms in the majority of schools in South Africa. The legacy of apartheid education is still manifest in the abilities, attitudes and politics of teachers, and policymakers on all sides of the process have consistently failed to confront that history and propose real strategies for change.

Acknowledgements

A few years ago, when I was halfway through my undergraduate degree in Utrecht, I dropped out of university. While it was officially a "leave of absence", I was convinced at the time that I would not return. I was suffering from severe depression, anxiety and panic disorders, and I thought that these conditions meant I would never be able to make it in academia, which seemed hostile to people like me. Being able to get to this point – of submitting a masters dissertation that represents two years of my life – seemed impossible back then.

I have only managed to get here through the support, guidance and love of others.

This research was done while I was a fellow at the Public Affairs Research Institute (PARI). PARI's support, through the postgraduate program, resources, and incredibly helpful feedback and critique from fellow researchers, has made this work possible. I must also thank my supervisors, Clive Glaser and Sarah Meny-Gibert, for their invaluable guidance over the last two years and for their patience with me. At Wits and PARI, I have had the opportunity to participate in exciting, enlightening debates and discussions while surrounded by these incredibly kind people. I have grown immeasurably as a person and as a scholar.

The support of my family and friends over the last two years has been incredible. Thank you for helping me through crises of health and confidence, for supporting me in getting this degree, and for your insights and feedback. I would not be the person or the academic I am today without my parents. Mama and Dad, thank you for raising me to be curious, kind and dedicated to making a difference in whatever way I can. Vani, thank you for your confidence in me. One day I hope to be a sister worthy of your belief.

My partner, Chris, has been an endless source of love, calm and reason throughout this process. Thank you for talking me down from anxiety attacks, for reading so many drafts of my work, for helping me get the better of depression and impostor syndrome, and for what must be hundreds of cups of tea.

Table of Contents

Declaration 3

Abstract i

Acknowledgements ii

Table of Contents iii

Acronyms vii

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

1.1: Background: teachers and teaching in contemporary South Africa 1

1.2: Aims and research focus 6

1.2.1: Why evaluation policies? 7

1.2.2: Why SADTU? 8

1.3: The argument 10

1.4: Appraisal, history and the literature 11

1.5: Understanding education policy 16

1.6: Sources 19

1.7: Overview 21

Chapter 2: Apartheid Education 23

2.1: An Overview of Apartheid Education 23

2.2: The Education Crisis and People's Education 28

2.3: Teachers under apartheid 32

2.3.1: Teacher education 36

2.3.2: School boards 40

2.3.3: Teacher appraisal and evaluation 42

2.3.4: Conclusion 45

2.4: Teachers' responses to apartheid education 46

2.4.1: Conservative professional associations 46

2.4.2: Early teacher resistance and conservatism 48

2.4.3: Teacher resistance and mobilisation 50

2.4.4: Towards teacher unity 53

2.4.5: Teachers and appraisal 58
2.4.6: Conclusion 62
Chapter 3: Education in Transition 65
3.1: Education negotiations during the transition 66
3.1.1: The Mandela Delegation and the Joint Working Group 66
3.1.2: Apartheid reforms 69
3.1.3: The National Education Conference 70
3.1.4: NEPI 72
3.1.5: The NETF 73
3.2: Post-apartheid policy work 75
3.3: SADTU 79
3.3.1: SADTU and Recognition 81
3.3.2: SADTU before and after transition 83
3.3.3: Unionism and professionalism 85
3.4: New developments in education 87
3.4.1: ELRC 87
3.4.2: SACE 88
3.4.3: NQF 89
3.4.4: Curriculum development 90
3.4.5: Teacher education 97
3.5: Conclusion 99
Chapter 4: The Developmental Appraisal System 102
4.1: Towards DAS: Policy Formation and Negotiation 103
4.2: The DAS Instrument 110
4.3: Implementation of DAS 112
4.4: Analysing DAS 115
4.5: Conclusion 119
Chapter 5: WSE and performance management 121
5.1: A shifting policy context 121
5.2: Towards WSE 125
5.3: Whole-School Evaluation 129

5.4: Developments in Performance Management 132
5.5: Policy Analysis 136
5.5.1: Language 136
5.5.2: Quality and indicators 137
5.5.3: Memories of apartheid 139
5.5.4: Control and democratisation 141
5.6: Conclusion 142
Chapter 6: IQMS 144
6.1: Towards IQMS 144
6.2: The IQMS instrument 147
6.2.1: The WSE component 147
6.2.2: The educator component 148
6.3: Implementation of IQMS 150
6.4: Analysis of IQMS 155
6.4.1: Conflation of summative and formative evaluation 156
6.4.2: Internal professional evaluation in the South African classroom 157
6.4.3: Ideological tension 159
6.4.4: Compliance and engagement 160
6.4.5: Unclear and inappropriate performance measures 161
6.4.6: Complexity and confusion 163
6.4.7: Teacher and resistance 163
6.5: Conclusion 164
Chapter 7: Conclusions 167
7.1: Key observations 167
7.1.1: Conflicts and negotiations 167
7.1.2: Confronting history in policymaking 168
7.2: Reckoning with failure 170
7.3: Further questions 174
Sources 176
7.4: Primary sources 176
7.4.1: ELRC Agreements 176

7.4.2: National legislation 176
7.4.3: Department of Education and government 177
7.4.4: SADTU Documents (selection) 179
7.4.5: Newspaper articles 181
7.5: Secondary sources 183
7.5.1: Books 183
7.5.2: Book sections 185
7.5.3: Journal articles 189
7.5.4: Unpublished sources 195
7.5.5: Research reports 196

Acronyms

Organisations and institutions

ANC – African National Congress
COSATU – Congress of South African Trade Unions
DET – Department of Education and Training (apartheid era)
DBE – Department of Basic Education
DHET – Department of Higher Education and Training
DOE – Department of Education
DNE – Department of National Education (apartheid era)
ELRC – Education Labour Relations Council
JWG – Joint Working Group
NAPTOSA – National Professional Teachers Organisation of South Africa
NECC – National Education Crisis/Coordinating Committee
NEEDU – National Education and Evaluation Development Unit
NETF – National Education and Training Forum
NEPI – National Education Policy Initiative
NTUF – National Teacher Unity Forum
SACE – South African Council of Educators
SADTU – South African Democratic Teachers Union
UDF – United Democratic Front

Policies and documents

DAS – Developmental Appraisal System
IPET – Implementation Plan for Education and Training
ISPFTED – Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development
IQMS – Integrated Quality Management System
NPM – New Public Management
NQA – National Quality Assurance
NQF – National Qualifications Framework
PDMS - Performance Management and Development System
PM – Performance Management
QMS – Quality Management System
WSE – Whole School Evaluation

Appraisal terminology

DSG – Development Support Group
PGP – Personal Growth Plan
SDT – Staff Development Team
SIP – School Improvement Plan

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1: Background: teachers and teaching in contemporary South Africa

The South African education system is in crisis. South African learners have high failure rates, high dropout rates, and score poorly across the board in national and international assessments.[1] A 2011 Department of Basic Education (DBE) report found that 60% of youths are left with no qualification at all beyond the Grade 9 level; university failure and dropout rates also suggest that those learners who do achieve a matric qualification are seriously underprepared for tertiary education.[2] A 2016 report found that a staggering 78% of South African Grade 4 children cannot read for meaning in any language.[3]

Teachers – the front line of education provision – are at the heart of current debates on the education system. Plainly put, the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. Current priorities for the Departments of Education, as well as education academics and activists, revolve around teachers: How do we, as a country, ensure that we train enough teachers to meet demand? How do we ensure that they are well trained and prepared for teaching? And how do we measure and improve the quality of teaching?

For many years the system was failing to train enough teachers to fulfil the growing demand. Evidence suggests that state attempts to increase the number of teachers have been working, and that supply will be able to meet demand for the next ten years, but there are still significant projected shortages in essential subjects (such as mathematics and languages), phases (most importantly, the foundation phase) and African language mother tongue education.[4] Even if enough teachers are being trained to meet demand nationally,

[1] For an overview of various local and international assessments and South Africa's results in context: Servaas van der Berg et al., "Identifying Binding Constraints in Education: Synthesis Report for the Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy Development (PSPPD)" (Research on Socio-Economic Policy (ReSEP), May 24, 2016); Graeme Bloch, *The Toxic Mix: What's Wrong with South Africa's Schools and How to Fix It*, 1st ed (Cape Town: Tafelberg, 2009); OECD, *Reviews of National Policies for Education: South Africa*, n.d.

[2] Department of Basic Education. 'Report on Dropout and Leaner Retention Strategy to Portfolio Committee on Education'. Department of Basic Education, June 2011, 6.

[3] Ina V.S. Muller et al., "PIRLS 2016 International Results in Reading" (TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College and International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), 2017).

[4] Centre for Development and Enterprise. *Teachers in South Africa: Supply and Demand 2013-2015*. In Depth. Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise, 2015.

it seems as though those teachers are not going where they are needed most, and that the most impoverished schools remain the most understaffed despite national and provincial post-provisioning norms.[5]

Even where there are enough teachers, it seems they have been underperforming. Around 19% of teachers are unqualified; still more are underqualified. 37.9% have the equivalent of M+3 but no professional teaching qualification and 10% have M+2 or lower.[6] The evidence suggests that most teachers' content and pedagogic knowledge is poor; a vast number of teachers lack knowledge of the subject, knowledge of the curriculum, and knowledge of how to teach the subject.[7] It is also clear in the literature that while teacher knowledge is not the sole determinant of learner achievement, it is a significant factor.[8] The research also points to inadequate teaching time, teacher absenteeism and insufficient opportunity to learn in schools as major problems.[9] This may be, in part, due to low levels of confidence and morale among teachers.[10]

Many of the problems within the teaching profession are undeniably the results of the apartheid education system. While teaching was, in many cases, one of the few professions available for black people to enter, the teacher education system was poor, and many are now suffering from the deficit of a second-class education

---

[5] Martin Gustafsson, "Teacher Supply and the Quality of Schooling in South Africa. Patterns over Space and Time," Working Paper, Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers (Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University, Department of Economics., 2016).

[6] CDE, *Teachers in South Africa,* 17. The "M+" model refers to the years of tertiary education. "M+3" would mean a teacher has a matric qualification and three years of tertiary education.

[7] Idem, see also Nick Taylor and Penny Vinjevold, eds., *Getting Learning Right: Report of the President's Education Initiative Research Project* (Braamfontein: Joint Education Trust, 1999); Department of Education, "Ministerial Committee on National Education Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU) Final Report" (Pretoria, April 17, 2009); Brahm Fleisch, *Primary Education in Crisis: Why South African Schoolchildren Underachieve in Reading and Mathematics* (Cape Town: Juta, 2008); Nicholas Spaull, "South Africa's Education Crisis: The Quality of Education in South Africa 1994-2011," *Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise*, 2013; Hamsa Venkat and Nic Spaull, "What Do We Know about Primary Teachers' Mathematical Content Knowledge in South Africa? An Analysis of SACMEQ 2007," *International Journal of Educational Development* 41 (March 1, 2015): 121–30; Nick Taylor and Stephen Taylor, "Teacher Knowledge and Professional Habitus," in *What Makes Schools Effective? Report of the National Schools Effectiveness Study*, ed. Thabo Mabogoane, Nick Taylor, and Servaas Van der Berg (Cape Town: Pearson Education, 2012), 202–23.

[8] Martin Carnoy and Fabian Arends, "Explaining Mathematics Achievement Gains in Botswana and South Africa," *PROSPECTS* 42, no. 4 (December 1, 2012): 453–68, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-012-9246-6; Debra Lynne Shepherd, "Learn to Teach, Teach to Learn: A within-Pupil across-Subject Approach to Estimating the Impact of Teacher Subject Knowledge on South African Grade 6 Performance," Working Paper, Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers (Stellenbosch University, Department of Economics, 2015); Ursula Hoadley, "A Review of the Research Literature on Teaching and Learning in the Foundation Phase in South Africa," Working Paper (Stellenbosch: Research on Socio-Economic Policy (ReSEP), 2016); Nick Taylor, "NEEDU National Report 2013: Teaching and Learning in Rural Primary Schools" (Pretoria: National Education Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU), 2014).

[9] van der Berg et al., "Identifying Binding Constraints in Education," 47–50.

[10] Martin Carnoy, Linda Chisholm, and Bagele Chilisa, eds., *The Low Achievement Trap: Comparing Schooling in Botswana and South Africa* (Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press, 2012); Yael Shalem and Ursula Hoadley, "The Dual Economy of Schooling and Teacher Morale in South Africa," *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 19, no. 2 (June 1, 2009): 119–34, https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210903257224.

from quick and dirty teacher training colleges. Multiple studies have found that the cause of poor teacher performance lies largely with poor teacher training and education.[11]

The working conditions of teachers are highly varied, reflecting the inherited unevenness of the education system. Many teachers work in poor conditions – overcrowded, understaffed and poorly equipped schools. Their time has been increasingly taken up by non-teaching tasks such as management, administration and paperwork; a load increased by assessment-heavy curriculum changes.[12] There are very low morale and commitment to the profession; more than half of the current teaching corps would leave the profession if they could. Salaries are also a major cause of dissatisfaction: while teachers are paid well compared to their counterparts in similar countries, teachers protest the pay differentials that exist between them and other professionals, as well as the non-progressive structure of their salary scales.[13]

Why has the education sector been unable to deal with these problems? Teacher unions are often portrayed as a (if not *the*) major problem in the South African schooling system, particularly the South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU). SADTU is often painted as a militant and obstructionist group that protects incompetent teachers, causes disruptive strikes, and blocks educational reform as well as government's attempts to create systems of accountability. SADTU is portrayed as a group preoccupied with working conditions and wages – the interests of its members above learners and education, at all costs.

While other teacher unions exist, SADTU is by far the largest, consisting of over 250 000 members and representing two-thirds of all educators. Other unions – the next largest being the strike-averse National Professional Teachers Association (NAPTOSA) – often disagree with the actions of SADTU where disruptive action takes place, but are also often unified against state initiatives intended to exert control over the profession.

[11] Idem, loc. 1545-1567. Also CDE, *Teachers in South Africa*, 17, and the findings of the Initial Teacher Education Research Project (ITERP).

[12] Linda Chisholm et al., "Educator Workload in South Africa," Report prepared for the ELRC (Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 2005).

[13] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *South Africa*, 299-300, see also Bloch, *The Toxic Mix,* loc. 1633-1655.

Perhaps the most severe accusation levelled at SADTU is that the union consistently blocks reforms and government interventions aimed at improving the quality of teaching. Critics point to several policy initiatives blocked by SADTU in recent years, for example:

- a plan to licence teachers to weed out the 20%-30% considered "untrainable." [14]
- the reintroduction of school inspectors [15]
- competency testing for entry into the profession and for promotion posts and performance-related pay and incentives for teachers mooted in the National Development Plan[16]
- the testing of matric markers[17]
- Whole School Evaluation [18]
- performance agreements for principals [19]
- appraisals for principals [20]
- a plan to introduce biometric systems in schools to combat teacher absenteeism [21]
- the designation of teachers as an "essential service" to prevent them from striking [22]
- Annual National Assessments for learners in schools [23]

---

[14] Thabo Mohlala, "Is Pandor Panicking?," *Mail and Guardian*, August 7, 2006, https://mg.co.za/article/2006-08-07-is-pandor-panicking.

[15] Mmanaledi Mataboge, "Lindiwe Sisulu's Public Service Plans Raise Sadtu's Ire," accessed March 14, 2018, https://mg.co.za/article/2013-03-08-00-lindiwe-sisulus-public-service-plans-draw-flak.

[16] Carol Paton, "SA Schools under Sadtu Dominion," *Business Day Live*, January 20, 2016, http://www.bdlive.co.za/opinion/2016/01/20/sa-schools-under-sadtu-dominion.

[17] TMG Editor, "Sadtu Opposes Competency Test for Matric Markers," *The Herald*, August 11, 2014, http://www.heraldlive.co.za/news/2014/08/11/sadtu-opposes-competency-test-matric-markers/.

[18] SADTU, "SADTU Calls for Urgent Moratorium on Whole School Evaluation (WSE)" (Press statement, May 17, 2002), SADTU Website, http://www.sadtu.org.za/press/2001/17-5-2002.0.htm.

[19] Bongekile Macupe, "Sadtu Digs in over a Matter of Principal," *Mail and Guardian*, June 23, 2017, https://mg.co.za/article/2017-06-23-00-sadtu-digs-in-over-a-matter-of-principal.

[20] Bekezela Phakathi, "Sadtu Reiterates Rejection of Appraisals for Principals," *Business Day*, May 4, 2017, Online edition, https://www.businesslive.co.za/bd/national/labour/2017-05-04-sadtu-reiterates-rejection-of-appraisals-for-principals/; SADTU, "SADTU Hosts a Succesful Policy Conference" (Press statement, March 27, 2012), http://www.politicsweb.co.za/party/sadtu-rejects-performance-contracts-for-teacherspr.

[21] Bongani Nkosi, "Teachers Give Minister Motshekga the Finger," *Mail and Guardian*, March 1, 2013, https://mg.co.za/article/2013-03-01-teachers-give-minister-the-finger/.

[22] Greg Nicolson, "Education as Essential Service: Sadtu's Really, Really Not Happy," *Daily Maverick*, February 13, 2013, https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2013-02-13-education-as-essential-service-sadtus-really-really-not-happy/; Bekezela Phakathi, "Teachers' Unions Want No Limit on the Right to Strike," *Business Day Live*, September 22, 2017, https://www.businesslive.co.za/bd/national/labour/2017-09-26-teachers-unions-want-no-limit-on-the-right-to-strike/.

[23] eNCA, "ANAs Terrorise and Demoralise Teachers: Sadtu," *ENCA*, September 21, 2015, https://www.enca.com/south-africa/anas-terrorise-and-demoralise-teachers-sadtu; SADTU, NAPTOSA, and SAOU, "Teacher Unions Unite on the 2015 Annual National Assessments (ANA)" (Press statement, September 11, 2015), http://www.sadtu.org.za/show.php?id=3024.

Most, if not all, of these issues concern teacher evaluation and accountability. Multiple studies in a growing body of literature have pointed to a lack of teacher accountability as a significant cause of South Africa's struggling education system. They have called for better teacher accountability mechanisms as one of the most important steps in improving the quality of education.[24] The government has also made teacher evaluation and accountability a priority in both its narratives and in the recent proliferation of policy initiatives, and it has been a central concern of opposition parties, civil society organisations and educationists alike. Evaluation policies have been incredibly controversial, resulting in intense contestation across the education system.

SADTU is often blamed for undermining accountability measures. Critics point to the union's "undue influence" on policymaking due to its close relationship with the ANC and the political power it wields.[25] A 2016 Ministerial Task Team report was particularly damning, reporting that "six and possibly more of the nine provinces are where SADTU is in de facto charge of the management, administration and priorities of education there". The report states that SADTU's "undue influence" is "endemic to greater and lesser degrees in the entire education system."[26]

The issue of teachers – and the influence have SADTU – have become polarising political issues. The Democratic Alliance, an opposition political party, has frequently excoriated the union. In 2017, it asked the SAHRC to investigate SADTU's "blocking of measures to hold educators accountable for poor performance"; its "neglect of teaching and learning while engaged in various unlawful protests and strikes", and its "unlawful interference and corruption in the appointment of teachers and principals".[27]

---

[24] van der Berg et al., "Identifying Binding Constraints in Education"; Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report"; Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*.

[25] See Robert Cameron and Vinothan Naidoo, "When a 'Ruling Alliance' and Public Sector Governance Meet: Managing for Performance in South African Basic Education," Occasional Working Paper (Cape Town: University of Cape Town Graduate School of Development Policy and Practice, December 2016), https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2835487.

[26] Department of Basic Education, "Report of the Ministerial Task Team Appointed by Minister Angie Motshekga to Investigate Allegations into the Selling of Posts of Educators by Members of Teachers Unions and Departmental Officials in Provincial Education Departments," trans. DBE, May 18, 2016.

[27] Rebecca Davis, "SADTU: SA's Most Controversial Union Faces Human Rights Probe," *Daily Maverick*, May 11, 2017, https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2017-05-11-sadtu-sas-most-controversial-union-faces-human-rights-probe/.

But is SADTU really to blame? The problems with the education system extend far beyond the union, including severe problems in resourcing schools, nutrition programs, scholar transport, and the provision of learning materials. South African teachers often work in incredibly difficult conditions, with minimal support from the education departments. Initial teacher education and support for teachers' professional development are far from sufficient. The state has consistently failed in its attempts to create appropriate education policy or to effectively implement its strategies.

The problem of education in South Africa is complex, and teachers and teaching are at the heart of it. In this dissertation, I will examine one aspect of the struggle to provide quality education: teacher evaluation. Evaluation is a critical piece of the puzzle – evaluation is how we can accurately assess the quality of teaching in our schools, which is vital for understanding why some teachers fail to perform, for holding teachers accountable for their performance, and for formulating strategies to improve teaching quality. So far, South Africa has failed to institute a system of teacher evaluation that can produce meaningful results – either in the realm of teacher accountability or in the realm of professional development.

Why do we have a teacher evaluation system today that is, by all accounts, almost entirely dysfunctional? This is the question I grapple with in this dissertation.

1.2: Aims and research focus

This dissertation is a historical analysis of teacher evaluation policies in South African education. I aim to contribute to an understanding of why and how various South African post-1994 teacher evaluation policies have failed to become institutionalised and have failed to ensure either robust teacher accountability or professional development.

In this dissertation, I examine the history of teacher evaluation in South Africa, in order to understand the evolution of these policies and systems over time. After discussing the legacy of apartheid-era evaluation, I assess three post-1994 policy phases: the 1998 Developmental Appraisal System (DAS), the 2001 Whole School Evaluation (WSE) policies and the 2003 Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS).

My primary questions are:

- What are the historical, political and social factors that influence policymaking in education?
- How has each of these policies been formulated, negotiated, implemented and received?
- How does the relationship between teacher unions and the state influence the development of evaluation policies? How do these policies, in turn, influence the relationship between teacher unions and the state? What is the role of SADTU in the development and function of these policies, and how has this changed over time?
- Why has each of these policies failed to take hold in schools and produce meaningful results?
- How has this historical process influenced our contemporary policymaking?
- Why have policymakers failed to institute a workable system of teacher evaluation that produces meaningful results?

1.2.1: Why evaluation policies?

Teacher evaluation provides a unique window into the system of education. Appraisal is one of the primary ways in which teachers and the state encounter one another. It structures the relationship between educators and the state in many ways. The most significant is that appraisal is one of the only tools the state uses to control teachers and their work. It articulates the demands made on teachers, and (through the creation of appraisal standards and criteria) expresses the state's definition of what a good teacher – and good teaching – is.

Evaluation policies, with their prescribed administrative procedures, have determined a large part of the daily work of teachers and schools. Appraisal results can contribute to determining promotions and pay progression for teachers. Evaluation is also essential to professional development for teachers, for teachers and schools need to be able to identify weaknesses in order to address them constructively. Appraisal, as it exists in our education system, is a central mechanism in accountability procedures – through the evaluation of teachers' performance and resulting punishments or rewards. In these ways, appraisal policies substantially impact the professional lives of teachers.

As I discussed above, accountability policies have been at the core of some of the most severely contested battles between SADTU and the state. Proposed methods of teacher evaluation have produced significant controversy and debate, and calls for holding teachers accountable always find strong purchase in public discourse. Examining these policies in fine detail, therefore, has the potential to reveal valuable insights about teachers, unions, the state and the state of education policy in South Africa.

1.2.2: Why SADTU?

A primary focus of this dissertation is the relationship between teachers and the state, particularly contestations between these parties around the control of teachers' work. I will analyse the major clashes between teacher unions and the state in the post-apartheid period, and examine the root causes of these clashes as well as their results. Who is able to influence policymaking? What is the role of unions in the policymaking process? How have these relationships changed over time?

This research will focus on SADTU as the largest and most dominant teacher union in the country. SADTU has a close but complicated relationship with the state, and its conflicts with the state often have far-reaching consequences in the South African education system.

The relationship between SADTU, the ANC and the state complicates any analysis of state-union relations in education. SADTU is a vital member of South Africa's largest trade union federation, the Congress of South Africa Trade Unions (COSATU), and therefore of the Tripartite Alliance. It is a staunch supporter of the ANC – although it has repeatedly made it clear that this support is dependent on the ANC pursuing certain policies.

It is also an important constituent of the ANC for several reasons. It is a very large union with a massive membership base; there are SADTU teachers in every corner of the country. SADTU members are professionals, mostly black, relatively affluent, and are often community leaders. Many ANC officials are former SADTU leaders, and many bureaucrats in the education system are SADTU members. In many parts of the education bureaucracy, SADTU is almost indistinguishable from the state. Yet despite this close relationship with the ruling ANC, SADTU frequently clashes with the Department of Education on various

issues, going so far as to complain of victimisation and supposed wars on teachers. The Department of Education, conversely, has frequently criticised SADTU's behaviour and policy positions and has occasionally drawn their ire by introducing unilaterally developed teacher accountability mechanisms.

The politics of the ANC, the state and SADTU are messy, and it is not easy to make a coherent distinction between the three. Some important research has been done in this area. Cameron and Naidoo show that policies for managing performance in basic education can best be explained as the outcome of a strategic interaction among three sets of actors – technocratically oriented public officials in the bureaucracy, teacher labour unions (especially SADTU, as the dominant union), and the ANC in its dual role as the top level of the public sector hierarchy and as the primus inter pares within the "ruling alliance".[28] Glaser shows that these blockages and conflicts are not necessarily unique to South Africa by comparing SADTU and the Mexican National Education Union.[29] De Clercq examines appraisal policies as socially constructed and politically contested, paying attention to the role of policy leadership in education departments and teacher unions.[30] Govender examined the role of teacher unions in the policymaking process of the South African Schools Act. He shows how the policymaking process has influenced and changed unions' strategies, highlighting the threat of state co-optation for teacher unions.[31]

These approaches are all critical to understanding the contested policymaking process through which evaluation policies are formulated. This dissertation contributes to the literature by analyzing how these interactions – between SADTU, the ANC and the state – create inertia and stagnate evaluation policy development, as well as produce policies rife with tensions and contradictions.

---

[28] Cameron and Naidoo, "When a 'Ruling Alliance' and Public Sector Governance Meet."

[29] Clive Glaser, "Champions of the Poor or 'Militant Fighters for a Better Pay Cheque'? Teacher Unionism in Mexico and South Africa, 1979–2013," *Safundi* 17, no. 1 (January 2, 2016): 40–62, https://doi.org/10.1080/17533171.2015.1118868.

[30] Francine de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa: Conflicts, Contestations and Mediations" (PhD Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 2011), http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/10135.

[31] Logan Govender, "Teacher Unions' Participation in Policy Making: A South African Case Study," *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 45, no. 2 (March 4, 2015): 184–205, https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2013.841467.

1.3: The argument

I argue that teacher appraisal policies after 1994 have failed because they have not adequately engaged with the historical realities of South African teachers. While the policy phases are distinct, they have important characteristics in common:

- They all adopt a top-down, national, centralised approach to appraisal policy. One policy is meant to apply to all schools, and therefore cannot adequately deal with the different on-the-ground realities of the South African school system. This is partly due to the weakening of grassroots and civil society involvement in education discourse and policymaking, resulting in the concentration of policymaking at a national, political level.
- These policies are all products of contestation between competing, often mutually exclusive goals, resulting in unresolvable tensions and contradictions in the policy mechanisms, which are self-defeating as a result. The complex relationship between SADTU, the ANC and the state, with all its politics and power dynamics, means that policymakers are forced to compromise and to cater for these competing interests.
- The policies make false assumptions about the abilities and attitudes of teachers (as well as principals, administrators and other key staff). Some of these appraisal mechanisms test competencies that teachers have not been sufficiently trained for and set standards that they cannot meet. Others still require particular skills and working environments in order to be used effectively in the first place – skills and environments which many teachers do not have. They also fail to address the traumas experienced by teachers under the apartheid system, which provoke suspicion, distrust and hostility to appraisal.
- They have all failed to account for dysfunction and diversity in the education system as a whole, and therefore have suffered serious problems in the implementation process, such as under-resourcing, inadequate training and poor communication. They also all prescribe necessary support from the Department(s) of Education, which has not been adequately delivered. The perceived failure of the state to provide this assistance reinforces the distrust between teachers and the state.

This analysis of change is necessarily also an analysis of continuity. The continuities in these evaluation policies show us that the legacy of apartheid education has not been adequately confronted by policymakers – specifically by unions and the state. Even as these policies are renegotiated, reformulated and changed, at a fundamental level, they continue to make the same mistake. Beyond the failure of each individual policy, the logic that underpins the policymaking process is fundamentally flawed.

They do not correspond to the real working conditions, abilities and attitudes of teachers, which have been shaped and devastated by apartheid. These policies have failed to create the conditions necessary for their own institutionalisation, and as a result, they have again and again failed even to take hold in schools. Ultimately, in failing to address these very real deficiencies, the evaluation and accountability policies have served only to reproduce them.

1.4: Appraisal, history and the literature

This dissertation straddles an uneasy line between historical research and policy analysis. In it, I discuss the evolution of teacher evaluation policies from the 1990s to the present. While I analyse these policies to some degree of depth, this work does not engage with expert educationist literature per se, and I do not advance a particular policy position. Instead, my aim is to analyse the way these policies have been developed, contested and changed over time with a particularly historical view – ultimately in order to better understand the state of teacher evaluation today.

I am not trying to read direct lessons from history. There is a complicated relationship between historical understanding and policy development. Kallaway notes that "good history will not automatically lead to good policy".[32] What historical research can do is reveal the complex, contradictory reality that policy-makers have to accommodate and transform. A historical perspective indicates "deep-seated trajectories of change, and it

[32] Peter Kallaway, ed., *The History of Education under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning and Culture Shall Be Opened* (Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa, 2002), 6.

helps to suggest which policy frameworks have a chance of succeeding and which are completely inappropriate."[33]

A historical approach has been present but limited in the literature on the contemporary state of education in South Africa. Most of this work focuses on education under the apartheid regime. Important studies in this field try to answer critical questions about the nature of apartheid education and the opposition to it over time. This work is varied, covering questions such as: What were the origins of Bantu Education?[34] How was it responded to?[35] How did it this differ (or not) from education policies that preceded it? How did it change over time?[36] What role did education play in the apartheid project, and what role did education play in mass opposition to that project?[37] And a more historiographical question - how has apartheid education been conceptualised and studied, both by scholars and in popular discourses?[38]

Cross argues that after 1994, we have witnessed a thinning of educational historiography and the convergence of educational research into the domain of policy.[39] Studies in this period have mainly focused

[33] Peter Delius and Stefan Schirmer, "Historical Research and Policy Making in South Africa," *African Studies* 59, no. 1 (July 1, 2000): 5–12, https://doi.org/10.1080/713650977.

[34] Brahm Fleisch, "State Formation and the Origins of Bantu Education," in *History of Education Under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning & Culture Shall Be Opened* (Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2002), 37–52; Cynthia Kros, *The Seeds of Separate Development: Origins of Bantu Education* (Pretoria: Unisa Press, 2010); Peter Kallaway, ed., *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1984).

[35] Jonathan Hyslop, *Classroom Struggle: Policy and Resistance in South Africa 1940-1990* (Pietermaritzburg; Johannesburg: University Of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 1999); Mokubung Nkomo, ed., *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Pr, 1990).

[36] Kenneth B. Hartshorne, *The Making of Education Policy in South Africa* (Oxford University Press, 1999).

[37] Pam Christie and Colin Collins, "Bantu Education: Apartheid Ideology or Labour Reproduction?," *Comparative Education* 18, no. 1 (March 1, 1982): 59–75, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006820180107; Elaine Unterhalter et al., eds., *Apartheid Education and Popular Struggles* (Johannesb: Ravan Press, 1991); Simphiwe A. Hlatshwayo, *Education and Independence: Education in South Africa, 1658-1988* (Westport, Conn: Praeger, 2000).

[38] Michael Cross, "A Historical Review of Education in South Africa: Towards an Assessment," *Comparative Education* 22, no. 3 (1986): 185–200; Michael Cross, Claude Carpentier, and Halima Ait-Mehdi, "Unfulfilled Promise: Radical Discourses in South African Educational Historiography, 1970–2007," *History of Education* 38, no. 4 (July 1, 2009): 475–503, https://doi.org/10.1080/00467600801975239.

[39] Cross, Carpentier, and Ait-Mehdi, "Unfulfilled Promise."

on issues of education policy and implementation[40] while few scholars deal with educational history and those that do have played a marginal role. While these studies do deal with history and historiography, it is not their primary concern.

Work produced in the early to mid-1990s includes critiques of education policy and implementation focusing on the democratisation of the education policy process.[41] Later work (the early 2000s onwards) deals with the challenges of the expanding and transforming education system. These studies are mostly concerned with learner performance and education quality, often with a more managerialist approach to education policy that heavily focused on implementation.[42] A significant although smaller group of studies review the policy shifts in the education system since 1994, often critiquing the way the education system was restructured

[40] For example: Andre Kraak and Michael F. D. Young, eds., Education in Retrospect: Policy and Implementation since 1990 (Pretoria : Johannesburg: Human Sciences Research Council in association with the Institute of Education, University of London ; Thorold's Africana Books [distributor], 2000); Nick Taylor, Johan Muller, and Penny Vinjevold, Getting Schools Working: Research and Systemic School Reform in South Africa (Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa, 2003); Linda Chisholm, ed., Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2004); Edward B. Fiske and Helen F. Ladd, Elusive Equity: Education Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa (Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2004); Keith Lewin, Michael Samuel, and Yusuf Sayed, eds., Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in South Africa: Policy, Practice and Prospects (Johannesburg: Heinemann, 2003).

[41] Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie, eds., *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa* (Johannesburg: Juta, 1999); Kraak and Young, *Education in Retrospect*; Yusuf Sayed, "Discourses of the Policy of Educational Decentralisation in South Africa since 1994: An Examination of the South African Schools Act [1][2]," *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 29, no. 2 (June 1, 1999): 141–52, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305792990290204; Linda Chisholm and Bruce Fuller, "Remember People's Education? Shifting Alliances, State-building and South Africa's Narrowing Policy Agenda," *Journal of Education Policy* 11, no. 6 (November 1996): 693–716; Saleem Badat, "Democratising Education Policy Research for Social Transformation," in *Education in a Future South Africa: Policy Issues for Transformation*, ed. Elaine Unterhalter, Harold Wolpe, and Thozamile Botha (Africa World Press, 1992); Sayed, "Discourses of the Policy of Educational Decentralisation in South Africa since 1994."

[42] Taylor, Muller, and Vinjevold, *Getting Schools Working*; Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*; Brahm Fleisch, *Managing Educational Change: The State and School Reform in South Africa*, 1st ed (Johannesburg: Heinemann, 2002); Kraak and Young, *Education in Retrospect*. Setting the scene for these works was a wave of government plans and reports including Department of Education, "Implementation Plan for Tirisano January 2000-December 2004" (Pretoria: Government Printer, 2000); Department of Education, "A South African Curriculum for the Twenty-First Century: Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005" (Pretoria, 2000).

after apartheid.[43] Some of these works criticise a movement away from earlier, more "radical" policies towards what are perceived to be more conservative, neoliberal ideas.[44]

Histories of education are often written or used in order to inform policymaking to some extent. It is almost impossible to find South African education policies that do not refer to South Africa's fraught past, and specifically to the apartheid education system. But these historical analyses are often shallow or simplistic. The apartheid education system does not explain all the challenges and complexities within our education policy today, and it should not be simplified to this point. Conversely, the history of education should not be reduced to "context" for analyses that otherwise ignore it.

My aim with this specific history of education is to attempt to understand the current dysfunction and stagnation of our teacher evaluation policies. A fundamental question is: how are these education policies informed by history? Often education policies are deliberately designed to break with "the past" (in South Africa's case, apartheid) and create some sort of change. This can be symbolic, or part of a transformative agenda.[45] In these cases, they are explicitly responding to histories. But current policies can interact with the past in other interesting ways. They can unintentionally reproduce past power structures, for example, or they can evoke memories and traumas of historical events, as I will show in this work.

This dissertation is an in-depth history of teacher evaluation policies in South Africa since 1994: specifically, how teaching is controlled and assessed, how these controls have changed since the advent of democracy in South Africa, and how they have been contested. While issues of accountability dominate academic, state and popular discourses on the improvement of education, the literature on evaluation policies tends to focus on

---

[43] Chisholm, Changing Class; Ursula Hoadley, Pedagogy in Poverty: Lessons from Twenty Years of Curriculum Reform in South Africa, First edition (London: Taylor and Francis, 2017); Enver Motala and John Pampallis, eds., The State, Education, and Equity in Post-Apartheid South Africa: The Impact of State Policies, The Making of Modern Africa (Aldershot, Hampshire, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002); Stephanie Allais, Selling Out Education National Qualifications Frameworks and the Neglect of Knowledge (Rotterdam: SensePublishers, 2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-578-6; Jonathan D. Jansen and Yusuf Sayed, eds., Implementing Education Policies: The South African Experience (Cape Town : Johannesburg: UCT Press ; [Distributed by] Thorold's Africana Books, 2001).

[44] Michael Cross, Ratshi Mungadi, and Sepi Rouhani, "From Policy to Practice: Curriculum Reform in South African Education," *Comparative Education* 38, no. 2 (May 1, 2002): 171–87, https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060220140566; Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?"; Everard Weber, "Shifting to the Right: The Evolution of Equity in the South African Government's Developmental and Education Policies, 1990–1999," *Comparative Education Review* 46, no. 3 (August 1, 2002): 261–90, https://doi.org/10.1086/341158.

[45] Jansen has argued that early post-apartheid policy was symbolic in function: Jonathan D. Jansen, "Political Symbolism as Policy Craft: Explaining Non-Reform in South African Education after Apartheid," *Journal of Education Policy* 17, no. 2 (April 2002): 199–215, https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930110116534.

the technical and mechanistic issues, and not on the historical complexities highlighted above. Very few scholars have written in more depth on teacher evaluation, but these works are significant. A discussion of these works follows.

Chisholm details the control of teachers' work under apartheid and the challenges to these controls by progressive teacher unions (eventually SADTU).[46] She argues that these controls (inspection and surveillance specifically) reflected broader social controls by the apartheid government and that struggles against this system operated as a metaphor for wider demands for national self-determination. Struggles for the control of teachers' work have therefore simultaneously been concrete struggles to transform authority relations within schools as well as both a metaphor for the broader processes of social change and a strategic component of that social change. Chisholm shows the centrality of professional control mechanisms to struggles in the education system, a critical perspective that I will build upon in this dissertation.

Apart from Chisholm's article, little of the literature focuses on contestations for control of teachers' work. Much of the research into teacher resistance to policy is framed in terms of implementation challenges or in terms of material struggles. Control and autonomy are essential concepts in the debate about evaluation, especially within the teaching profession; the lack of attention to these concepts in the South African case shows a significant gap in our understanding.

De Clercq gives a very detailed, in-depth analysis of post-1994 appraisal systems.[47] Her approach – a political analysis – traces the complex and contradictory policy processes, with different constructions and contestations by policy communities and their leadership who tried to exploit the space and opportunities created. De Clercq shows how policies are socially constructed and politically contested; they are therefore fraught with socio-educational tensions around the balance between teacher development and accountability. Policies, as they are shaped by stakeholders who interpret and mediate policy processes in pushing for their agendas, remain fragile settlements which are constantly renegotiated. De Clercq's key theoretical insights are significant and inform much of this dissertation.

---

[46] Chisholm, 'The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work'.

[47] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa."

Other work has engaged with specific policies – DAS, WSE and IQMS – which I engage with in the chapters to come.

What this dissertation contributes to the literature is an understanding of why these evaluation policies, despite massive investments of time, energy and resources, and complex and tough negotiations, have consistently failed to become institutionalised and to produce results. Even as these policies have been renegotiated and redeveloped, they have all failed to engage with the actual realities of teachers and classrooms in the majority of schools in South Africa.

It is therefore insufficient to engage with the failure of each of these policies in isolation, insufficient to ask: *Why did DAS fail?* or *Why did WSE fail?* This dissertation rather asks: *Why do these policies continue to fail? Why has the policy process been unable to produce workable evaluation policies?* The continuity – the *lack* of change – in this aspect necessitates an approach that traces the causes of these commonalities.

1.5: Understanding education policy

My aim in this section is to provide an overview of concepts and debates in education literature that inform both the policies analysed in this thesis and my analysis of them. I cannot give a full review of nor engagement with the education literature on these topics; it is decidedly out of the scope of this dissertation. I would like to stress that such concepts are not necessarily straightforward or unproblematic. Where relevant to this thesis, I will elaborate.

Accountability is a buzzword in popular debates in education across the world. The basic understanding of accountability is having to account for one's outcomes or performance and to accept responsibility for those outcomes, usually implying some sort of reward or punishment. In South Africa, there is a significant body of research that suggests a serious need for increased accountability in order to improve the quality of education.[48] It has also been deemed a priority of the education department and the government more

[48] Nic Spaull, "Accountability and Capacity in South African Education," *Education as Change* 19, no. 3 (September 2, 2015): 113–42, https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2015.1056199; Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report"; van der Berg et al., "Identifying Binding Constraints in Education"; Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*; Bloch, *The Toxic Mix*.

broadly.[49] Internationally there is increasing consensus that encouraging higher levels of autonomy and accountability within education systems is necessary for educational improvements.

Much of the education literature draws on Darling-Hammond and Ascher, who regard an accountability system to be a:

> set of commitments, policies and practices that are designed to: 1) heighten the probability that students will be exposed to good instructional practices in a supportive learning environment; 2) reduce the likelihood that harmful practices will be employed; and 3) provide internal self-correctives in the system to identify, diagnose, and change courses of action that are harmful and ineffective.[50]

Frymier defines accountability as implying responsibility, responsibility as implying judging performance and judging performance as implying evaluation.[51] In this sense, accountability, appraisal, and evaluation are interlinked.

Although the term "accountability" is widely used, it is inconsistently defined in both popular discourse and academic literature; though in each account the definition can be specific, the concept itself must be viewed as vague and incoherent.[52] The aim of this thesis is not to engage accountability policymaking or to propose a definition of the concept, but rather to analyse the ways in which this concept is defined and used in different ways, by different actors, at different times.

The form accountability takes regarding teaching – as well as the theory and narrative informing it – differs according to how the following questions are answered:

- What is good teaching? Who defines good teaching? What is the role of the teacher? Accountability requires a judgement of outcome or performance against expectations or standards.

---

[49] National Planning Commission South Africa, *Our Future: Make It Work: National Development Plan, 2030* (Pretoria: National Planning Commission, 2012); Department of Basic Education, "Action Plan to 2019: Towards the Realisation of Schooling 2030" (Pretoria, 2015).

[50] Linda Darling-Hammond and Carol Ascher, "Creating Accountability in Big City School Systems. Urban Diversity Series No. 102," March 1991, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED334339.

[51] Jack Frymier, *Accountability in Education: Still an Evolving Concept. Fastback 395* (Phi Delta Kappa, 408 N, 1996).

[52] See Renée Kuchapski, "Conceptualizing Accountability: A Liberal Framework," *Educational Policy* 12, no. 1 (January 1, 1998): 191–202, https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904898012001013; Janet Ouston, Brian Fidler, and Peter Earley, "The Educational Accountability of Schools in England and Wales," *Educational Policy* 12, no. 1 (January 1, 1998): 111–23, https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904898012001008.

- Who is responsible for delivering good education? Accountability can be located in various people, groups and structures, and can operate in different directions. Teachers, learners, parents, departments of education, and unions can all be "accountable" to different people for different things.
- How is teaching evaluated? How does the evaluation ensure or promote good teaching?

Darling-Hammond, as well as much of the subsequent literature, distinguishes between five different types of educational accountability: political, legal, bureaucratic, professional, and market.[53] *Political accountability* is accountability to the public, usually articulated in terms of democratically elected representatives. It can take the form of elected school governing bodies at the micro-level, or elected legislators passing education law and policy.

Legal accountability is accountability to the law, and therefore the courts. This form of accountability has been gaining prominence in South Africa as various civil society organisations have resorted to taking various officials in the departments of education to court in order to force action. *Market accountability* refers to school choice and competition; parents and students may choose the programs or schools they believe are most appropriate for their needs. School choice has been a significant debate in South African education policy.

Bureaucratic accountability and *professional accountability* are the most relevant to this thesis as the concern teachers directly. Under *bureaucratic accountability*, education departments set policies, rules and regulations to ensure that schools meet standards and follow procedures. Bureaucratic accountability most often refers to line management supervision, whether performed externally (by departmental subject advisors or inspectors) or internally (by school management). Bureaucratic accountability strongly emphasises compliance, supervision and control, and in South Africa, it is often associated by SADTU with the apartheid-era inspectorate system.

Professional accountability refers to peer educators monitoring and assessing colleagues, on the basis of standards of accepted teaching practice, in order to promote professional collaborative sharing, reflection

[53] Linda Darling-Hammond, "Accountability for Professional Practice," *Teachers College Record* 91, no. 1 (1989): 59–80.

and teamwork over teaching and learning practices in the specific context of the school to improve teachers' and learners' performance. In the process, teachers develop shared standards of professional knowledge and practices and then set their professional goals as well as how to monitor these.

Much of the literature also differentiates between internal and external evaluation, although they can be combined in different ways in different systems of accountability. External evaluation, strongly associated with bureaucratic modes of accountability, implies the evaluation of teachers by external persons or bodies (inspectors or supervisors). External evaluation is assumed to be more professional, comparative and objective, although external inspectors can provoke distrust and feelings of victimisation in teachers.

Internal evaluation, strongly associated with professional accountability, includes self- and peer-evaluation. The internal evaluation approach is based on the understanding that teachers themselves are best placed to reflect on the quality of the work they do, to decide on the evidence needed to make judgements on their performance, and to identify areas and strategies for improvement. However, internal evaluation requires teachers to have the expertise and professionalism necessary to hold themselves to account effectively; it depends on individuals' sense of their responsibility as well as collective expectations and commitment among school stakeholders to get the work of the school done.[54]

Finally, there is an important distinction between appraisal for development and appraisal for accountability (often labelled as "formative" and "summative" respectively). Appraisal for development refers to evaluation in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses of educators, so that they can prioritise their professional development needs. Appraisal for accountability refers to evaluation in order to assess teachers' performance and outcomes, in order to reward or punish them.

1.6: Sources

This research was based on a close reading of a range of primary documentary sources, supported by other research and literature in this field. Archival material was gathered from a number of documentary histories

[54] Charles Abelmann et al., "When Accountability Knocks, Will Anyone Answer?," CPRE Research Report Series (Consortium for Policy Research in Education, 1999), https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED428463.

and relevant collections in the University of Witwatersrand's Historical Papers Library, mainly the SADTU collection, and the South African History Archives teacher union collections.

I drew upon a wide range of sources in order to comprehensively cover the time period (the late 1980s to the present) and the diversity of actors in the field.

Regarding SADTU and the ANC, sources included constitutions, policy and discussion documents, conference reports, meeting minutes, programmes, manifestos, press statements, speeches, pamphlets, posters, and media reports, among others. It must be noted that these documents do not necessarily reflect the positions of SADTU's membership base. The focus of this study is on the trajectory of national policymaking, and it is beyond the scope of it to interrogate the internal relationships within SADTU. It is certainly more nuanced, diverse and complex than SADTU statements and documents suggest, and it is an area worthy of further study. [55]

As this is a history of policy, must of this research is based on extensive reading of legislation, collective agreements, policy documentation, training manuals, implementation plans, policy handbooks written for educators and administrators, press statements and policy reviews. I have also drawn from insider accounts of policy processes, which were fortunately plentiful for some areas of this study.[56]

Secondary documentation has been used both to inform my analysis and as objects of analysis themselves. Many studies written on these policies have themselves become part of the policymaking process and have influence evolving discussions and negotiations on appraisal.

[55] Some starting points might be: Thulani Zengele and Izaak Coetzer, "The Perceptions of Educators on the Involvement of Teacher Unions during the Filling of Promotional Posts," *Africa Education Review* 11, no. 1 (January 2, 2014): 17–32, https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2013.853565.

[56] For example, Muavia Gallie, "The Implementation of Developmental Appraisal Systems in a Low-Functioning South African School" (PhD Thesis (Education), University of Pretoria, 2007), http://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/25650; Linda Chisholm, "The Politics of Curriculum Review and Revision in South Africa," in *Culture, Context and the Quality of Education* (Oxford International Conference on Education and Development, Oxford, 2003).

1.7: Overview

Chapter Two delivers a brief history of apartheid education, with particular reference to the experiences of teachers under this system. It explores the construction and nature of the Bantu Education system as well as significant challenges to this system posed by the mass democratic movement and specifically, the movement for People's Education. It covers teachers' experiences in depth, focusing on three areas: the nature of teaching within the apartheid education system, the responses of teachers to that system, and the changing nature of teaching and teacher organisations during this period. Throughout, particular attention is paid to the apartheid inspectorate as a precursor to the appraisal policies that are the subject of this dissertation. This chapter aims to investigate the historical roots of three major questions. Firstly, how do teachers and the state relate to one another? Secondly, how do teachers conceive of "teaching" – how do they understand their roles and their work? Thirdly, how do teachers relate to performance appraisal policies?

Chapter Three traces policymaking in education during South Africa's negotiated transition from apartheid to a democratic system. It looks primarily at the formation of the new education dispensation. It examines the contestations between various actors and policy positions during this period of policymaking in order to understand which policy positions became dominant. Lastly, this chapter briefly analyses several vital developments in education policy during this time, in order to better contextualise the evaluation policies which were developed within this framework.

The first teacher evaluation system implemented after the transition, the 1998 Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) is the subject of Chapter Four. This chapter traces the development of the DAS policy, by analysing the policy context, the policymaking process, and contestations between the actors involved in the policy negotiations. It details the implementation of these policies over the next five years, paying particular attention to changes and continuities with the previous apartheid-era appraisal systems. Lastly, this chapter analyses why DAS failed to take hold in schools and to achieve its stated aims.

Chapter Five deals with the short-lived 2001 Whole-School Evaluation (WSE) policy. It firstly covers the changing policy context which ultimately gave rise to the WSE, as well as the changing relationships between teachers and the state. The chapter then analyses the content of the policy itself, as well as its attempted

implementation. The strong backlash from SADTU is covered in depth, as well as the related deterioration of teacher-state relations.

In 2003, DAS and WSE were combined and integrated into a new policy, the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). Chapter Six analyses the negotiations that led to the formulation of the IQMS and its eventual implementation. The chapter then analyses the ways in which IQMS represented a break with previous policies – and the ways in which IQMS reproduced behaviours and structures of the past. It lastly analyses the changing attitudes to the IQMS which resulted in the eventual development of the new Quality Management System.

The final chapter looks at all these policy phases as a continuous policymaking process and seeks to answer the central question of this thesis: Why have these evaluation policies, despite massive investments of time, energy and resources, and complex and tough negotiations, consistently failed to become institutionalised and to produce results? I argue that, even as these policies have been renegotiated and redeveloped, they have reproduced the same tensions and fundamental weaknesses in each new iteration of evaluation policy. This demonstrates an underlying weakness in the policymaking process, which is characterised by impossible compromises between competing interests, inherent tensions and false assumptions about the skills, attitudes and working conditions of teachers.

Chapter 2: Apartheid Education

This chapter serves to illustrate the political and social context of teaching in South Africa inherited from the apartheid period. This understanding of teachers and teaching up to and including the transition to democracy in 1994 is indispensable in the analysis of teacher evaluation policy to follow. This chapter firstly describes the system of education under apartheid, providing an overview of the education space. I then describe the crisis in black education as well as the People's Education movement that developed in opposition to apartheid education. This chapter focuses substantially on teachers within that education system: how they were imagined in policy, how they were trained and posted, and how they practised their professions. This section will also cover the relationships between teachers and their employer – the state. Particular attention is paid to the role of teacher evaluation in constructing this relationship. I then follow the development of teachers' responses to apartheid education, by tracing the formation and evolution of teacher organisations. I cover in detail the period of the late 1980s and early 1990s, in which teachers organised en masse against apartheid education for the first time. Lastly, I look at the creation of SADTU, one of the primary actors in the following chapters.

This chapter shows that apartheid inspection regimes were used to police and discipline teachers, and suppress political activism. The result was a high level of resistance and a complete discrediting of evaluation systems. By the end of the apartheid period, the system had been rendered ungovernable by mass collective action by students and teachers, leaving a vacuum which the new policies of the post-apartheid ANC government sought to fill. SADTU was shaped by resistance, struggle and the rejection of authority, which influenced its organisational identity, priorities and strategies for engagement and policymaking.

2.1: An Overview of Apartheid Education

In South Africa, mission education, linked to the colonial "civilising" agenda of converting "natives" to Christianity, was the context in which African education evolved. The churches were the primary provider of education to black people so that by 1953, 5000 out of the 7000 schools for black children were faith-

based.[57] For much of the early colonial period, and well into the twentieth century, the state was unconcerned with the particularities of black education.[58] State policy on black education continued to be one of neglect and limitation until the Nationalist Government came into power in 1948, and almost immediately began to restructure education as part of its grand apartheid design.[59]

Apartheid was a demand for separation, for racially institutionalised superiority along with protectionism for whites through the state. Education policy was to be part of the array of apartheid laws, including pass laws, segregation, police controls, the Group Areas Act, job reservation and the Bantustan system. The role played by education was in asserting ideological control over the black population while at the same time giving workers the necessary skills for a changing economy. The new government converted the already inequitable education system of the colonial and segregation eras into a powerful means of maintaining order and socialising various elements of the population to their appropriate roles in apartheid society.

In January 1949 the government set up a Commission on Native Education. The main terms of reference for this commission were:

> the formulation of the principles and aims of education for Natives as an independent race, in which their past and present, their inherent racial qualities, their distinctive characteristics and aptitudes, and their needs under ever changing social conditions are taken into consideration.[60]

The Eiselen Commission reported in 1951[61]. The Commission considered black education to be an integral part of a carefully planned policy of segregated socio-economic development. The commission emphasised the functional value of the school as an institution for the transmission and development of "Bantu" cultural heritage. Citing inefficiencies and wastage associated with missionary education, the commission called for

---

[57] Bloch, *The Toxic Mix*, Kindle Locations 497-498.

[58] The state aided the vast majority of mission schools, albeit inadequately, from the beginning of the twentieth century. In exchange for payment of teachers' salaries by the state they were required to follow provincial syllabi. This was never adequate and was supplemented by other sources.

[59] On pre-apartheid education policy see Hartshorne, *The Making of Education Policy in South Africa*; Frank Molteno, "The Historical Foundations of the Schooling of Black South Africans," in *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans*, ed. Peter Kallaway (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1984), 45–107.

[60] Union of South Africa, "Report of the Commission on Native Education, 1949-1951 (Eiselen Commission Report)" (Pretoria: Government Printer, 1953).

[61] On the Eiselen Commission, see Christie and Collins, "Bantu Education"; Fleisch, "State Formation and the Origins of Bantu Education."

a bureaucratic structure based on rational planning and technical efficiency run by white professionals. The commission articulated a vision of education "as a vital social service concerned not only with the intellectual, moral and emotional development of the individual but also with the socio-economic development of the Bantu as a people."[62]

Consequently, the Bantu Education Act was introduced in 1953, giving wide powers to the Minister of Native Affairs to implement the commission's major recommendations. Black education was to be directed to "black needs". Black education was to be tribalized and situated in the Bantustans as far as possible. At the same time, it was to be centrally controlled and financed under the Native Affairs Minister.

The impetus for apartheid education came from a combination of a profoundly racial and ideological agenda on the one hand and, on the other, the need of the government and capital for a cheap, compliant and suitably trained labour force.[63] The system was designed to maintain white supremacy and perpetuate black subordination, and as such produced segregated and vastly unequal parallel education systems. After the Bantu Education Act of 1953, separate education was to be extended to coloured people in 1963 and to Indians in 1964, and a white Education Act was passed in 1967. Separate education departments were responsible for various racial and ethnic groups, which were subjected to different legislation, funding, and working conditions; this education bureaucracy only became more complex over time.

This administrative fragmentation was accompanied by a centralised approach to education governance, with the Department of National Education (DNE) in control of overall finance as well as the development, implementation and monitoring of education policies in the various devolved departments. The centralisation of education powers and decision-making, coupled with a racially fragmented and unequally funded administration, resulted in an incredibly inefficient system of education delivery and provisioning.[64]

---

[62] Fiske and Ladd, *Elusive Equity*, 42.

[63] See Christie and Collins, "Bantu Education"; Linda Chisholm and Michael Cross, "The Roots of Segregated Education in Twentieth Century South Africa," in *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa*, ed. Mokubung Nkomo (Africa World Press, 1990); Fleisch, "State Formation and the Origins of Bantu Education"; Jonathan Hyslop, "Social Conflicts over African Education in South Africa from the 1940s to 1976" (PhD Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1990).

[64] Jane Hofmeyr and Peter Buckland, *Education and Governance in South Africa* (Johannesburg: Urban Foundation, 1993).

The inequalities between these departments were steep. White education departments were better resourced and, together with the four independent homelands, had some control over curriculum, examinations, teacher training and employment, as well as school construction and infrastructure. In contrast, the Department of Bantu Education, later renamed Department of Education and Training (DET), which catered for black Africans, was poorly-resourced, with restricted policy and decision-making powers, as well as severe inefficiencies in delivery and provisioning.

Bantu Education brought with it an unprecedented massification of state education and the systematic and comprehensive control over education by the apartheid government. The government dramatically increased the numbers of young children getting initial access to education throughout the 1950s, and especially the 1960s and 1970s.

In the 1940s, 30% of whites got to Grade 12. By the 1960s, this figure had risen to 45% and had reached 80% by 1970. That same year, 90% of whites made their way into secondary school. The secondary school enrolment of Africans was 4% in 1960, up to 16% in 1970, and had risen to 28% in 1975 and 35% by 1980. In 1940 less than a quarter of black children from six to sixteen were in school at all. There were about 284 250 black students in schools in 1930; this had more than doubled to 587 586 by 1945. There were 747 000 black students altogether in school in 1950, doubling to 1.5 million by 1960. 76% of black learners were concentrated in the first four years of schooling and only 3.4% in post-primary classes.[65]

This period saw a significant increase in government spending on black schooling, although funding was still unequal. For every R10 spent on a white pupil, R1 was spent on a black child, the difference increasing to about sixteen to one by 1968 and slightly dropping to about fourteen to one in 1976, despite considerable investments in black education.[66] As late as 1994, after the government had significantly increased spending on black students, the amount spent per pupil in white schools was more than two and a half times that spent

[65] Bloch, *The Toxic Mix*, Kindle Locations 585-587.

[66] Bloch, Kindle Locations 649-653.

on behalf of black students in the urban townships. An even greater disparity existed between white schools and schools in the Bantustans.[67]

This period established the structures of a critically underfunded and poorly organised mass education system for black people. The expansion of schooling, in a short space of time and without the necessary resources, support and funding, led to overcrowding, growing learner/teacher ratios, and stagnant – and often declining – standards. The quality of education in black schools varied widely. While there were some good teachers and pockets of excellence, most black teachers were underqualified and poorly trained (discussed below), and most black schools were unable to provide high-quality education. This was compounded by apartheid curricula, which were controlled by the DNE and designed to perpetuate black subordination.

By the end of apartheid, the education system was heavily segregated and convoluted. A 1992 report describes how the system was articulated in the 1983 constitution:

> In terms of the 1983 constitution which established "general affairs" and "own affairs", the control of education in South Africa outside the bantustans was divided between the two categories. "General education affairs" are the responsibility of a white cabinet minister, and African education is designated a "general affair". "Own affairs education" refers to the education of Coloureds, Whites, and Indians, and is the responsibility of racially segregated Coloured, White and Indian education departments. The Department of National Education, created in 1984, was given the right to determine "general" policy across all racial groups and for all departments outside the bantustans. This applied to formal, informal, and non-formal education with regard to norms and standards for financing education, the salaries and conditions of service of staff, the professional registration of teachers, and norms and standards for syllabi and examinations. Alongside the DNE are the four other ministries responsible for the education of designated population groups. Each of the four ministries is racially exclusive and is accorded control over the implementation of policy, teacher training, its teaching corps, and education programs and methods.
>
> The control of education in South Africa is accordingly fragmented into four separate education systems for Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, and Ciskei, six for the self-governing territories [Gazankulu, Lebowa, kaNgwane, kwaNdebele, kwaZulu and Qwaqwa], one for White education [plus four province-based operating departments], one for Coloured education, one for Indian education, and one general education system for

[67] Fiske and Ladd, *Elusive Equity*, 44–45.

> African education under the Department of Education and Training. This results in nineteen operating departments under fourteen different cabinets implementing their own regulations in terms of at least twelve Education Acts and seventeen different authorities employing teachers. [68]

An important caveat to the above, and the descriptive analysis below, is that apartheid education was far more uneven than many academic or popular narratives of this period suggest, and conditions varied widely between areas and even individual schools. These nineteen education departments all had different systems and bureaucracies, had access to different resources and staff, were managed by people with differing goals, and catered to students from very different backgrounds. This created a high level of complexity and diversity in the education system. Some black schools were centres of academic excellence and tried to provide alternative, progressive education to their students.[69] The Bantustans, while poorly resourced, had some degree of control over education, making it difficult to generalise their schooling systems.[70] It is necessary to paint with a broad brush when describing historical trends, but these nuances should not be ignored or forgotten.

2.2: The Education Crisis and People's Education

Education was a significant site of struggle by black South Africans against apartheid and the education system itself.[71] The education section in the Freedom Charter (in later campaigns known specifically as the Education Charter), drawn up in 1955, became the foundation for all specific demands around education in the anti-apartheid movement(s):

> THE DOORS OF LEARNING AND OF CULTURE SHALL BE OPENED!
> The government shall discover, develop and encourage national talent for the enhancement of our cultural life;

---

[68] National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), *Governance and Administration* (Cape Town; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

[69] A classic example is Livingstone High School, see Alan Wieder, "Informed by Apartheid: Mini-Oral Histories of Two Cape Town Teachers," in *The History of Education under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning and Culture Shall Be Opened*, ed. Peter Kallaway (Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa, 2002).

[70] While this is under-researched, education in the Bantustans seems much more complex and diverse than usually acknowledged in the literature. See Linda Chisholm, "Bantustan Education History: The 'Progressivism' of Bophutatswana's Primary Education Upgrade Programme (PEUP), 1979–1988," *South African Historical Journal* 65, no. 3 (September 1, 2013): 403–20.

[71] For more on the opposition to apartheid education before 1976, see Hyslop, *Classroom Struggle*; Kallaway, *The History of Education under Apartheid, 1948-1994*; Kallaway, *Apartheid and Education*; Nkomo, *Pedagogy of Domination*; Pam Christie, *The Right to Learn: The Struggle for Education in South Africa* (Ravan Press, 1991).

> All the cultural treasures of mankind shall be open to all, by free exchange of books, ideas and contact with other lands;
>
> The aim of education shall be to teach the youth to love their people and their culture, to honour human brotherhood, liberty and peace;
>
> Education shall be free, compulsory, universal and equal for all children;
>
> Higher education and technical training shall be opened to all by means of state allowances and scholarships awarded on the basis of merit;
>
> Adult illiteracy shall be ended by a mass state education plan;
>
> Teachers shall have all the rights of other citizens;
>
> The colour bar in cultural life, in sport and in education shall be abolished.[72]

Education became a primary site of struggle in 1976, when the outbreak of student revolt in the streets of Soweto, Johannesburg heralded a crisis in black education. The late 1970s and 1980s saw an unprecedented wave of militant student action in black schools, including protests, marches, and school boycotts. Following the massification of education by the government, more black children were in school than ever. Students formed political organisations such as the Congress of South African Students (COSAS) and SAYCO (the SA Youth Congress). Students rejected apartheid education and campaigned for the end of the apartheid system under slogans such as "liberation before education" and "liberation now, education later". Struggle over education had become inextricably intertwined with the broader struggle for liberation. At the height of the education protests, education in black schools, most often in urban centres, came to a standstill.[73]

After a period, the intensified and sustained boycotts began to concern amongst parents and teachers regarding the future of their children and students. Schools were volatile and often violent, with students clashing with state security forces and even other youth organisations, sometimes fatally. Many students were receiving no education at all. Others in mass democratic movement worried about not having control over the precise contours and methods of protest by students. Children under the age of eighteen comprised between 26% and 45% of all those in detention during the two States of Emergency between 1985 and 1989.

---

[72] *The Freedom Charter*, Adopted at the Congress of the People, Kliptown, South Africa, on 26 June 1955., 1955.

[73] Though Soweto was the epicenter of student resistance, the unrest spread to other locations in 1976 and 1977: Natal (now KwaZulu-Natal), the Northern Transvaal (now Limpopo), and other townships of the Southern Transvaal (now Gauteng).

Children as young as seven years old were detained, schoolchildren house-arrested by the government, sometimes even entire schools were rounded up.[74]

In response to the escalating crisis, progressive organisations, from political parties such as the ANC to local community groups like the Soweto Parents Crisis Committee, launched campaigns that centred the importance of education while still rejecting the apartheid ideology and education system. They called for "education for liberation" instead of "liberation before education", and pioneered new thinking about democratic, emancipatory forms of education. These strategies included back to school campaigns, protests and marches, alternative classrooms and curricula, and the forced removal of apartheid education bureaucracy personnel from schools and communities. Parents, students, teachers, communities and progressive teacher organisations called for a democratic system of learning and teaching best articulated by the slogan "People's Education for People's Power"; this came to be known as the movement for People's Education.

Two national conferences were held in 1985 and 1986, attended by representatives of various progressive groups, through which the National Education Crisis (later, Co-ordinating) Committee (NECC) was formed. The NECC campaigned for a non-racial, democratic system of education specifically, inextricable from the call for the end of apartheid itself. The first real definition of People's Education was articulated at the 1985 National Education Consultative Conference:

> People's education is education that:
> (i) enables the oppressed to understand the evils of the apartheid system and prepares them for participation in a non-racial democratic system
> (ii) eliminates illiteracy, ignorance and the exploitation of one person by another
> (iii) eliminates capitalist norms of competition, individualism and stunted intellectual development, and replaces it with one that encourages collective input and active participation by all, as well as stimulating critical thinking and analysis
> (iv) equips and trains all sectors of our people to participate actively and creatively in the struggle to attain people's power in order to establish a non-racial democratic South Africa

[74] Bloch, *The Toxic Mix*, Kindle Locations 762-765.

(v) allow students, parents, teachers and workers to be mobilised into appropriate organisational structures which enable them to participate actively in the initiation and management of people's education in all its forms

(vi) enables workers to resist exploitation and oppression at their workplace.[75]

The democratisation of education was the major priority on the People's Education agenda. At the forefront was the demand for a desegregated and equal system of schooling. Student and teacher organisations focused on issues such as free and compulsory schooling, curriculum and pedagogy, the provision of facilities and materials, and teacher's working conditions and pay. The fight against racially based schools and exclusionary school fees was a primary site of struggle in education-related activism.

At a more localised level was the demand for the democratisation of schools themselves. The NECC campaigned for democratic governance structures within the institutions of learning. In its own structures and projects, the NECC was consultative and community-oriented. The campaign to establish Parent-Teacher-Student Associations (PTSAs) and Student Representative Councils (SRCs) was critical to the NECC. These were intended to replace the school committees and prefect systems which were seen as illegitimate functionaries of the apartheid government.

A critical project in the fight for People's Education was the development of radical pedagogy and curricula in order to combat and replace the illegitimate prescriptions of the apartheid education system. To this end, progressive teacher unions such as the National Education Union of South Africa (NEUSA) established subject commissions to pursue new materials and techniques for education. This resulted in, among other outputs, the publication of subject workbooks and teaching principles.

However, the People's Education movement was severely hampered by the civil unrest in the country, as well as severely threatened by the apartheid government, which detained many NECC leaders, banned all major progressive teacher organisations, arrested teachers and students, and imposed restrictions under emergency regulations on the introduction of alternative curricula in black schools. By 1990s the NECC and progressive education movement had been almost entirely subsumed by negotiations towards teacher unity (the

[75] National Education Crisis Committee (NECC), "Resolutions Re Education Crisis Taken at National Consultative Conference, December 28-29, 1985 (Convened by SPCC)" (December 29, 1985), AK2117-J6-CA41, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

formation of SADTU) and ultimately by the national negotiations taking place for the impending political transition.

2.3: Teachers under apartheid

The teaching profession was no exception to the fragmented nature of apartheid education; the differentiated training, employment and control of teachers was instrumental to the functioning of the racialised system.

The ideology of Bantu Education carried with it a particular image of what it meant to be a "Bantu" teacher. The two principal aims of the education system under apartheid – the perpetuation of white supremacy and the need for black labour – help explain what kind of teachers the system required and consequently aimed to produce. The apartheid system necessitated that "Bantu" children should be taught only by "Bantu" teachers. The system also required teachers who were compliant and reliant on the state to teach the apartheid curricula and ideology.

The earliest imagining of the ideal "Bantu" teacher can be found in the report of Eiselen Commission, which formed the basis of the Bantu Education Act of 1953. The report recommended that African children be taught only be African teachers "to make the schools as Bantu in spirit as possible as well as to provide employment", and the ideal African teacher should not only have appropriate qualifications and skills, but should also have qualities of "obedience, willingness to help, truthfulness, self-control, and the gift to impart knowledge".[76] Prospective teachers were to provide a statement from the minister of the church to which they belonged regarding their morals and religion.[77] The state also required that the curriculum stress "obedience, communal loyalty, ethnic and national diversity, acceptance of allocated social roles, piety and identification with rural culture."[78] These recommendations show that the ideal black teacher was one that was compliant with authority and dutifully taught apartheid ideology to their learners.

---

[76] Union of South Africa, "Eiselen Commission Report."

[77] Heather Jacklin, "Teachers, Identities, and Space," in *Being a Teacher: Professional Challenges and Choices: Reader*, by Mike Adendorff and John Gultig (Braamfontein: South African Institute for Distance Education and Oxford University Press, 2002).

[78] Molteno, "The Evolution of Education Policy," 89.

The ideal white teacher was very different.[79] While white teachers had historically played a primarily pastoral and religious role, they came to be seen as well-paid professionals within a civic administration. Despite this professional status, however, the autonomy and authority of white teachers were strongly limited by the centrally controlled education system. Christian National Education (CNE), the ideological basis of white education, also carried precise prescriptions for the conduct and role of white teachers:

> As all authority in the school is seen as authority borrowed from God, it follows that the C.N.E. view of method and discipline is traditional and teacher-centred: the authoritative teacher is the source of knowledge and the children the respectful, obedient recipients of that knowledge. ... The teacher is accorded a high status and heavy responsibility as the parents' substitute. C.N.E. demands that the teacher be a person of Christian life and world-view who is trained at a Christian and National institution. In addition to the appropriate religious instruction, the teacher trainee must also receive secular instruction, particularly in pedagogic science.[80]

There were significant disparities in the teaching profession between racial and ethnic groups. White teachers were usually qualified and well-trained, and benefited from reasonable salaries and favourable working conditions in well-resourced schools, with white students from relatively privileged backgrounds. Black schools, on the other hand, were usually severely under-resourced, and often staffed by poorly qualified and poorly paid teachers, who taught students from poor communities with mostly illiterate parents who could not be very involved in their children's schooling.

Bantu Education brought about a significant expansion of primary-level educational provisions for the African population. However, this expansion did not keep up with explosive demand, and new schools were built without corresponding additional infrastructural, financial and human resources. As a result, African teachers faced particularly difficult working conditions in overcrowded facilities, with limited teaching

---

[79] This thesis does not deal with white teachers in significant depth. Some nuanced perspectives include: Yael Shalem, "Teachers' Struggle: The Case of White English-Speaking Teachers in South Africa," *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 13, no. 3 (1992): 307–28; Yael Shalem, "Educated Labour: A Study of White English-Speaking Teachers in Secondary Government Schools on the Witwatersrand" (PhD Thesis (Education), University of the Witwatersrand, 1990); Alan Wieder, "White Teachers/White Schools: Oral Histories from the Struggle against Apartheid," *Multicultural Education* 10, no. 4 (2003): 26–31; Alan Wieder, "White Teachers/Black Schools: Stories from Apartheid South Africa," *Multicultural Education* 8, no. 4 (2001): 14–23; Wieder, "Informed by Apartheid: Mini-Oral Histories of Two Cape Town Teachers,."

[80] Jane Mary Hofmeyr, "An Examination of the Influence of Christian National Education on the Principles Underlying White and Black Education in South Africa: 1948 - 1982" (Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1982), 30–31, http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/18190.

resources and inadequate assistance from their education departments, which were more concerned with controlling them than with providing support to improve their teaching.[81]

Teachers under apartheid education were primarily treated as state functionaries or civil servants with very limited autonomy. Teaching was highly controlled at all levels. A major requirement of teachers was bureaucratic and political compliance with state education; the teacher was "an obedient civil servant that executed the well-defined instructional tasks per an official syllabus and a 'moderated' examination".[82] The teaching profession was also under bureaucratic controls that placed teachers under heavy surveillance in the form of inspections and evaluations and punished deviation from prescribed norms and standards.

Because of whites' enfranchised status and their freedom to associate, authority relations between white departments and their teachers were not as bureaucratic and controlling as with teachers of other races.[83] White education departments expected their teachers to use prescribed textbooks and transmit syllabi designed by experts loyal to the apartheid ideology. White teachers were usually better trained and were allowed some professional autonomy with some development opportunities. White teachers also had some representation in policy-making and in the development of curriculum, and through teacher-parent committee structures. Most white teachers were insulated from the realities and experiences of black schools. Ultimately, however, white teachers were only allowed professional autonomy insofar as they complied with the prescriptions of CNE and apartheid education in general.

African, Indian and Coloured teachers were managed in a far more authoritarian manner. Black education departments relied on bureaucratic, punitive forms of authority and control to discipline teachers who were expected to comply with strict rules and procedures. They were not encouraged to develop their teaching competencies or professional status. Instead, they were perceived as workers with basic technical skills to transmit the apartheid curriculum with "teacher-proof" syllabi, which not only outlined the contents that

---

[81] Molteno, "The Evolution of Education Policy."

[82] Jonathan D. Jansen, "Image-Ining Teachers : Policy Images and Teacher Identity in South African Classrooms," South African Journal of Education 21, no. 4 (November 1, 2001): 242–46.

[83] Dianaraj Chetty et al., "Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa: Policy Options and Strategies" (Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand/NECC, 1993); Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*.

learners had to learn, but also the objectives and methods of teaching teachers had to employ.[84] These teachers were also required (in some cases forced) to sign documents that bound them to comply with government policies.[85] Control over their work was exercised through a bureaucratic and authoritarian system expecting obedience and subservience.

Furthermore, teachers were expected to comply with a narrow idea of professionalism in terms of their behaviour and public image. This professionalism de-politicised teaching and prioritised commitment to the interests of the "child" over those of "politics": teachers were meant to focus solely on in-classroom or in-school activities. This built on the influence of Christian mission education notion of the "good" or "caring" teacher, dedicated to the needs of learners and communities.[86] This view of professionalism also prescribes teachers' dress, appearance and manner. A 1992 SADTU pamphlet on professionalism described:

> Teachers were expected to be well dressed, civil and reasonable, and had to refrain at all times from actions which could lead to confrontation between themselves and their employer. ... Teachers were expected to teach under bad conditions in schools, and apply a racist curriculum in class. And when teachers would dare raise their voices against these problems, they would be victimised.[87]

The Bantu Education Department tried to convince teachers of this perception of their role, in line with the aims of apartheid. The department and its publications made much of the concept of professionalism, for example. But this was not always successful. The department often put forward themes that were bluntly racist and threatened against any form of dissent. Hyslop notes remarkable examples from the department's publication, the *Bantu Education Journal*.[88] It published obvious comments such as: "Teaching should lead the child to do naturally, and therefore willingly, what society has prescribed as correct, good and commendable."[89] In one example, it claimed that South African whites were the most important whites in

84 Jansen, "Image-Ining Teachers."

85 Crain Soudien, "Notions of Teacher Professionalism in the Context of a Racially Divided Society: The Case of South Africa," in *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in South Africa: Policy, Practice and Prospects*, ed. Keith Lewin, Michael Sarmuel, and Yusuf Sayed (Heinemann, 2003).

86 See Molteno, "The Evolution of Education Policy."

87 "South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU): Professionalism and Unionism," *New Nation*, April 3, 1992, sec. Learning Nation, http://saldru.lib.msu.edu, SALDRU Clippings Collection 1975 - 2000.

88 Hyslop, *Classroom Struggle*.

89 Quoted in Editorial, "Fighting Against Bantu Education," *Liberation: A Journal of Democratic Discussion*, no. 14 (December 1955): 3–7.

the world: "They are honest and sincere in their actions to all, people whose word is their bond and who will not be frightened by violence". This 1965 editorial is both striking and bizarre:

> It is about time that we take a look at our South African Bantu population to see in what respects they have exceptional qualities... choral singing is one of our strong points... Another talent which is manifested in our children is their neat handwriting... subversive activities and sabotage are not our strong points. There are some of our fellow men who, following the instigation of strangers attempted this but they were bound to fail. They failed because these things have never had a share in our traditional way of life and because they are not intrinsic abilities of the Bantu.[90]

These messages of white superiority were "incapable of forming an ideological rallying point for the educated black strata of society" – ultimately far too crude to find purchase with teachers.[91] While teachers were mostly compliant with Bantu Education and the apartheid educational bureaucracy, there remained a simmering resentment and hostility of many teachers to the department. This eventually gave way to large-scale teacher resistance.

2.3.1: Teacher education

Like all other aspects of the South African education system, teacher education was characterised by fragmentation, segregation, and discrimination, and there was no national coherent teacher education policy or plan for national development. Control over teacher education was located in various agencies responsible to different departments of education, which resulted in significant disparities across decentralised apartheid geographies.

Responsibility for white teacher education was located in the four provinces. Black teacher education followed the apartheid logic of racial classification: Indian and Coloured students were trained in Indian and Coloured colleges of education. African teachers were trained by the DET and teacher education colleges controlled by homeland governments. Although teachers could train in independent institutions, the DNE

[90] Quoted in Hyslop, *Classroom Struggle*, 120.

[91] Hyslop, 120.

did not guarantee them recognition.[92] By the end of the apartheid era, South Africa had 19 different governance systems controlling teacher education in at least 120 colleges of education, together with 32 partially autonomous schools (21 universities and 11 technikons) providing teacher education.[93] The 1995 National Teacher Education Audit identified 281 different institutions providing some form of teacher training.[94]

This system was costly, inefficient, and incoherent. There was a multiplicity of curricula and qualifications, little nationally coordinated planning of supply and demand, and little to no quality assurance and accountability procedures. Nevertheless, the overall hegemony of apartheid education was pervasive, as evidenced by a strong core curriculum and the primacy of Fundamental Pedagogics.

Up until the era of democracy, it remained possible for black students to qualify as teachers with Standard 8 school-leaving certificates. This system had by then long been abolished in white education, where student teachers were required to have matriculated. For example, a 1979 report by the Taylor Commission of Enquiry into Education, established by the government of the Transkei, found that 94% of primary school educators had not achieved matric.[95] Teacher training institutions did little, on average, to make up for the limited schooling black student teachers had received.

White, and to some extent Indian, student teachers were provided with some meaningful teacher education and in-service teacher training opportunities to improve their professional competencies, with some teachers also able to innovate on aspects of their teaching.[96] Limited opportunities for development and training existed for African, Coloured and Indian students, who mainly attended poor quality teacher training colleges which tended to specialise in the humanities or social sciences and religious studies, offering limited

---

[92] National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), *Teacher Education* (Cape Town: Oxford University Press/NECC, 1992).

[93] Lewin, Samuel, and Sayed, *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in South Africa*, 20, 108.

[94] Jane Hofmeyr and G Hall, "The National Teacher Education Audit: Synthesis Report" (Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD), 1995).

[95] Council on Higher Education, "Report on the National Review of Academic and Professional Programmes in Education," HE Monitor No. 11 (Pretoria, South Africa: Council on Higher Education, 2010), 8–9.

[96] Nevertheless, even white teachers could not stray far from the ideology of Christian National Education. See Shalem, "Teachers' Struggle"; Shalem, "Educated Labour."

opportunities to train in maths, science and technology. They also did not have access to much in-service training to develop professional teacher capabilities.[97]

This was coupled with a system of post provisioning which allocated teachers to racially- and ethnically-segregated schools. In effect, each type of college and university trained teachers for particular schools.[98] Ultimately, teachers acquired their knowledge and competencies through socialisation in a racialised environment, and through a teacher education system designed to sustain the ideology of apartheid.[99]

The dominant educational philosophy in teacher education during apartheid was "Fundamental Pedagogics", which affected all teachers regardless of race. Fundamental Pedagogics was claimed to be a science of education, and was the default approach to education theory taught in almost all universities and teacher training colleges. Fundamental Pedagogics positioned both teacher and learner as passive subjects; teachers were mere practitioners of education, subject to specialists who would dictate what it is they were supposed to do in the classroom and how it should be done, with little room for engagement, creativity or autonomy.[100]

Fundamental Pedagogics promoted a pedagogic style that was "authoritarian, hierarchical, and infantilising".[101] It contributed to training teachers who lacked the ability to exercise their professional autonomy – teachers who were de-professionalised through the process of teacher education. Fundamental

---

[97] Yusuf Sayed, "Changing Forms of Teacher Education in South Africa: A Case Study of Policy Change," *International Journal of Educational Development*, Researching Teacher Education: The Multi Site Teacher Educations Project (MUSTER), 22, no. 3 (April 1, 2002): 381–95, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(01)00062-1.

[98] Yusuf Sayed and Yusuf Sayed, "The Case of Teacher Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Politics and Priorities," in *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, ed. Linda Chisholm and Yusuf Sayed (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2004), 247–66; National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), *Teacher Education*.

[99] Nazir Carrim, "From Teachers to Educators: Homogenising Tendencies in Contemporary South African Educational Reforms," *International Journal of Educational Development* 21, no. 1 (January 1, 2001): 45–52, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(00)00012-2.

[100] On Fundamental Pedagogics see: National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), *Teacher Education*, 17; Penny Enslin, "Science and Doctrine: Theoretical Discourse in South African Teacher Education," in *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa*, ed. Mokubung Nkomo, 1. print (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Pr, 1990), 77–92; Penny Enslin, "The Role of Fundamental Pedagogics in the Formulation of Educational Policy in South Africa," in *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans*, ed. Peter Kallaway (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1984), 139–47.

[101] Linda Chisholm, "Continuity and Change in Education Policy Research and Borrowing in South Africa," in *History of Education Under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning & Culture Shall Be Opened*, ed. Peter Kallaway (Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2002), 100.

Pedagogics also aimed to instil passiveness and obedience to authority in teachers.[102] Their authority and curricular competence were undermined to the point that they were "prevented from developing an understanding of the relationship between education and the context in which knowledge and understanding are created and shared."[103] Fundamental Pedagogics was intellectually harmful in that it "neutralises and depoliticises educational discourse, and does not provide students and teachers with the concepts necessary to assess critically its (or any other) claims about education."[104] Almost all teacher training curricula and the externally set examinations contributed substantially to this uncritical uniformity.

This form of teacher training also served to exclude teachers from engaging with important policy-making affecting their work. Fundamental Pedagogics actively discouraged critical engagement and "head[ed] off the possibility of critical reflection on that system by making reflection illegitimate."[105] Furthermore, it justified authoritarian practices and silenced teachers, as only those with the "science" were considered qualified to speak. This approach to teacher education aimed to inculcate passiveness and obedience in teachers, and to legitimate existing policy through a discourse of "scientific" truth.[106] (This was ultimately unsuccessful, as I will show below).

Despite the state of teacher education, many African, Indian and Coloured students still chose to pursue teaching. Under apartheid, the black population's higher education options were limited mainly to "teaching or preaching". Few students successfully completed basic education, and even fewer successfully completing secondary schooling. Not only were there limited higher education opportunities, but the curriculum within the secondary school system was usually limited to humanities subjects. In this context, many students enrolled in teacher education training programmes in order to acquire higher educational opportunities and consequently achieve middle-class aspirations.

---

[102] Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*.

[103] National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), *Teacher Education*.

[104] National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), 17.

[105] Enslin, "Science and Doctrine," 83.

[106] Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*; Enslin, "Science and Doctrine."

The state's attempts to control education via teacher education and training were not necessarily successful. The unevenness of the system often served to undermine the government's control. Some excellent teacher training institutions (mostly in the 1950s and 1960s, less common after 1970) managed to provide high-quality teacher education and produce well-qualified teachers. Many teachers, often the amongst most academically qualified members of their communities, were community leaders who aimed to teach their students well despite the limitations of the state. Professional teacher associations, while mostly compliant with the state until the late 1980s, did manage to create some opportunities for continuing teacher education and development, and contributed to important ideas and debates on teaching, pedagogy and the education system.

In the final tally, however, very few black teachers were able to access quality teacher training. The rapid expansion of the school system under Bantu education also meant that many un- and under-qualified teachers were hired in order to meet growing demand. In the mid-1990s, a person was qualified to teach if they had a senior certificate as well as three years of additional training. According to the 1995 Teacher Education Audit, almost a quarter (24.3%) of all teachers were underqualified to teach on the basis of this criterion.[107] Subsequent research has shown that most South African teachers trained during apartheid have very poor content knowledge and professional capabilities despite being formally qualified.[108]

2.3.2: School boards

Bantu Education placed control of schools in the hands of school boards in 1955. These were wholly appointed bodies, with one school board controlling a group of school committees. In urban areas, all board members were appointed by the Native Affairs Department. In rural areas, members were nominated by Pretoria and by the "Bantu Authority". The boards had considerable powers over local schools and teachers. All African teachers' salaries were paid as subsidies to the school boards, which meant they effectively

[107] Auditor General of South Africa, "Education Sector Report for 2015-16," 2017.

[108] Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*.

controlled hiring and firing (although Pretoria could force the board to fire a teacher by withdrawing the subsidy in respect of a particular person).[109]

These structures had dictatorial powers over teachers. While some teachers had good relationships with school boards, they were largely a source of a simmering sense of grievance.[110] They were considered ineffective, and they did not represent teachers and communities. Teachers were placed in a structurally weak position by the school board system, which they claimed evaluated them on the basis of their compliance with apartheid policy. The school board era was "an unhappy one for teachers", as it did little to advance the interests of teachers and weakened the position of teacher organisations in their negotiations with the state.[111] The boards also became the instrument of the state's purge of politically dissident teachers from the profession during the late 1950s.

Although the school board system was intended in part to control teachers, it also served to alienate teachers from the education system. Hyslop notes:

> The board system ... undermined the position of teachers as professionals. It thus served as an obstacle, and not an aid to their ideological incorporation into the Verwoerdian social order. The role which the school boards and committees were supposed to play in underpinning the hegemonic project of Bantu Education was undermined by the assertive bigotry of officialdom, by the state's abandonment of teachers to the mercy of local tyrants, by the governments' refusal to listen to criticisms of policy voiced by the representative structures which it had itself established, and ultimately by the long simmering traditions of popular resistance. [112]

Even teachers who were otherwise compliant in the apartheid education system resented being controlled by school boards. Much of the animosity between teachers and school boards was fuelled by the way in which teachers, a formerly relatively prestigious social group, were placed under the control of bodies often consisting of people less educated and less experienced than themselves. The school board system also often

---

[109] Jonathan Hyslop, "Aspects of the Failure of Bantu Education as a Hegemonic Strategy: School Boards, School Committees and Educational Politics 1955-1976," Working Paper, The Making of Class, 9-14 February 1987 (Johannesburg: Wits History Workshop, 1987), http://digi.nrf.ac.za/handle/10539/7856.

[110] Philip Vilardo, "Contemporary Conflict in Black Teachers Politics: The Role of the Africanization of the Apartheid Education Structure, 1940-1992," Working Paper, August 31, 1992, 9, http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/9937.

[111] Kenneth B. Hartshorne, Crisis and Challenge: Black Education 1910-1990 (Cape Town ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

[112] Hyslop, "Aspects of the Failure of Bantu Education as a Hegemonic Strategy," 8.

led to corruption and brute authoritarianism, as well as arbitrary exercises of power, which resulted in many complaints from teachers and parents across the political spectrum.

At one school in the Tswana Territorial Authority, the vice-chairperson of the school board told the school committee: "Teachers are but dogs. We can dismiss them at any moment."[113]

2.3.3: Teacher appraisal and evaluation

The Wits Education Policy Unit's 1993 study of appraisal, along with a number of other works, provides a comprehensive overview of apartheid-era evaluation systems and how they were perceived by educators.[114] According to Chetty et al., there was no uniform system of teacher appraisal and evaluation, as the various departments of education were likewise responsible for teachers within their own polities, although the influence of the DET was strongly reflected in the inspectorate systems of the Bantustans.

Teacher evaluation in the apartheid system involved an inspectorate primarily concerned with and divided into management functions and subject advisory services (which operated under the rubric of "teacher guidance"). These two functions of appraisal mirror the distinction between evaluation for accountability and evaluation for professional development described in Chapter One. The relationship between the two functions varied considerably between and sometimes within departments. Typically for South Africa, the departments with the highest number of poorly qualified teachers – black departments – had the lowest numbers of supervisory and advisory staff because of their constrained resources.

---

[113] Hyslop, *Classroom Struggle*, 124.

[114] Chetty et al., "Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa"; Linda Chisholm, "The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work in South Africa," *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 29, no. 2 (June 1999): 111–26; Jonathan D. Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession: A South African Case Study," *Research Papers in Education* 19, no. 1 (March 1, 2004): 51–66, https://doi.org/10.1080/0267152032000176972; Ella Mokgalane et al., *National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report* (Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, 1997); Crain Soudien, "Biographies, Autobiographies, and Life Stories: Teachers' Responses to the Introduction of Apartheid Education," in *History of Education Under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning & Culture Shall Be Opened*, ed. Peter Kallaway (Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2002), 211–23; Shirley M. Sebakwane, "The Contradictions of Scientific Management as a Mode of Controlling Teachers' Work in Black Secondary Schools: South Africa," *International Journal of Educational Development* 17, no. 4 (October 1, 1997): 391–404.

The control of white teachers and their work was, Chisholm notes, "deeply rooted in their relation to citizenship in the apartheid state."[115] They were treated as professionals and were given some autonomy over their own work, as well as representation in policy making at a national level. Evaluation in white schools was not uniform, but the system was well-developed and appeared to integrate successfully advisory services with teacher development.

Black teachers faced a different reality. The principal object of teacher evaluation in black education was monitoring and surveillance, not development. It was mostly inspectorial and bureaucratic, with a top-down, hierarchical and authoritarian character. At the school level, supervision was oriented towards improving exam results as a narrow objective rather than improving educational processes generally; it focused on assessing teachers with a view to monetary rewards; and it was overwhelmingly about compliance with departmental regulations rather than engaging educators about their work. Formative appraisal was minimal if it existed at all.[116]

The instruments of appraisal were forms and record books, and the system itself was bureaucratic and inflexible. Evaluations were conducted by checklists with predefined criteria, which were the state-prescribed indicators of effective teaching performance. These checklists evaluated teachers on four components: *curricular efficiency*, *extra-curricular efficiency*, *personality and character traits*, and *professional disposition and attitude*. These criteria were ambiguous and easily abused. Evaluation forms made no provision for consideration of contextual factors that may influence a teacher's performance – for example, the conditions of the school, available resources, home lives of students, and the socioeconomic context of the learners and staff.

Criteria on "personality and character traits" and "professional disposition" assessed the loyalty and submission of teachers to the DET, and details about a teacher's religious and professional affiliations, whether they read official publications and whether they belonged to official bodies or not, were part of the assessment. Teachers were suspended, transferred or dismissed when found to be "disloyal". Belonging to

[115] Chisholm, "The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work."

[116] This is a necessary generalization – some areas (for example in certain homelands) had better teacher development programs, but these were unique and not representative of the system.

progressive teacher unions or participating in any other forms of political or educational organisation were considered evidence of disloyalty.

The inspection function of the evaluation system was heavily prioritised over the function of professional development. Inspectors, for example, had significantly more power than advisors, as well as a much greater potential for career advancement. Very few advisory posts were available, and those posts had only very limited mobility and opportunities. These imbalances created significant disincentives to entering the advisory service while actively prioritising the inspection role of evaluation. Severe inadequacies in provision meant that black teachers received little no advisory services or support for professional development. On the other hand, they frequently encountered the inspectorate and were subject to inspection procedures.

Chetty et al.'s review identified considerable shortcomings in the quantity and quality of the agents of appraisal – inspectors, subject advisors, and managers at all levels of the education bureaucracy. The range of criticisms levelled against the nature and purpose of the evaluations was extensive, including:

> the prevalence of political bias in the system
> the unchecked power which inspectors wield
> the victimisation of teachers on the basis of their organisational affiliations
> keeping new teachers on probation for extended periods
> the incompetence of inspectors
> sexual harassment and discrimination against women promotion candidates
> the time it takes to prepare 'record books' for inspection
> the irrelevance of some evaluation criteria
> the practice of 'one-off' visits which inspectors use for appraisal
> the arbitrariness of scores given for appraisal
> the secrecy which surrounds the appraisal
> the difficulties of challenging the inspectors' assessment
> the absence of contextual factors in the appraisal
> the abuse of patronage in cases of promotion; the abuse of merit awards.[117]

The use of evaluation as a tool of social and political control was a major point of dissatisfaction for black teachers, creating distrust, suspicion and hostility to inspection and monitoring. Chetty et al. note: "Loyalty

[117] Chetty et al., "Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa," 3.

to officials and their departments outweighs the interests and needs of teachers. Consequently, teachers' perceptions of the current appraisal system reflect a strong sense of distrust and anxiety."[118] The evaluation system would later become one of the central issues in teacher resistance to apartheid education.

2.3.4: Conclusion

Although many teachers strived to provide high-quality education for the learning, they did so despite working within a system that aimed to de-professionalise and disempower black teachers at every level.

Through teacher education, Bantu Education produced generations of black teachers who were poorly educated in what they had to teach, in terms of content, teaching skills and pedagogy. Teachers were not given the tools or opportunities to improve as professionals and were not given the necessary autonomy required to exercise control over their own work and development.

Through schooling policies, black teachers were placed in overcrowded, under-resourced schools. Their work was highly controlled, and teaching was mainly seen as mechanistic, reduced to the rote instruction of the prescribed curriculum. Black teachers were not able to engage with policymaking or curriculum design.

Through appraisal, the apartheid state monitored black teachers through rigid, bureaucratic controls. This appraisal was often punitive, victimising teachers for outcomes over which they had little control, and served as a means of political control to keep teachers in line.

Though the literature on teaching as a profession is vast and contested, there can be little doubt that the apartheid system did not treat black teachers as professionals or allow them the tools to develop as such, despite proclaiming the virtues of "professionalism". The impact of this system of educations on teachers, and teaching in general, has had grave consequences for the education system – and attempts to reform or improve it. The legacy of apartheid education is still keenly felt in South Africa, particularly by our teachers who were at the very centre of it.

---

[118] Chetty et al., "Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa."

2.4: Teachers' responses to apartheid education

The previous section described in depth the conditions under which teachers were trained, supervised and under which they were required to work. The following section will describe and analyse the various ways teachers responded to this system of education, focusing on two things: (1) the professional organisation of teachers and (2) the resistance of teachers to apartheid education.

2.4.1: Conservative professional associations

Before the emergence of progressive teacher unions in the 1980s, teachers were primarily organised into professional associations. These traditional associations tended to work within the state education system and were recognised as representative of teachers by the various apartheid education departments. As such, they were uniracial, despite many claiming a non-racial character, reflecting the racially segregated nature of the apartheid system.

There were four major profession teacher associations, each representing one of apartheid's racial categories: the African Teachers' Association of South Africa (ATASA), the Indian Teachers' Association of South Africa (TASA), the Coloured Union of Teachers' Association of South Africa (UTASA) and the white Teachers' Federal Council (TFC). These associations were officially recognised by the government and represented teachers within particular apartheid education departments. They were federal in nature, comprising smaller, regionalised teacher associations.

These organisations described themselves as "professionals". They sought career advancement within the apartheid hierarchy and promoted the racial federalism of teacher organisation.[119] They espoused a "professional" approach in dealing with the education authorities, relying primarily on strategies of consultation, negotiation and persuasion while eschewing militant and confrontational action. The organisational work of these bodies did not directly challenge the apartheid state – in fact, according to Moll,

[119] See Chisholm, "The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work"; Jonathan Hyslop, "Teacher Resistance in African Education from the 1940s to the 1980s," in *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa*, ed. Mokubung Nkomo (Africa World Press, 1990), 93–119.

they helped to "work the machinery of apartheid education."[120] In many ways, they were the organisational agents of the government education departments which governed them.

White teacher organisations were allowed direct lines of communication with the education departments and a certain level of power and influence. They eventually assumed many supervisory functions within the inspection system.[121] Departmental structures provided professional support to educators and ensured that schools were well resourced. Representatives of white teacher associations sat on official committees concerned with policy, conditions of service, curriculum planning and other professional matters, for black schools as well as white.[122] However, their ability to influence policy extended only to the point that Christian National Education and its legitimacy were not challenged. The limitations of the apartheid education system ensured that the role that white teachers played was a "light advisory function" as opposed to playing a role of partners in policymaking.[123]

Black teacher associations were smaller and wielded little power. They were rarely, if ever, involved in decision- and policy-making structures, and worked under a system which treated black teachers less like professionals and more like unskilled workers transmitting pre-approved curricula. Nevertheless, many of them were committed to improving black education within the limitations of apartheid and managed to do good work inasmuch as that was possible.

---

[120] Ian Moll, "The South African Democratic Teachers' Union and the Politics of Teacher Unity in South Africa, 1985-90," in *Apartheid Education and Popular Struggles*, ed. Elaine Unterhalter et al. (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1991), 188.

[121] Chetty et al., "Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa."

[122] Chisholm, "The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work."

[123] Education Policy Unit, "The State of Teacher Professionalism in South Africa" (Paper prepared for the South African Council for Educators (SACE), October 2005).

2.4.2: Early teacher resistance and conservatism

Black teacher organisations were mostly docile for much of early apartheid education and from the 1960s onwards, which resulted in a conservative approach based on "non-involvement in politics and dedication to 'professional' life as the best path for the teacher."[124]

In the early 1940s teachers became radicalised for the first time.[125] This corresponded with an intensification of class struggle during this period; teachers worked closely with parents and trade unions on educational and community issues and therefore could not escape politics. Concretely, teacher politics centred on three issues: the financing of black education, the salaries and conditions of work of black teachers, and the control of black education. A combination of partial concessions by the government on wage issues and a failure of teacher leadership to follow through their campaigns led to a rapid collapse of this new militancy. [126]

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, young teachers who had been influenced by the ANC Youth League and the rise of political activism entered the profession. Teacher organisations began to participate in new radical politics influenced by the congress movement. Teacher resistance in the 1950s centred on opposition to the introduction of Bantu Education in 1953. Teachers were among the first to recognise the sweeping implications of the Eiselen Report and to mount a campaign against the commission's recommendations. However, widespread resistance to Bantu Education, as well as political activism among teachers, was effectively defeated by the late 1960s. Bantu Education had been successful in meeting the demand for mass education, and campaigns against it failed to produce viable alternatives for education.

By the 1960s, black teacher associations had become very tame. The state's crackdown on opposition movements in the early 1960s destroyed hopes of political change and encouraged careerist and cautious teacher activity. The general retreat of the organised working class in the face of state repression left the black middle class, and especially teachers, vulnerable to state coercion and co-optation. Many feared retribution

[124] Hyslop, *Classroom Struggle*.

[125] Hyslop, "Social Conflicts over African Education in South Africa from the 1940s to 1976."

[126] See Vilardo, "Contemporary Conflict in Black Teachers Politics"; Hyslop, *Classroom Struggle*; Hyslop, "Teacher Resistance in African Education from the 1940s to the 1980s."

against politically active teachers. Seeing no possibilities for a new political order, teachers opted for seeking the best possible deal within the status quo.

Black teachers' turn to conservatism was not only a result of repressive policies but also of teachers' middle-class and professional aspirations. Teaching was one of the few routes to middle-class respectability open to black people, but teachers were dependent on the state for employment. Few teachers were, therefore, willing to take the risk of losing their place in the professional world.[127]

Furthermore, the radicalisation of teachers' politics in the late 1940s had produced conservative backlash in all of the major teacher associations, which experienced significant splits over the issue of the politicisation of education. This divided and polarised teacher associations and had weakened their ability to organise and campaign.

Although many black teacher associations had initially opposed the implementation of Bantu Education, they were instrumental in the "Africanisation" of the education bureaucracy. [128] The state provided expanded employment and career advancement opportunities; one of the first acts of the Bantu Education administration, for example, was to create the new position of sub-inspector to be filled by African teachers, nearly doubling the number of administrative positions available to African educators. Black teacher associations took it upon themselves to populate the education bureaucracy and campaigned aggressively for Africanisation. The following decades of fighting for black advancement certainly bore fruit. For example, by 1985 over 90% of the DET and homeland inspectorate was African.[129]

These teacher associations pushed for black advancement within the structures of apartheid education, remaining outwardly uncritical of the system and compliant with apartheid authority. In many cases, the established black teacher associations collaborated with the government and rejected popular struggles against apartheid education. They continued to represent the interests of teachers on professional issues such

[127] Glaser, "Champions of the Poor or 'Militant Fighters for a Better Pay Cheque'?"

[128] See Vilardo, "Contemporary Conflict in Black Teachers Politics," 10.

[129] Vilardo, "Contemporary Conflict in Black Teachers Politics."

as salaries, career advancement and securing greater autonomy for teachers from school boards. It was not until the 1980s that teacher organisations would really begin to push back against apartheid ideology itself.

2.4.3: Teacher resistance and mobilisation

Despite the state's authoritarian control of the teaching profession, teachers have always found ways to resist apartheid education. The domination of conservative teacher associations, as detailed above, meant that most teachers who resisted did so as individuals and not through collective action – at least at first. The politics and organisation of teaching and teachers underwent a dramatic change in the mid-1980s. As part of the broader opposition to apartheid, campaigns against apartheid education were mounted by political groups, teachers, students, parents and civil society organisations. At the height of the education protests, education in black schools came to a standstill, and violent clashes between students and apartheid security forces became commonplace. It was in this environment of political violence and repression that teachers had to do their work.

Politically involved teachers began to break away from the established, professional bodies and to mobilise for change. This led to the emergence of many new, radical, progressive teacher bodies which organised themselves as trade unions and aligned themselves with the mass democratic movement and the movement for People's Education. This was the first time that teacher protest action was conducted on a mass, rather than individual or localised, scale.[130]

These new teacher organisations had a combined political and education agenda and adopted explicitly unionist approaches. They focused on the rights of teachers as workers and used methods such as strike actions, sit-ins, marches, and "chalk-downs". They constituted themselves as non-racial and were aligned to vanguard organisations of the democratic movement, most notably the ANC, the Congress of South Africa Trade Unions (COSATU) and the South African Communist Party (SACP).

---

[130] On teachers' resistance before the 1980s, see Soudien, "Teachers' Responses to the Introduction of Apartheid Education"; Hyslop, "Teacher Resistance in African Education from the 1940s to the 1980s"; Hyslop, *Classroom Struggle*. On the mobilisation of teachers from the 1980s, see Ihron Rensberg, "Collective Identity and Public Policy: From Resistance to Reconstruction in South African, 1986-1995" (PhD Dissertation, Stanford University, 1996); Moll, "Sadtu and the Politics of Teacher Unity."

These unions came into immediate conflict with the established teacher associations. Many of these conflicts were characterised by opposing ideologies – the conservative professionalism espoused by older, established associations against the progressive, militant unionism espoused by the newer teacher unions. Progressive unions, for example, accused the recognised teacher organisations of having accepted the legitimacy of a racially segregated educational system and therefore unable to advance the educational interests of South Africa. Many of the principals and inspectors who made up the authority structures belonged to conservative associations and were therefore rejected by the radical unions. The established teacher associations, on the other hand, criticised the new unions for putting politics before their students, for being unprofessional, and for damaging the education system which, even if flawed, they thought was better than no education at all.

The National Education Crisis Committee (NECC) and the People's Education movement focused the struggle for people's power on the politics of education. They emphasised the importance of teacher mobilisation and collective action, the political culture of teaching and the role of teachers in the mass democratic movement. Pressure was directed at teachers and their organisations to play their part: teachers were considered an irreplaceable asset to the realisation of people's power and People's Education.[131]

As far as the People's Education movement was concerned, conservative teacher associations had, until now, collaborated with the apartheid state. These conservative bodies had to be brought together with the newer progressive organisations into a national movement of teachers, which could become a mechanism for realising People's Education. The political space opened by the NECC and the growing movement had delegitimised the conservatism of established teacher organisations while encouraging the growth of militant, progressive teacher unions.

At the same time, a new generation of teachers was entering the teaching profession. These teachers had been educated in a time of intensified mobilisation against apartheid – many of them had been in high school during the school uprisings in 1976, and many others had been part of student politics and activism at universities and colleges. The massification of black schooling in the 1980s had increased the demand for

[131] National Education Crisis Committee (NECC), "Resolutions Re Education Crisis Taken at National Consultative Conference, December 28-29, 1985 (Convened by SPCC)"; National Education Crisis Committee (NECC), "Report on the Second National Consultative Conference on the Crisis in Education" (March 30, 1986), AK2117-K2117-J6-CA42, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

teachers and increased the access of black youth to education – two developments which reinforced this demographic shift. This new generation increased the pressure on conservative teacher organisations to separate themselves from the apartheid state and align themselves more clearly with the mass democratic movement in order to recruit members.

During this period, the established black teacher organisations were often part of state attempts to reform the education system from within. For example, in 1981 they were involved in the Human Sciences Research Council's Investigation into the Provision of Education (also known as the De Lange Commission); they were the only black organisational presence in the work of the commission.[132] These associations were considered part of the state by organisations in the democratic movement and by the emerging progressive teacher unions.

However, by 1985 these organisations came under considerable pressure from student and community groups, as well as from their own members. ATASA was incorporated into a broad anti-state alliance in Soweto during 1985; by December of that year it was working closely with community and student organisations in the Soweto Parents' Crisis Committee (SPCC) and making significant political gains in opposition to apartheid education in the process. ATASA was fully represented at the launch of the NECC. UTASA and TASA experienced similar pressures – the mobilisation and politicisation of the communities from which they drew their members began to change their political direction. Nevertheless, deep divisions between the new generation of progressive unions and the older professional associations persisted and were the cause of many conflicts and continued fragmentation within staff rooms and the teaching profession as a whole.

Simultaneously, the increasing mobilisation of teachers, students, parents and others in the education space provoked the apartheid state to strike back. Education activities were subjected to increasing political interference; politically involved teachers were targeted and victimised, often threatened with suspension, firing or being passed over for appointments; new, even more authoritarian systems of inspection of teachers

[132] Moll, "Sadtu and the Politics of Teacher Unity." See also Hartshorne, *The Making of Education Policy in South Africa*; National Education Union of South Africa (NEUSA), "De Lange... Marching to the Same Order" (Booklet, 1982), Delmas Treason Trial 1985-1989 Collection, AK2117, J3.21.AV2, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

were introduced; progressive teacher organisations were threatened with deregistration and derecognition; militant teacher organisations were banned, their members detained; and teaching posts were frozen.[133] NEUSA was banned in 1985. The second State of Emergency imposed in June 1986 also targeted teacher organisations and education activists. By the end of the year, most of the NECC leadership was in detention, and the NECC was severely disrupted on the ground. More than 100 members of progressive teacher unions were in detention at various points in 1986 and early 1987.[134]

This state repression was and directed at all teachers and organisations regardless of political alignment. This prompted even conservative teacher organisations to defend themselves and to retaliate. The States of Emergency and surges of repression in education institutions exacerbated the crisis in the schools and teachers increasingly bore the brunt of the collapsing education system. In addition to this, teachers had other material concerns – real salaries and working conditions were dramatically declining for all teachers.

It was during this period of crisis in 1986-1987 that many progressive organisations emerged. While they initially remained isolated, their mushrooming reflected the dissatisfaction and growing militancy among teachers. Progressive organisations grew in number and size, while traditionally conservative organisations became increasingly politicised and continued to forge closer ties with the democratic movement through structures such as the NECC. ATASA's decision in 1986 to withdraw from participation in the structures of the DET was the first significant indication of this political shift. All of these organisations, except the Afrikaans and bilingual white teacher associations, came to oppose apartheid and segregated education as a matter of policy by the late 1980s.[135]

2.4.4: Towards teacher unity

All these teacher groups eventually participated in teacher unity talks convened by organs of the liberation movement. Militant teacher organisations aimed to unite, mobilise and politicise all teachers, while

[133] Rensberg, "Collective Identity and Public Policy," 138–39.

[134] Moll, "Sadtu and the Politics of Teacher Unity," 193.

[135] Moll, "Sadtu and the Politics of Teacher Unity."

conservative associations pursued the creation of a unified, federalist teacher association. These two streams of unity talks eventually flowed together in the pursuit of teacher unity.

The issue of teacher unity – to unify all teachers within a single, progressive body – was tabled for the first time and placed on the political agenda of the democratic movement at the first National Education Consultative Conference in 1985. From the resolutions of the conference:

> Teachers should work actively with students towards the formation of democratically elected SRCs
> Teachers should work closely with parents and students in dealing with the current education crisis
> Teachers should become involved in community struggles and help to set up PTA's [sic] in all schools
> Education programmes for teachers which bring out the history of progressive teachers' struggles, the role of teachers in the community, and the role of teachers' unions, should be conducted
> Teachers should work to unify all teachers into a single, progressive teachers' body
> Meetings of teachers should be called in all areas to give students and parent organisations an opportunity to address them on the education crisis.[136]

The conference was guided by the principle of maximum unity of all anti-apartheid forces, and the unification of teacher organisations – and the profession more broadly – seemed to be an important goal. Teacher organisations needed to be drawn into the programmes of the NECC. The majority of African teachers in the country were members of ATASA; delegates argued that it was a mass-based organisation that needed to be included in the NECC, despite its past conservatism. The newer, progressive teacher organisations had within their ranks many young activists dedicated to the democratic movement and likewise needed to be included. [137]

Teacher unity proved to be far more difficult and complex than initially anticipated. There were deep conflicts between the established organisations and the progressive unions which repeatedly surfaced at the NECC conference. Many delegates at a major People's Education conference argued that the ATASA leadership was comprised of the very principals and inspectors who carried out the agenda of apartheid

[136] National Education Crisis Committee (NECC), "Resolutions Re Education Crisis Taken at National Consultative Conference, December 28-29, 1985 (Convened by SPCC)."

[137] Moll, "Sadtu and the Politics of Teacher Unity," 192.

education – and were, therefore, apartheid collaborators. ATASA saw the progressive organisations as "an insignificant fringe group of hotheads" who did nothing more than disrupt proceedings.[138]

The schism between these organisations largely revolved around issues of professionalism and unionism. Progressive teacher organisations organised themselves as labour unions and aggressively campaigned for teachers' interests using methods such as protest action and strikes. Conservative organisations considered themselves to be "professional" and did not believe teachers should put their interests before those of students; they preferred the politics of negotiation and collaboration. These deep tensions would prove to be the largest obstacle to achieving teacher unity.[139]

Teacher organisations debated teacher unity throughout 1986 but made little progress. This was compounded by state repression and backlash. Nevertheless, during this period both the NECC and the United Democratic Front (UDF) continued to stress the importance of teacher unity. COSATU began to play a role in teacher organisation in 1987, strongly recommending that teachers should be united according to the principle of "one industry, one union".[140] Teacher organisations had always avoided explicit political affiliations, but the possibility of becoming a trade union was becoming increasingly attractive.

By the end of 1987, two parallel sets of unity talks had emerged: once between progressive unions and one between established, conservative organisations. Unity talks between the progressive unions were convened in October 1987, and by the end of the year, they had all committed to the goal of becoming a unified trade union within COSATU. By early 1988, most of the conservative associations had agreed in principle to work towards unity amongst themselves. The divide between conservative and progressive teacher organisations was not as vast as it had once been. For example, NEUSA was invited to unity talks convened by ATASA. NEUSA declined not because of opposition to ATASA but because its fellow unions had not been invited.[141]

---

[138] Moll, 192.

[139] See Rensberg, "Collective Identity and Public Policy"; Logan Govender, "Teacher Unions, Policy Struggles and Educational Change, 1994 to 2004," in *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, ed. Linda Chisholm (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2004), 267–91; Moll, "Sadtu and the Politics of Teacher Unity."

[140] Congress of South African Trade Unions, "Report on the Education Conference" (Johannesburg, 1987), AH2373-12-12.3-12.3.2, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

[141] Moll, "Sadtu and the Politics of Teacher Unity," 196.

Eventually, the exiled South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU), the All African Teachers' Organisation (AATO), the World Confederation of Organisations of the Teaching Profession (WOCTP) in close collaboration with COSATU and the host organisation, the Zimbabwe Teachers Association (ZIMTU), called a *Teacher Unity Seminar* in Harare, Zimbabwe in April 1988 in order to draw teacher unions together and iron out differences.

The influence of COSATU was significant; conservative teacher associations and progressive unions were both highly respectful of and keen on affiliation with COSATU. SACTU and COSATU's association with the highly-legitimated ANC was also influential in securing buy-in from the teacher organisations. AATO and WOCTP appealed to the conservative teacher organisations: they were seen as professional bodies, and several of the traditional South African teacher associations were affiliated to or closely associated with these organisations.[142]

After a week of discussion, all parties agreed to a set of guidelines as the basis for future teacher unity. These guidelines were known as the *Harare Accord*:

1) All representatives of the teachers' organisations present agreed on the need for the national unity of teachers and committed themselves to discuss this in the various structures and to propagate the feasibility of one national teachers' organisation.
2) The representatives of teachers' organisations agreed that organisations should get together and decide on the form which the envisaged united organisation should take.
3) Such an organisation should be committed to a unitary, non-racial, democratic South Africa.
4) Such an organisation should commit itself to be part of the national mass democratic movement.
5) The organisation should commit itself to a free, non-racial, non-sexist, compulsory, democratic education in a single education system.
6) The organisation should protect and promote the rights of teachers as workers and professionals.
7) The organisation should implement as a matter of urgency a programme of political and professional education of teachers for them to play an active role within the community.
8) Ideology should not be precondition for unity.
9) The representatives of organisations agreed to urge their organisations that they, as well as the envisaged organisations, would abide by the principle and practice of non-collaboration with all structures of the apartheid system.

[142] Rensberg, "Collective Identity and Public Policy."

10) Negotiations with respective authorities should only be conducted with the mandate of the constituencies concerned.
11) The organisation should commit itself to the realisation of the ideals of people's education in our country.
12) In the interim, the representatives of organisations will urge their organisations to consult on ways to co-ordinate the various attempts and work together in formulating and implementing people's education projects.
13) Organisations are encouraged to organise joint projects which will facilitate national unity.
14) The representatives of organisations committed themselves to urge their organisations to maintain the spirit of comradeship, mutual respect and common purpose which has characterised the Harare seminar on teacher unity as a necessary element in the process of achieving unity.
15) The representatives of organisations have agreed to urge their organisations to establish a negotiating machinery to pursue the objectives stated in this document. They request that as a matter of urgency Cosatu should convene a machinery, having consulted with the organisations about the composition and powers of such a machinery. Cosatu is further requested to consult with other sectors of the democratic movement.[143]

These guidelines situated the teacher unity process firmly within the 1980s thrust of maximum national unity in the pursuit of people's power. The teacher unity process and its surrounding issues of the political culture of teaching, teacher mobilisation, collective action and organisation were firmly entrenched within the socio-political project of the mass democratic movement. Significantly, the accord assigned equal importance to the rights of teachers as workers and the roles of teachers as professionals. The commitment of COSATU as the facilitating organisation provided organisational resources for the process of teacher unity that had been lacking before.

After the Harare talks, teacher unity was discussed in eleven meetings back in South Africa. This became the National Teacher Unity Forum (NTUF). These teacher unity talks continued for another two years. During this time, several teacher organisations undertook collective action as the NTUF. For example, more than 600 teachers of all races marched on Parliament on May 28, 1990. Eleven teacher unions along with COSATU and the NECC met with the Minister of Education in a historic 6-hour-long meeting. The NTUF also issued demands to the DET, organised a "Day of National Action" in schools nationwide in July, and began to speak on behalf of teachers collectively.

[143] National Teacher Unity Forum (NTUF), "Harare Guidelines" (4th National Teacher Unity Talks 1989, 1989), AL2418 I1 92-005-11, The South Africa History Archive.

In the teacher unity talks, heated debates ensued. Some issues were practical in nature (the timetable for dissolution, the future of assets and infrastructure) while others were concerned with the nature of the potential united teacher union. Should it be federal or unitary? Should it be purely professional, a trade union, or reflective of both positions? It was eventually decided to form a single national teachers' union, charged with both the advancing of 'collective bargaining' rights as well as maintaining 'high standards of ethical conduct and professional integrity' on behalf of its members.[144] This conception of unionism and professionalism as non-competing, compatible approaches would become a cornerstone of the identity of the new union – SADTU.

Some conservative associations had already withdrawn from the unity process; their biggest grievance was the issue of political affiliation to the ANC and liberation movement. Some of those conservative teacher organisations would eventually unite in a federal alliance under the umbrella of the National Professional Teachers' Organisation of South Africa (NAPTOSA).

In October 1990, the South African Democratic Teachers Union was launched. It was the militant teacher unions, dominant during the unity process, who were determining the direction of SADTU. SADTU "married educational struggles with the call for liberation, thus adopting an acutely antagonistic attitude towards the apartheid education structures." The organisation adopted a radical transformation project and militant strategy to end apartheid education.[145]

2.4.5: Teachers and appraisal

One of the issues central to the platforms of many of these progressive organisations was the system of teacher evaluation. The push for People's Education implied the rejection of apartheid authorities in the education system, and the creation of liberated zones in which teachers could be politicised and People's Education could be pursued. Teachers "focused on the defiance of the symbols of authority and control by a white

[144] Rensberg, "Collective Identity and Public Policy," 143.

[145] Samuel Amoako, "Teacher Unions in Political Transitions: The South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU) and the Dying Days of Apartheid, 1990–1993," *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 49, no. 2 (April 1, 2014): 150.

department exercising control over work through its departmental proxies."[146] This included defiance of the inspectorate, the most immediate representation of apartheid repression in the schooling system.

That position was formalised by the NTUF in the statement that "no classroom visits be done by inspectors or subject advisers for the purpose of evaluation but that inspectors may visit schools for the completion of certain administrative functions."[147] In a major meeting between the NTUF and the DNE, one of the teachers' demands was "the immediate suspension of all inspection activities and other prescriptive bureaucratic controls and negotiations on these issues."[148] Inspection had become a core issue of the new political teacher movement.

Protests in the late 1980s and early 1990s took the form of stayaways, "chalk-downs", marches to regional offices, submissions of grievances, sit-ins and the prevention of departmental officials and inspections from visiting schools. Control personnel such as inspectors and subject advisers were often barred from school grounds and even physically removed.

At the same time, the inspection system expanded throughout the country. Its goal was to enforce compliance and quash the growing resistance to apartheid education policy. Panel inspections and subject assessments monitored and enforced state policy in terms of curriculum and administration of public schools. Between inspections and state-moderated examinations, any deviation from the curriculum would be exposed. Inspectors played a central role in "subduing teachers and holding them to account".[149] But this crackdown only served to intensify teacher resistance to this inspection system.

This banishment of state authority from schools also left in its wake a nearly complete absence of developmental inputs in the work of teachers (if any had existed before), and the lack of effective interventional authority in the disciplining of teachers.[150] But this withdrawal from the professional life of

---

[146] Chisholm, "The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work."

[147] SADTU, "First National Congress (NASREC, Johannesburg, 10-12 October 1991)," Report, October 1991, 26–27, SADTU Collection, AH3389, AA2, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

[148] National Teacher Unity Forum (NTUF), "Memorandum Issued to the Minister of National Education" (May 1990), AL2418 92-005-14/I4, The South African History Archive, Progressive Teachers League Collection.

[149] Soudien, "Teachers' Responses to the Introduction of Apartheid Education."

[150] Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession," March 1, 2004.

the school was replaced with a violent assertion of the same authority in the political life of the school. For example, in the first twelve months of 1986 about 700 people in the field of education were detained, and in 1987 the DET terminated the services of 1585 permanent teachers in order to contain anti-apartheid actions among teachers.[151]

At its formation, SADTU had inherited a fragmented and localised campaign of defiance. These practices were also becoming embedded in existing practices ranging from teaching, teacher organisation and collective action, through the curriculum, schooling, school organisation and management. In some areas, school inspection and teacher evaluation were practically non-existent. Resistance to the apartheid education system had all but driven the inspectorate from schools.

In 1990, the newly formed SADTU embarked on a Defiance Campaign that targeted at all departmental regulations concerning evaluation and inspection. It encouraged the forceful expulsion of inspectors from schools and declared non-cooperation with school principals and heads of departments. At the end of 1990, the total number of principals and others in authority being driven from their posts came to 1 991.[152]

The inspection system was one of the most important issues on SADTU's agenda. Their major objections to the system centred around the victimisation of teachers, the punitive nature of the system, and the lack of support and opportunities for the developments. The overarching concern was that the inspectorate was a fundamentally undemocratic institution and represented the apartheid system that fundamentally SADTU rejected. One of SADTU's statements on inspection reads:

> The present system of inspection has been designed to supervise, control and manage apartheid education; the present system of inspection has been used to victimize and harass teachers. As teachers, we in SADTU have a moral duty and a central role to play in determining education policies and structures such as evaluation, which govern education. SADTU would therefore like to call for suspension of all inspections and evaluation until 31 March 1992, to enable SADTU and the department to finalize a mutually acceptable position in respect of same.[153]

---

[151] Hartshorne, *The Making of Education Policy in South Africa*, 97.

[152] Chisholm, "The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work."

[153] Randall van den Heever, "Inspection and Evaluation," n.d., Ismail Vadi Collection, A2147, A3.9, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

During SADTU's Defiance Campaign, the DET accused SADTU of attempting to take over control of schools.[154] The seriousness of the threat posed by the campaign was evident in a court order attained by the DET Minister restricting SADTU members from "instructing and encouraging principals, teachers and pupils to hinder inspectors or other department officers from entering school premises to perform their duties."[155]

Traditional conservative teacher associations criticised SADTU for ostensibly putting politics ahead of students. SADTU General Secretary van der Heever responded:

> SADTU does not want to destabilize education. Nor does it have any axe to grind with principals and inspectors. But we cannot stand by when democratic principles are trampled underfoot by education authorities.[156]

SADTU's Defiance Campaign was largely unsuccessful in prompting formal policy change from the apartheid government, but it did manage to almost completely remove the apartheid inspectorate from the schooling system. By the time the new government came to power, very few schools were practising any form of teacher evaluation. A 1994 ANC document noted:

> As a result of these and other problems, particularly the lack of legitimacy of the system and professional respect for many of the incumbents, the activities of inspectors and subject advisors have been suspended in large parts of the country. In some areas, inspectors and advisors are virtually banned from entering school premises, and the system of supervision and inspection has collapsed.[157]

"To this day," a former teacher commented as late as 1997, "there is virtually no system of teacher appraisal or evaluation in place in most black schools in the country."[158]

The apartheid appraisal system represented to teachers the worst of the apartheid education system: it was undemocratic, unequal and structurally, systematically violent. It is little wonder that inspection became the

---

[154] Department of Education and Training (DET), "1991 Annual Report" (Pretoria: Government Printer, 1992).

[155] Vilardo, "Contemporary Conflict in Black Teachers Politics," 25.

[156] Quoted in Amoako, "Teacher Unions in Political Transitions," 151.

[157] African National Congress (ANC), *A Policy Framework for Education and Training*, 1994, http://www.anc.org.za/content/policy-framework-education-and-training.

[158] Glaser, "Champions of the Poor or 'Militant Fighters for a Better Pay Cheque'?," 52.

subject of intense defiance and resistance. As we shall see in the next chapter, the development of a new appraisal system was one of the SADTU's first priorities. As we shall see in the rest of this dissertation, teacher appraisal has remained highly contested and politicised within the South African education system.

2.4.6: Conclusion

Teacher resistance to apartheid education in the 1980s and 1990s significantly changed the teaching profession in South Africa. New, progressive teacher organisations, among others, challenged the ideological basis of apartheid education, as well as the various institutions that supported it. These groups resisted apartheid as part of the mass democratic movement, but also made very important gains in education specifically.

The People's Education Movement pioneered new work on teaching and pedagogy which was critical to the formation of new teacher unions and eventually SADTU. The simultaneous processes of resistance to apartheid education and the quest for teacher unity produced important thinking on the roles and status of teachers, as well as their work.

Teachers began to identify as workers and to identify with the labour movement more broadly. The resulting demands of progressive teacher unions were fundamental to the movement, including teachers' rights, fair pay and working conditions, the right to strike and protest action, collective bargaining, and the challenge to the authoritarian nature of the state and the one-sided relationship between teachers and their employers – the state. The influence of the labour movement is also evident in People's Education, which saw education as liberatory and a potential challenge to capital. All of these issues formed a significant part of the SADTU's identity.

The other side of this worker/professional discourse was also enriched. Unlike the compliant, strict professionalism expected of teachers during apartheid, new ideas of professionalism gained popularity. Teachers emphasised ideas of autonomy and control over their own work, which had been largely denied to them by the apartheid bureaucracy. The notions of "the ideal of service" and the prioritisation of the child,

essential to professionalism discourse during this time, also became points around which teachers opposed the apartheid state.

Many teacher unions and, ultimately, SADTU, sought to incorporate both unionism and professionalism into their organisations. Appropriately titled "Unionise for Democratic Professionalism", the 1991 SADTU congress tackled this head-on. SADTU argued that "the trade union and professionalism aspects... [are] two sides of the same coin":

> Many teachers have been conditioned into accepting the definition of professionalism which says teachers do not have the right to protest. The rights to organize and protest are basic human rights and we make no apology for calling on teachers to protest against undemocratic service contracts. The state expects teachers to act professionally while they treat us in the most unprofessional manner possible. For them, professionalism means towing their line and we are not prepared to do that.
>
> There are two inescapable realities about teachers. One is that they are educators and the other is that they are workers. Teachers have no option but to fight for their rights as employees and at the same time exercise the responsibilities of the profession of teaching. It would be the most misguided view of professionalism to conclude that teachers by reason of their commitment to education would accept low salaries, unsatisfactory conditions of service and discriminatory practices.
>
> SADTU fully accepts that teachers have a serious responsibility to provide an education of the highest standard to pupils in the classroom ... [and] ... that teachers also have democratic rights, in particular the right to bargain for improved benefits for the profession.[159]

Teacher politics during this period also challenged those aspects of apartheid education that had de-professionalised and disempowered teachers. Teachers sought to improve or supplement the inadequate and highly ideological teacher education system, and to replace the dictatorial school boards with democratic PTSAs. They challenged and, in many places, effectively stopped the apartheid state's major tool of control – the inspectorate. They also began to form new ideas of teacher professionalism and to develop education policy to support it.

[159] "South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU): Professionalism and Unionism."

The rest of this dissertation builds upon this history in order to examine the new forms of appraisal developed in post-apartheid South Africa. The legacies of apartheid education, the People's Education movement, and militant teacher unionism continue to influence the South African education system in myriad, complex and profound ways.

Chapter 3: Education in Transition

The 1990s brought hopes of change in South Africa, both in education and the overall political dispensation. The unbanning of political organisations such as the ANC and the release of opposition leaders like Nelson Mandela led to a new period of "legitimate" political activity and possibilities for changes in state power.[160] Moves towards a negotiated settlement through structures such as the Convention for a Democratic South Africa (CODESA) and subsequent multiparty talks promised a new constitution with equal rights for all and an interim government of national unity. Imminent change in government brought with it expectations of a new education dispensation. During this "transition" period, interest groups shifted from tactics of opposition to a new mode of political engagement: planning and policy-making for the new South Africa.

As hopes were rising, the crisis in black education – a dual crisis of under-provision and lack of legitimacy – was escalating.[161] Black schooling was still unequal and under-resourced and was beset by protest action, boycotts and strikes which brought a virtual collapse of the system in some parts of the country. Eleven million pupil-days of school were lost in 1992 due to riots, political action and school closings. The following year this number had quadrupled to 51 million pupil days. Between January and August 1993, 29 111 schools reported being closed, 8 737 reported low attendance, and 6 796 incidents of pupils "leaving school early".[162] The absence of government policy initiatives to address this continuing crisis is a striking feature of this transition period from 1990 to 1994.[163]

This chapter focuses on emerging education policy during this period. The first part of this chapter outlines negotiations in the education sector during the transition and identifies which actors and policy ideas became dominant and eventually shaped the new education dispensation. The second part of this chapter analyses the policy positions of the ANC and the nascent SADTU that were formulated during this period. I aim to

---

[160] Pam Christie, "South Africa in Transition: Educational Policies, 1990-93," *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 14, no. 2 (April 1, 1994): 45–56, https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930140204.

[161] See Pam Christie, "From Crisis to Transformation: Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa," *Australian Journal of Education* 36, no. 1 (1992): 38–52.

[162] Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?," 705.

[163] On the other hand, there had been significant restructuring in white schooling. See Christie, "South Africa in Transition."

answer the following questions: How did these organisations position themselves in the policymaking space? What were their priorities? How did they relate to one another? How successful were they in their attempts to influence the education policy of the new South Africa? The third part of this chapter outlines some of the major new developments in education policy emerging from the transition, outlining the policy context for more specific and in-depth policy analysis in later chapters.

This chapter is critical in building an understanding of the policymaking environment in South Africa after apartheid. It traces how certain actors gained power and were able to position themselves within policymaking structures; alternately, how other actors weakened or were sidelined from negotiations and decision making. It also traces which issues became priorities in education, and how the larger policy environment in the Government of National Unity set the scene for the development of evaluation policy in the 1990s.

3.1: Education negotiations during the transition

3.1.1: The Mandela Delegation and the Joint Working Group

In 1991 ANC President Nelson Mandela convened an Education Delegation comprising representatives of the ANC, SADTU, the NECC and other progressive political organisations, educationists, education organisations and some of the Bantustan departments of education and entered into discussions with the National Party government to address the education crisis.[164] At the same time, Mandela and others in the ANC called on students to go back to school. This call lent weight to the NECC's Back to School Campaign launched in 1990, followed in 1991 by the Intensive Learning Campaign.[165] With negotiations on the horizon, liberation movement leaders and parents alike wanted to stabilise the education system and focus on formulating new policy.

[164] Notably, there were no representatives from student groups, who had been a critical part of education activism. On the Education Delegation, see Mary Metcalfe, Mokubung Nkomo, and Ismael Vadi, "From the Mandela Delegation to the National Education Conference: Setting the Stage for Negotiations," *Perspectives in Education* 13, no. 2 (1992): 107–32.

[165] Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?," 703.

The Delegation sought to address both the immediate crisis in schools and the long-term restructuring of the system. The Delegation was concerned with urgent problems such as the delivery of textbooks, an emergency fund to address historical backlogs of classroom construction, access to resources in white schools, and more efficient administration of ongoing examinations. At a broader level, they sought to stop the government from pressing ahead with its own agenda, including the semi-privatisation of white schools, and to involve black communities meaningfully in decision-making.[166]

It was agreed to set up a Joint Working Group (JWG) made up of members from government and the Education Delegation to address immediate problems in schools as well as investigating possibilities for establishing a fully representative forum to discuss the reconstruction of education.

The JWG lasted 14 months and achieved only limited success. Negotiations deadlocked around the creation of a representative negotiating forum: the government was reluctant to concede any control or decision making powers, saying that "such a Forum will of necessity be an informal body and, as such, will not have any powers of decision-making" and that "until a new constitution comes into force, decision-making as such remains with the government and government departments". [167] The Education Delegation was unable to make recommendations which were binding on the state, and the government's team dominated the forum, as clearly reflected by the joint report produced by the JWG which was "DET-centred" and delivered very little in terms of substantive issues.

The Delegation's failure to report back to its constituents and to meaningfully engage with its NECC affiliates created suspicion that there were "secret talks" about a future education system. It also served to isolate the negotiations and minimise democratic engagement with the process. Further problems lay in allied organisations' perception that the negotiations weakened popular campaigns and deflected attention away from the government education departments to the JWG itself. The JWG provided an "escape route" to the

[166] D Pillay, "Negotiating a Way out of the Education Crisis," in *Back to Learning: The National Education Conference 1992* (Johannesburg: Sached; Ravan Press, 1992), 29–46.

[167] Metcalfe, Nkomo, and Vadi, "From the Mandela Delegation to the National Education Conference," 110–11.

DET and DNE; when challenged on policy, they consistently claimed the matters were being addressed by the JWG.[168]

At the same time, the strength of the NECC was waning. The recently-unbanned ANC, with a historically more moderate approach to educational reform, assumed political leadership over the NECC. Leading activists within the NECC became divided between building the ANC internally or keeping the momentum of the NECC going as a separate organisation. Smaller interest groups and initiatives found themselves subsumed or overshadowed by the ongoing national-level negotiations and other similar processes, such as the teacher unity talks.[169]

The People's Education movement as a whole had been in crisis as a result of state repression by harassment, arrests and other crackdowns. The NECC was no longer effectively coordinating the struggles of its diverse constituencies, and the movement was fragmenting. Government and other conservative groups also attempted to co-opt concepts of People's Education for their own agendas. Furthermore, cracks began to show in the theoretical foundations of the people's education discourse; the lack of conceptual clarity of the core concepts limited the emergence of coherent goals and strategy.[170]

At the same time a small group of policy analysts, brought together by the NECC and the ANC education sector leadership, was gaining prominence. International organisations began to support the training of certain members in the tools of central planning, rational policy and economic analysis, and budgetary analysis. But this was an approach to policy that removed the earlier focus on local participation and social relations in the classroom.[171]

---

[168] Christie, "South Africa in Transition," 53; Ismael Vadi, "Apartheid Education and Non-Racial Teacher Unionism: SADTU's Campaign for Recognition," *Perspectives in Education* 14, no. 1 (93 1992): 81–87.

[169] Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?"

[170] See Richard Levin, "People's Education and the Politics of Negotiations in South Africa," *Perspectives in Education* 12, no. 2 (1991): 1–18.

[171] Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?"; Pillay, "Negotiating a Way out of the Education Crisis."

3.1.2: Apartheid reforms

Under apartheid, policymaking was characterised by secrecy and authoritarianism. The government's approach to the policy process was hierarchical and "top-down", drawing heavily on the work of pseudoscience such as Fundamental Pedagogics. The policy process did not include consultation with stakeholders or civil society participation. The developments of the transition period led to important changes in apartheid education policy. While the apartheid state continued to pursue its own internal, unilateral reform process, it did so with the realisation that old and rigid apartheid policy formulae would no longer be effective. It aimed to modernise apartheid educational policies to make them less problematic to the opponents in the democratic movement.[172]

In 1991, the apartheid government produced two important documents on education reform: the draft *Education Renewal Strategy* (ERS) and *A Curriculum Model for Education in South Africa* (CMSA). The state also published the *Investigation into a National Training Strategy for the Republic of South Africa*, which was the product of research by the state and "employers" from business and industry.

Unlike the traditional narratives of CNE and Bantu Education, these documents framed their recommendations in the discourse of rights as used by the opposition movements, as well as in terms of human capital development. The CMSA emphasised the role of education and training in creating skills to meet the needs of the economy. The ERS recommended as fundamental principles that "race should not feature in structuring the provision of education" and that "justice in educational opportunities must be ensured".[173] They also expressed commitment to the accommodation of diversity, equal opportunity in the education system, and equal standards of education. This narrative change was a significant break with the discourse of apartheid and evidenced what Christie termed a "hegemonic rearticulation of 'race' and education".[174]

---

[172] See Cross, Mungadi, and Rouhani, "From Policy to Practice."

[173] Department of National Education, "Education Renewal Strategy: Discussion Document" (1991).

[174] See Christie, "South Africa in Transition," 49.

The ERS initiative tried to involve a wider range of stakeholders in the policy development process, including National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) participants. However, although open to public contributions, attempts to involve the wider community in the ERS were not successful. It only managed to involve the private sector and not the wider education sector, especially the progressive education sector.[175] These proposed reforms provoked strong criticism from progressive academics and policy analysts as well as education activists. Progressive education organisations regarded the ERS and CMSA as an illegitimate policy exercise by the apartheid regime: a unilateral move to restructure education without democratic consultation, meant to protect white schools and certain aspects of apartheid education.[176]

3.1.3: The National Education Conference

As an attempt to break the deadlock caused by the failure of mass action and negotiations to resolve the education crisis, the Education Delegation convened a National Education Conference (NEC) in March 1992 at Broederstroom.[177] The conference was attended by political, teacher, student and educational organisations. The objectives of the conference were to: develop "broad principles, norms and values that should underpin a future education system"; develop "joint strategies and campaigns to address the education crisis"; and create "mechanisms for constructing a new education system and for dealing with education in the transition period".[178]

The NEC considered itself successful in "achieving unity across the political and ideological divide"; there was "substantive agreement" around the principles and values needed to underlie a new education system.[179] The conference agreed to engage the state and business on a range of issues, particularly on education service delivery, but that negotiations should be accompanied by complementary strategies of mass action and media

---

[175] Cross, Mungadi, and Rouhani, "From Policy to Practice"; National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), *Framework Report and Final Report Summaries* (Cape Town; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[176] See Badat, "Democratising Education Policy Research for Social Transformation"; Christie, "South Africa in Transition."

[177] For more on the JWG and the National Education Conference see Back to Learning: The National Education Conference 1992 (Johannesburg : Braamfontein: Sached ; Ravan Press, 1992); Vadi, "SADTU's Campaign for Recognition."

[178] Ahmed Essop, "Introduction," in *Back to Learning: The National Education Conference 1992* (Johannesburg: Sached Trust; Ravan Press, 1992), 6.

[179] Human dignity, liberty and justice; democracy, equality and national development, among others.

campaigns. The major resolution of the conference was the demand for the immediate end to any unilateral restructuring of the education system by the apartheid government. The NEC further resolved to engage the state in setting up an education forum to address the education crisis.[180]

The process of setting up this forum was slow and contested. The government refused to accede to the forum or to end unilateral restructuring until early 1993, when it announced that the apartheid education system would be dismantled and replaced by a single national education system. Both sides agreed to establish a joint negotiating body but could not agree on its composition of functions – the state favoured an advisory council of experts appointed by the minister, characteristic of the state's technocratic and hierarchical approach to policymaking, while the NEC, a group intent on democratising education, favoured a representative forum of relevant stakeholders.[181]

In 1993 the government launched a revised version of the Education Renewal Strategy. The new ERS2 proposed decentralisation of power from central to regional levels as well as a larger degree of authority to the level of school governance. It emphasised "freedom of association" and the rights of "the parent community that wants to align its children's schooling with religion, culture and home language".[182] This commitment to "autogenous education" aimed to preserve the right of whites to control their own education – and for that education to be segregated at the will of communities.[183] The revised ERS also did not attempt to explain how their stated commitments to justice and quality might be realised – these principles remained only at a discursive, symbolic level: an attempt to make the policy more palatable.

The NEC had agreed to ERS2 purely as a negotiating document, but in March in government announced unilateral plans to unify the education system. This included the establishment of an Education Coordination Service to implement the plan, and the appointment of a Minister of Education

[180] Essop, "Introduction," 7.

[181] Christie, "South Africa in Transition," 54.

[182] Department of National Education, "Education Renewal Strategy 2" (1993), 17.

[183] Christie, "South Africa in Transition," 49.

Coordination.[184] The NEC viewed these steps as evidence of unilateral action and as an infringement of their January agreement, which once again led to deadlocked negotiations.

3.1.4: NEPI

Outside of negotiations with the state, the democratic movement was working independently to develop policy positions in education. The NECC commissioned the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), which was completed in 1993.[185] NEPI brought together political activists, officials of mass organisations, academics, students, teachers, policy analysts and trade unionists. Its main object was to generate policy options for a new education dispensation in South Africa. Policies were analysed in terms of their values, objectives and conceptual coherence. NEPI was the first major attempt at a new conceptualisation of the education system in the 1990s. The reports provided a base for policy research during this period, and the NEPI process itself was vital in developing local capacity for policy research and analysis.[186]

The NEPI project, committed to many of the principles of People's Education, provided a useful counter-example to the technocratically developed reform proposals of the apartheid state. NEPI argued for a centralised education department to balance the objectives of equality, redress and social justice as well as a democratic, responsive bureaucracy with participatory and consultative structures with civil society. This included the empowerment of communities and individuals through equal opportunity in education, a new curriculum and ethos, and greater involvement in the governance of education and the formulation of education policy.

However, NEPI came under intense criticism for being idealistic and naïve. The documents did not engage with issues of implementation in any meaningful way; they also could not anticipate and plan for the realities

[184] Christie, 49.

[185] National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), *NEPI Framework Report*, 1993.

[186] Saleem Badat, "Educational Politics in the Transition Period," *Comparative Education* 31, no. 2 (June 1, 1995): 152, https://doi.org/10.1080/03050069529083.

of the negotiated settlement of the education bureaucracy under the government of national unity. What eventually became ANC education policy was significantly different to the initial NEPI recommendations.[187]

After the establishment of NEPI, the ANC constituted an independent policy-research agency, the Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD) in 1993. CEPD was conceived as an autonomous institution, providing policy support to the ANC. CEPD developed the ANC's *Implementation Plan for Education and Training* (IPET). This plan was an attempt to translate the NEPI's options into an action plan so as to provide more realistic policies after apartheid. However, much like NEPI, the IPET also could not effectively develop plans outside of the conditions of education departments such as would exist after political negotiations.[188]

3.1.5: The NETF

Contested negotiations between the state, the ANC and other education stakeholders continued as the crisis intensified, backgrounded by mass action by SADTU and militant demonstrations by students. On 7 August 1993, the promised consultative forum was finally launched as the National Education and Training Forum (NTEF). The mission of the NETF was to initiate, develop and participate in a process involving education and training stakeholders in order to arrive at and establish agreements on the resolution of crises in education; the restructuring of education for a democratic South Africa; and the formulation of policy frameworks for the long-term restructuring of the education and training system which are linked to the human, social and economic development needs of South Africa. The NETF specifically aimed to address crisis issues in education, to reach agreement on a restructured education system and to build agreement on "core values and policy frameworks for a future system".[189]

It appeared that the NEC had achieved its representative forum – the NETF was comprised of around 80 representatives of stakeholders including the central government, the NEC, business, all the Bantustans, the

---

[187] Francine de Clercq, "Policy Intervention and Power Shifts: An Evaluation of South Africa's Education Restructuring Policies," *Journal of Education Policy* 12, no. 3 (May 1, 1997): 127–46, https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093970120302.

[188] Jonathan D. Jansen, "The Race for Education Policy after Apartheid," in Implementing Education Policies: The South African Experience, ed. Jonathan D. Jansen and Yusuf Sayed (Cape Town : Johannesburg: UCT Press ; [Distributed by] Thorold's Africana Books, 2001), 12–24.

[189] National Education and Training Forum (NETF), "NETF Founding Agreement," 1993, 2.

training sector, universities, parent and church organisations, and civil society organisations. But the NETF came to be dominated by representatives whose "history and allegiance did not lie in the democratic movement"; only 12 of 80 representatives were drawn from constituencies linked to the democratic movement.[190] The ANC did not bring strong political representation into the NETF (for example Mary Metcalfe, the ANC's prominent PWV education organiser at the time, asked Sue Reece of NAPTOSA to represent the NEC in the NETF).[191] Chisholm and Fuller wrote that the NETF "was almost exclusively concerned with 'macro-systems' issues and signalling that its members could engage in liberal-modern forms of policy analysis … This served to critically weaken and emasculate the radical content of the NEC's broader education agenda."[192]

The NETF, with its overrepresentation of (apartheid) state and business stakeholders, was unable to connect with the progressive interests embodied by the NEC. Its bureaucratic mode of operation also ensured that students, teachers, workers, parents and others had little active part in the proceedings. The NETF was soon dominated by the interests of labour, business and government.[193]

Business and labour (represented by COSATU) had been negotiating on issues of training since 1991, through the National Training Board (NTB). Among the competing policy initiatives underway in expectation of a change of government, it was the NTB's National Training Strategy Initiative (NTSI) which formulated the idea of an "integrated system of education and training".

The origins of this integrated system lie in the unions' concerns about the quality and accessibility of black education, the racist job reservation system, and concerns from both industry and the apartheid state about low levels of skills in the workforce and labour market. Labour and business, within the NTB, borrowed ideas about competency-based education from Australia and about qualifications frameworks from New Zealand, and reached the conclusion that a national framework of learning outcomes, compiled into qualifications and part qualifications, would address both sets of concerns. This would form the basis of the National

[190] Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?"

[191] Jansen, "The Race for Education Policy after Apartheid."

[192] Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?," 705.

[193] See Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?"; de Clercq, "Policy Intervention and Power Shifts."

Qualifications Framework (NQF), making the NTB arguably "the most important policy and political vehicle for charting the future education and training system" according to Jansen's account of this period.[194]

The NETF pushed forward on two major issues: the NQF, as well as curriculum reform, both of which appealed to moderates. But the NETF had no legal status and would gradually find itself dismantled under the weight of conflicting and impossible demands, without the kinds of resources to effectively intervene in the scale of inequality and disruption which had come to characterise apartheid education. Negotiations went nowhere. Severe distrust was evident among the negotiating parties. There were several events competing for the attention of many representatives of affiliate organisations, such as CODESA and the upcoming elections.

However, the NETF, its dying moments, came to define the first significant education policy action of the new government: the review and "cleansing" of apartheid's school syllabi in the latter half of 1994.[195]
The other area in which the NETF was able to make significant inroads was the NQF.[196] The NQF was introduced as a key mechanism for overhauling the racially divided and unequal apartheid education system. It had very broad support across the political spectrum and was strongly associated with the transition to democracy, being symbolic of the development of a single education system for all South Africans.

3.2: Post-apartheid policy work

The first wave of post-apartheid education policy work in the early 1990s was mainly concerned with the development of an open, democratic and equitable policy framework to restructure the education system to answer the sociopolitical demands of the oppressed majority as they had been voiced in the People's

---

[194] See Jansen, "The Race for Education Policy after Apartheid," 16.

[195] Jonathan D. Jansen, "The School Curriculum since Apartheid: Intersections of Politics and Policy in the South African Transition," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 31, no. 1 (January 1, 1999): 57–67, https://doi.org/10.1080/002202799183296; Jansen and Christie, *Changing Curriculum*.

[196] See Allais, *Selling Out Education National Qualifications Frameworks and the Neglect of Knowledge*; Rosemary Lugg, "Making Different Equal? Fractured State and Ruptured Policy: The National Qualifications Framework in South Africa," *International Journal of Educational Development* 29, no. 3 (May 1, 2009): 260–67, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2008.06.001; Roger Deacon and Ben Parker, "Positively Mystical: An Interpretation of South Africa's Outcomes-Based National Qualifications Framework," in *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, ed. Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie (Johannesburg: Juta, 1999), 59–75.

Education movement. This policy work aimed to mobilise opposition forces around "what was educationally desirable" by providing an alternative visionary policy framework which ignored the question of the feasible or "what was possible" in a post-apartheid context. But this policy work was not based on research or practice-based knowledge of South African educational dynamics and practices.[197]

In 1993, the ANC and COSATU put out a discussion document entitled *A Framework for Lifelong Learning*, which was the first conceptualisation of a new education system. It was built around objectives and values denied by apartheid — such as equality, participation, and democracy — rather than issues relating to the quality of teaching and learning. De Clercq argues that this document "remained essentially a substantive symbolic policy document with little understanding of dynamics on the ground and of implementation strategies".[198] It also borrowed heavily from the international comparative policy literature and experience, although it claimed to have adapted these ideas to South African concerns of redress and equity.[199] The development of this document was dominated by COSATU and therefore deals mostly with training, with issues of schooling and education being marginalised both conceptually and politically. [200]

A few months later, the ANC launched its own document, *A Policy Framework for Education and Training*.[201] This was the first real education policy framework formulated by the ANC. This was quickly followed by the *Reconstruction and Development Programme* (RDP), published in the run-up to the first democratic elections. The RDP was an integrated socio-economic policy framework intended to underpin the ANC's legislative agenda in government. It sought to "mobilise all our people and our country's resources toward the final eradication of apartheid and the building of a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist future."[202] An important principle of the RDP was the integration of growth, development, reconstruction and

---

[197] de Clercq, "Policy Intervention and Power Shifts," 132.

[198] de Clercq, 132.

[199] On borrowing see Chisholm, "Continuity and Change in Education Policy Research and Borrowing in South Africa"; Carol Anne Spreen, "Appropriating Borrowed Policies: Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa," *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending*, 2004, 101–113.

[200] Jansen, "The Race for Education Policy after Apartheid."

[201] African National Congress (ANC), *A Policy Framework for Education and Training*.

[202] African National Congress (ANC), "The Reconstruction and Development Programme: A Policy Framework" (ANC Website, March 1, 1994), http://www.anc.org.za/content/reconstruction-and-development-programme-preface.

redistribution into a unified programme, which challenged the orthodox belief that growth should precede development.

The RDP sections on education and the *Policy Framework for Education and Training* are virtually identical. They identify in their problem statements a racially fragmented system "saturated with the racist and sexist ideology and educational doctrines of apartheid"; unequal access to education and training at all levels; and a lack of democratic control within the education and training system. The policy promised a massive expansion and qualitative improvement in the education system in order to address these problems. Schooling would be free and compulsory for at least nine years. Education and training were considered vital in the broader scheme of socio-economic development and the "human resources" needed in the economy.

The education system envisioned in these documents was explicitly dedicated to the principles of "democracy, non-racism, non-sexism, equity and redress".[203] They contain many commitments in line with the discourse of People's Education, such as a focus on rights, democratised school governance, transformation of curriculum and equity of provision within the system.

This new system of education aimed to simultaneously address development and equity objectives – an idealistic approach that was largely un-problematised. It also failed to sufficiently address questions of implementation, on the grounds that the new government would have to formulate implementation plans after the elections:

> We believe it is realistic and attainable, but we do not present detailed proposals for implementation. The document is not a plan, though a plan is required and one will be prepared once the policy framework has been agreed and adopted... The present circumstances in our country make it difficult to propose detailed implementation procedures with confidence, or to judge what pre-conditions are likely to be required for successfully translating policy ideas into reality.[204]

As ANC policymakers assumed that the question of implementation was not an essential part of the policy formulation process, its framework for change was not based on an appropriate understanding of

[203] African National Congress (ANC), 3.3.3.

[204] African National Congress (ANC), *A Policy Framework for Education and Training.*

educational realities and problems.[205] CEPD was commissioned to develop broad implementation plans for each of the education sectors identified in the Policy Framework. The 1994 *Implementation Plan for Education and Training* (IPET) was the result, and was also not informed by grounded in research-based knowledge of how the South African system of educational governance worked on the ground.[206]

These documents were all symbolic in nature, outlining the ANC's commitment to various positions and principles, but did not engage in questions of implementation and capacity. The tensions between the symbolic nature of these policies and the contextual constraints at the implementation level have proved difficult to deal with; subsequent policy developments show a significant shift from these initial policy frameworks.

Some have criticised the NEPI and ANC policy work for failing to empower or build capacity at the grass-roots level and for departing substantially from the radical demands of the People's Education movement. They have argued that the emphasis on education as a means of empowering social groups and democratising power relations had given way, in the ANC Framework document, to a discourse that emphasises performance, outcomes, cost-effectiveness and economic competitiveness. They blame this change of policy emphasis on a shift in the balance of social forces and the emergence of different educational organisations during the transition period.[207]

After the ANC was elected into government, their policies on education often differed from the ideas contained in the Yellow Book and contemporary documents. The fact that the transition involved negotiated change rather than a radical rupture with the past had important consequences for educational policy. As noted by Kader Asmal, the second minister of education, and Wilmot James, former dean of humanities at the University of Cape Town, "One consequence of a negotiated change is that reforms must proceed with inherited assets and liabilities. The de-racialisation of schooling had to be evolutionary, and every positive step toward this end required an act of political will."[208]

---

[205] de Clercq, "Policy Intervention and Power Shifts."

[206] de Clercq; Jansen, "The Race for Education Policy after Apartheid."

[207] Chisholm and Fuller, "Remember People's Education?"

[208] Fiske and Ladd, *Elusive Equity*, 65.

3.3: SADTU

Soon after its formation in 1990, SADTU had the largest teachers' membership in the country: SADTU members accounted for one-third of the profession.[209] Its highest priorities included formal recognition, redress and equity, ending unfair appraisal and evaluation, and the establishment of collective bargaining procedures.

SADTU's policy vision was rooted in the principles of People's Education and emphasised questions of curriculum, methodology, language policy, system and structure of schooling, resources and evaluation of teachers and students. It was committed to redress and the redistribution of resources, and was unequivocally against private schools. SADTU called for 13 years of free and compulsory education (more than the ANC's 10). It saw the state as bearing primary responsibility for financing and providing education and proposed major increases in the education budget (contrary to the NEPI and ANC recommendations).

At their Second National Congress in 1993, SADTU showed its commitment to its position in policy debates:

> The visionary nature of many of the resolutions must not be confused with idealism. As a body of professional educators, we have stated our vision. If others say we are unrealistic, let them state their case. We will listen, and may compromise out vision is they can convince us of other priorities and constraints. But we must first put our vision up front, and never lose sight of those goals.[210]

SADTU was closely linked to COSATU and the ANC, although the question of whether it would formally align itself to those bodies was unresolved for quite some time. As the likelihood of negotiations leading to a democratic election increased, SADTU's agitation receded considerably. SADTU's focus shifted towards making a decision on its future political stance. The question was whether to join COSATU and the ANC. In a discussion document, its NEC noted:

---

[209] SADTU, "National Council Meeting 3/4/5 November 1994," 1994, SADTU Collection, AH3389, M4.14, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand. . One third of teachers were members of conservative professional organisations, and the last third were unaffiliated.

[210] SADTU, "Minutes of the Second National Congress of SADTU Held on 5-7 July 1993 in Johannesburg" (1993), SADTU Collection, AH3389:M3.6, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

> Affiliation to COSATU takes us squarely into the tripartite alliance. It is time for this union to say that it supports the ANC in this election and to commit our resources and influence to achieving a landslide victory for the ANC in the April elections.[211]

After further deliberation and intensive lobbying of SADTU members, SADTU's National General Council resolved to apply for membership to COSATU. It also affirmed its commitment to contribute resources to an ANC victory. SADTU also resolved to deploy some leaders to the ANC national election list. SADTU was consequently well-positioned for negotiations on education policy after an ANC win.

SADTU was also a member of the ANC Education Alliance. After the ANC's election into government, SADTU members secured key positions in the new Department of Education, the Education Labour Relations Council and the South African Council for Educators. Reg Brijraj, the chief executive officer of SACE, and Dhaya Govender, the CEO of the ELRC, are former SADTU officials. Thami Mseleku, a former SADTU vice-president, was appointed as political advisor to Education Minister Sibusiso Bhengu in 1994, and later held the position of director-general in the Department of Education (DoE). SADTU leaders Shephard Mdladlana, Randall van den Heever and Ismail Vadi also served as ANC MPs on parliament's Portfolio Committee on Education.[212]

Duncan Hindle, a former SADTU president and also former director-general in the DoE, left little doubt about the strategic importance that an ANC government held for the union:

> We've put our own people in Parliament, in the Department, it's our Minister, our Thami [Mseleku] is advising the Minister ... there was a degree of confidence stemming from the realization that we've finally elected a democratic government, we've got people in Parliament, in the bureaucracies, and so on ... we knew that our government had our particular view on the issues ...[213]

As important as an ANC was for SADTU, the converse was also true – SADTU became an important partner to the ANC, and SADTU teachers were powerful political, cultural and economic group. SADTU was one of the largest unions within COSATU, and many COSATU leaders came from the teacher union itself. Teachers

---

[211] Quoted in Granville Whittle, "The Role of the South African Democratic Teachers Union in the Process of Teacher Rationalization in the Western Cape, 1990 and 2001" (PhD Thesis, University of Pretoria, 2007), 103.

[212] Cameron and Naidoo, "When a 'Ruling Alliance' and Public Sector Governance Meet."

[213] Interview with Govender, "Teacher Unions' Participation in Policy Making."

were also a relatively affluent and well-educated constituency, and were influential within the ANC as well as civil society. Former SADTU leaders were deployed to government, parliament, and the education bureaucracy itself. Unsurprisingly, the union exerted a strong influence on education policy and was a powerful force within the Tripartite Alliance.

3.3.1: SADTU and Recognition

One of the resolutions of SADTU's inaugural rally was "to immediately get recognition from the Minister of National Education as the only teachers' union representing teachers on a non-racial, national basis."[214] SADTU believed that recognition should run together with the process of implementing a single education department and a collective bargaining mechanism for teachers, two of its top priorities.

The issue of recognition was crucial. Firstly, recognition meant that SADTU would be able to legally negotiate for improved salaries and conditions of service for its members. Secondly, it would enable the union to negotiate procedures for grievance arbitration and dispute resolution. Thirdly, it would allow the union to gain stop order facilities, which was critical to facilitate the collection of members' subscriptions for the union's financial stability. Fourthly, without recognition, SADTU was unable to defend its members from intimidation and victimisation by the education authorities and apartheid state. Lastly, recognition would enable SADTU to access information about educational matters and policy processes – without which they would be significantly disadvantaged in negotiations during this period of transition.

Existing legislation precluded the possibility of recognising teacher unions with full collective bargaining rights; the various education acts recognised only professional teacher associations. SADTU's struggle for recognition challenged law and traditional perceptions of teachers as 'professionals' without labour rights. Central to this struggle were two things: collective bargaining rights for teachers, and the place of unitary and non-racial teacher organisations in a divided education system.

Immediately after its launch, SADTU initiated meetings with the National Department of Education and various other departments for discussion of recognition. Over the next two years, SADTU participated in

[214] Vadi, "SADTU's Campaign for Recognition."

protracted negotiations with education departments, largely unsuccessfully. The DNE continued to delay and subjected SADTU to further bureaucratic frustration. Eventually, SADTU sought a meeting with President de Klerk, and when their request was denied, it declared a national day of teacher's action to protest the government's refusal to recognise it. SADTU declared:

> It appears as if the government is deliberately delaying the process of recognition at national level. This is not in the interest of resolving the crisis in education, as no meaningful mechanism exists between our members and the education departments to resolve the education conflicts. SADTU branches must discuss the question of recognition and make recommendations on mass action.[215]

This frustration was exacerbated by the fact that de Klerk had agreed to meet with NAPTOSA. General Secretary van den Heever said at the time: "We experience this latest response as adding insult to injury and can only view it as a form of bias in favour of the retention of racially based teacher associations, and a rejection of the concept of unitary, non-racial teachers' unions."[216]

The first year of negotiations yielded no results. The DNE was reluctant to recognise SADTU for various reasons. Formal recognition would legitimate the teacher union, which would likely increase SADTU's membership and strengthen its positions. The DNE was also attempting to allow NAPTOSA, widely seen as a rival to SADTU, an opportunity to consolidate its organisation. Also significantly, the DNE had no coherent approach to dealing with the questions that were core to SADTU's position.

In late 1991, SADTU altered its campaign strategy. This new three-pronged approach saw the union seek interim recognition agreements with various education departments, proceed with negotiations to establish a collective bargaining mechanism for teachers, and embark on various forms of mass action to pressure authorities to recognise SADTU. SADTU organised a "National Day of Teacher Action" on 7 August 1991, during which 40 000 teachers across the country "chalked down". After this, negotiations between SADTU and the DET began in earnest, but soon deadlocked around issues related to strike action and grievance

[215] SADTU, "SADTU and Recognition" (Pamphlet, May 1991), Colin Purkey Collection A1984:C16.15., Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

[216] Vadi, "SADTU's Campaign for Recognition," 82.

resolution. Other education departments were reluctant to engage SADTU while its negotiations with the DET were ongoing.

In May 1992 SADTU called a two-day strike nationwide and threatened more militant action if the state did not accede to its demands. In addition to the question of recognition, SADTU's focus included the victimisation of SADTU members, the unilateral restructuring of education by the government, too-low salary increases for teachers, and the governments "support for sweetheart teachers organisations". This collective put the process in motion for the DET and, eventually, the DNE to formally recognise SADTU. The recognition agreement was finalised on 18 November 1992.

This struggle for recognition in the SADTU's early years was critical. The protracted recognition process served to exclude SADTU from "legitimate" negotiations in education policymaking; much of the union's policy agenda could not move forward until SADTU was formally recognised. The state's persistent refusal to recognise SADTU as a teacher association only served to concretise the union's identity as an oppositional, activist union that operated outside of and against the state.

3.3.2: SADTU before and after transition

As the first democratic elections of April 1994 edged closer, SADTU began to strategize about its relationship to the state, and about how the union would conduct itself moving forward. A discussion document framed this as a balancing act between defending and advancing sectoral interests on the one hand, and promoting broader political and national interests on the other:

> The truth is we can no longer conduct our struggle in the old way. This formulation does not mean that SADTU will denude itself of strong militant union traditions, neither should it mean that we will have a sweetheart relationship with the incoming government. ... The ANC's ascendancy to power is no substitute for struggle, neither will it bring miracles.[217]

[217] SADTU, "SADTU Before and After Transition Discussion Document: A Strategic Perspective," October 27, 1993, AH3389, South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU), Records, 1990-2013, AB52, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

The question of SADTU's relationship to the ANC was at the forefront of union strategising during the period. SADTU members and leaders were wary of co-optation by the state, and were primarily worried about failing to maintain the union's independence going forward:

> Our support for the ANC should not succumb us into a state of submissiveness. Whilst we are loyal to the ANC, in SADTU structures we should seek to advance and defend the interests of teachers within the realm of broader worker and national interests. Contradictions will certainly emerge in the course of struggle between sectoral and national interests. It therefore becomes the role of leadership to ensure that in the pursuit of broader national interest sectoral interests are not sacrificed. If the ANC led government violates on the rights of teachers, it should be challenged. Any attempt to ameliorate the hard earned gains should be met with pressure. On the other hand we should put our full weight behind the ANC led government if it promotes work, and in particular, teach interests. If we fall into the trap of trade union reformism, we shall have betrayed the interests of our members.[218]

Or, put more succinctly by a young SADTU leader: "'We must refuse to be loyal to warnings that we be careful of biting the hand that feeds us and that half a loaf is better than no bread."[219]

SADTU began to formulate different strategies for dealing with the new government within a democratic context. For example, during this period SADTU initiated training for its members on collective bargaining and negotiations, and tabled the need for a research unit within the organisation in order to ensure SADTU's positions were well researched and evidence-based.

SADTU's key issues at the time, as articulated by General Secretary Thulas Nxesi, were:

> Improved labour rights
> Building and strengthening of structures
> Membership benefits
> Education policy formulation
> Special training programmes for women teachers [220]

[218] SADTU, "National Council Meeting 3/4/5 November 1994," 5.

[219] Rensberg, "Collective Identity and Public Policy," 146.

[220] SADTU, "National Council Meeting 3/4/5 November 1994," 21.

3.3.3: Unionism and professionalism

Another critical issue on SADTU's agenda during this period was the issue of professionalism. SADTU had always rejected the distinction between "unionism" and "professionalism". SADTU confronted this debate head-on in multiple forums. SADTU's original 1990 constitution defined the objects of the union as both the advancing of "collective bargaining" rights as well as maintaining "high standards of ethical conduct and professional integrity" on behalf of its members. SADTU's first congress in 1991 was titled "Unionize for Democratic Professionalism". A 1992 SADTU *Learning Nation* piece laid out the union's stance clearly:

> In SADTU the trade union and professional aspects of our organisation and the two sides of the same coin. ... SADTU accepts professionalism as an important principle in education. SADTU however rejects the notion that fighting for the material interest of teachers is unprofessional. The SADTU president said "There are two inescapable realities about teachers. One is that they are educators and the other is that they are workers. Teachers have no option but to fight for their rights as employees and at the same time exercise the responsibilities of the profession of teaching. It would be the most misguided view that teachers by reason of their commitment to education would accept low salaries, unsatisfactory conditions of service and discriminatory practices."
>
> [...]
>
> "The conditions under which teachers work are the same conditions under which children learn. There is therefore no way in which teachers can hope to achieve their professional excellence is the conditions under which they work are not conducive. There is therefore a clear and desirable mutuality between teachers as professionals and teachers as workers."[221]

Active union work, therefore, could enhance the professional status of teachers and enable them to achieve professional excellence. SADTU's conception of "democratic professionalism" is grounded in the discourse of citizens' rights and responsibilities in a democracy. This approach to unionism and professionalism was seen as a fundamental part of the democratisation of education. SADTU aimed to change the union's own identity from one of defiance to one of leadership in transformation and to "bring back" the role of teachers in education. This shift in discourse was part of a wider strategy on the part of SADTU to become more of a professional organisation.

---

[221] "South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU): Professionalism and Unionism."

Despite the complaints of conservative teacher associations that SADTU's approach was "unprofessional", the union immediately began to implement programmes aimed at professionalising teachers and assisting in their professional development. SADTU adopted a Code of Professional Conduct at its first congress in 1991, which emphasises teachers' professional responsibilities.[222] The union also began to hold "Teachers' Schools", in which teachers came together to discuss quality teaching. A speech at one Teachers' School in 1992 declared:

> SADTU Teachers must set an Example ... As teachers we need to reclaim the dignity and nobility of our labour. We need to ensure that our experience is recognised and implemented in a new education system. We must take back from so-called "experts" our role as initiators and developers of the curriculum. ... We must refuse to turn a dead eye to sloppy classroom practice. We must reject the immoral shirking of our responsibilities. ... As the hallmark of the New Teachers' Culture let us learn to do our jobs well. It should be a condition of service that all teachers, at regular intervals, have in-service training. ... Let us ensure that we create the conditions in the classroom that make students want to come to school.[223]

A then-SADTU negotiator explained: "It was time for teachers to take responsibility for their performance, behave and be perceived as professionals as well as be supported in improving their teaching."[224] However, the membership of these unions consisted of poorly qualified (many un- or under qualified) teachers. Many teachers did not identify, embrace and/or own the vision in these teacher-related policies, which quickly pressurised, alienated and dispirited them, as we shall see in later chapters.[225]

SADTU leaders wanted to commit the DoE to a plan with meaningful development opportunities. As a former SADTU/SACE policy adviser said, "It was felt strongly that teachers should be assisted with progressive enabling policies which would redress the apartheid legacy and empower teachers… It was important to emphasize our aspirations about what teachers should be able to achieve…"[226]

---

[222] SADTU, "First National Congress (NASREC, Johannesburg, 10-12 October 1991)."

[223] "The Need for Quality Teaching: Ideas from the SADTU Teachers' School," *New Nation*, June 12, 1992, sec. Learning Nation, http://saldru.lib.msu.edu, SALDRU Clippings Collection 1975 - 2000.

[224] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 148.

[225] Everard Weber, *Educational Change in South Africa: Reflections on Local Realities, Practices and Reforms* (Sense Publishers, 2008).

[226] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 199.

Simultaneously to this drive for professionalism, SADTU pursued union work and crusaded for teachers' rights. SADTU mounted campaigns to reform collective bargaining and democratise education governance structures. SADTU also campaigned – and sometimes embarked on mass action – to improve the material conditions of its members, focusing mainly on issues of salaries and retrenchments, as well as the crucial issue of rationalisation of schools in the new dispensation.

In 1996 the government agreed to large salary increases for teachers, a major victory for SADTU. Remuneration increased sharply, in part through re-grading teachers onto a new grading system. Lower-paid teachers benefited most from the increases, with some seeing their salaries double in real terms between 1993 and 1997. Overall, personnel expenditure rose by 20% in real terms between 1995/96 and 1997/98. The deal brought acquiescence from teachers: "teachers have been relatively calm because of this agreement", commented a former SADTU official.[227]

3.4: New developments in education

3.4.1: ELRC

The struggle to secure collective bargaining rights for teachers paid off in 1993 with the passing of the Education Labour Relations Act. A formal mechanism for collective bargaining and determination of labour policies, the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC), had been instituted. The ELRC is composed of equal numbers of employer and trade union representatives, with the former representing both provincial and national departments of education. All major teacher unions, including SADTU and NAPTOSA, are represented on the ELRC.

The ELRC's mandate is:

> To maintain and promote labour peace in education
> To prevent and resolve labour disputes in education
> To promote collective bargaining and perform dispute resolution functions

[227] Jeremy Seekings, "Trade Unions, Social Policy & Class Compromise in Post-Apartheid South Africa," *Review of African Political Economy* 31, no. 100 (June 2004): 299–312, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305624042000262301.

To confer on workplace forums

To conduct research, and to promote training and build capacity in education [228]

The ELRC ensured that teacher union concerns would be articulated during the process of policy development, although the focus within the ELRC tended to give priority to the basic conditions of service of teachers as evidenced in its objectives. This created tensions between teacher unions themselves as they did not necessarily share common visions because of their own separate ideological heritage. Nevertheless, the establishment of the ELRC was significant as it marked the institutionalisation of teacher trade unionism in South Africa.

However, the mid-1990s' economic restructuring with the adoption of "neo-liberal" market-driven reforms and fiscal austerity measures made SADTU prioritise its role in education policy-making around issues of equity and redress rather than around professional development. It emphasised better working conditions and collective bargaining. It tried to widen the ELRC scope to include all policymaking revolving around teachers' working conditions.[229] Tensions soon developed within the ELRC between education departments and teacher unions, creating splits and deadlocks in deliberations. The council's structure also created distance between ELRC representatives and their constituencies, with some members not being fully aware of certain bargaining positions and signed ELRC agreements and their implications.

3.4.2: SACE

The South African Council for Educators (SACE) was established by the 1998 *Employment of Educators Act.* SACE was a professional body, made up of representatives from education departments and teacher unions, responsible for regulating the teaching profession; its mandate included the professional registration of teachers and developing a professional code of conduct, as well as norms and standards for educators. SACE's mandate did not extend to include broader education policy issues.

---

[228] ELRC, *Resolution No. 6 of 2016: Constitution* (Pretoria: Government Printer, 2016).

[229] Ronald B. Swartz, "The South African Democratic Teachers' Union, Collective Bargaining, and Education Transformation" (M.Ed. Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1994).

SACE could have been a vital actor in the development of teacher professionalism policy, but it was not successful in establishing itself as such. From its beginning, SACE confined its work to coordinating in-service education opportunities, organising workshops and producing materials to support teachers in their individual development.

SACE also responsible for the accreditation of teachers. SACE decided to register and license all teachers on the basis of their official qualifications, regardless of their quality, on pragmatic and political grounds. The accreditation of teachers for their knowledge, competences, ethics and performance in schools (which was often standard in many professional bodies) was not seen as appropriate at that time because it would have victimised, yet again, the disadvantaged black teachers who had received a poor pre-service and in-service teacher education.[230]

Education departments did not push hard for SACE to acquire the resources and leadership needed to take on the task of setting up an association to protect and advance teacher professionalism. SACE was soon caught in conflicts between unions and the departments of education, ultimately neglecting its task to work with teachers on the development of professional standards, codes, values and behaviours.[231]

SACE was, from its inception, dominated by SADTU representatives. SADTU fought to ensure that the council seats allocated to teacher organisation representatives would be divided proportionally – meaning that SADTU, the largest union by far, would have a vast majority. Critical posts within the SACE bureaucracy were also filled by ex-SADTU members. This would eventually become a point of contention between SADTU and the department of education.

3.4.3: NQF

The NQF was introduced through the first piece of educational legislation passed after the advent of democracy in South Africa. The NQF was designed as a highly comprehensive framework, covering the entire education system at all levels and in all sectors. It was also designed to forefront the role of learning outcomes,

[230] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 2014.

[231] de Clercq, 203.

based on the idea that specified learning outcomes should drive all aspects of the education system — education programmes were to be designed, taught, assessed, and evaluated against outcomes which had been nationally specified. The NQF afforded teachers a great deal of autonomy in terms of curriculum – they were free to design learning programs as long as learner outcomes were achieved.

The NQF was strongly supported across the political spectrum when it was introduced but failed to live up to the various claims made about it.[232] It has been the subject of protracted policy review since shortly after its introduction into the education system. As an outcomes-based system, it paved the way for the introduction of C2005, which is described below.

3.4.4: Curriculum development

The first phase of curriculum change in South Africa was an intense period of "cleansing" in 1994. The apartheid curriculum was stripped of its racist, sexist and otherwise ideological content, although its core content was left largely intact.

Curriculum 2005 was introduced in 1997 and revised (the *Revised National Curricular Statements* or RNCS) in 2002. C2005 borrowed heavily from curricular developments in New Zealand and the United Kingdom, thought to be "best-practice" elsewhere in the world. Guided by principles of outcomes-based education (OBE), learner-centered education and the critical outcomes of the NQF, it defined specific outcomes and standards of achievement in eight learning areas. This represented major shifts in what was to be learned in schools, emphasising competencies rather than content knowledge.

OBE (realised in the C2005 curriculum) was, for its initiators, the pedagogic route out of apartheid education. In its emphasis on results and success, on outcomes and their possibility of achievement by all, rather than on a subject-bound, content-laden curriculum, it constituted a decisive break with all that was limiting in the content and pedagogy of apartheid education. OBE and C2005 seemed to provide a broad framework for the

[232] See Allais, *Selling Out Education National Qualifications Frameworks and the Neglect of Knowledge*; Michael Young, "The Educational Implications of Introducing a NQF for Developing Countries," *Journal of Education and Work* 24, no. 3–4 (September 2011): 223–32, https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2011.584684; Lugg, "Making Different Equal?"

development of an alternative to apartheid education that was open, non-prescriptive and reliant on teachers creating their own learning programmes and learning support materials.[233]

However, C2005 quickly drew a great deal of criticism and opposition. A major critique was that "policy is being driven in the first instance by political imperatives which have little to do with the realities of classroom life" and that OBE was based on flawed assumptions about what happens inside schools, how classrooms are organised and what kinds of teachers exist within the system.[234] Many teachers and scholars critiqued the pedagogical and philosophical basis of OBE. Others still were unconvinced that it could be adequately implemented given the failings of the education bureaucracy and the complex reality of schooling post-apartheid.

The history of the curriculum debate is beyond the scope of this thesis; other scholars have covered the subject broadly and in depth.[235] What is essential to this thesis, and what is covered in this section, is the impact of the new curriculum on teachers in the new South Africa.

C2005 was lauded by most teachers upon its launch. SADTU had played a "leading role" in the policy process (in their view[236]) and felt a strong sense of ownership over the new curriculum, although teachers were not party to the decision to adopt the philosophy of OBE.[237] Teacher union representatives served on the Learning Area Committees (LACs), which were the key forums deliberating on the new subject areas. NAPTOSA claims to have played an effective participatory role in these committees, which it attributed to the huge "reservoir of persons with outstanding expertise and knowledge" from its ranks.[238]

---

[233] Chisholm, "The Politics of Curriculum Review and Revision in South Africa."

[234] Jonathan D. Jansen, "Curriculum Reform in South Africa: A Critical Analysis of Outcomes-based Education," *Cambridge Journal of Education* 28, no. 3 (November 1, 1998): 323, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764980280305.

[235] For comprehensive histories of South African curriculum development, see Jansen and Christie, *Changing Curriculum*; William F. Pinar, *Curriculum Studies in South Africa: Intellectual Histories & Present Circumstances* (Springer, 2010); Hoadley, *Pedagogy in Poverty*. Also Cross, Mungadi, and Rouhani, "From Policy to Practice."

[236] SADTU, "Curriculum Development Capacity Building Project," Research report, 2000.

[237] Jansen and Christie, *Changing Curriculum*.

[238] Govender, "Teacher Unions' Participation in Policy Making."

C2005 was seen as a transformative curriculum that would democratise much of the core work of teaching by allowing them significant professional autonomy and freedom. This was a "reverse process" – from deskilling and proletarianisation, to reskilling and professionalisation.[239] From C2005:

> Teaching will become a far more creative and innovative career. No longer will teachers and trainers just implement curricula designed by an education department. They will be able to implement many of their own programmes as long as they produce the: necessary outcomes.

Research has consistently found that teachers were very receptive to this curriculum; the C2005 Review refers to "overwhelming support for the principles of C2005".[240] However, these studies have also consistently found that teachers struggled to effectively implement C2005. The unions soon identified problems that were widely experienced by teachers, including unrealistic timeframes, the need for teacher training programmes and lack of basic infrastructure and resources. The concerns raised by teacher unions were echoed by several others. With public pressure mounting, the government instituted a review of the new curriculum in 2000. The Report of the Review Committee echoed many of the implementation problems identified by the unions and recommended strengthening human rights and social-justice aims. After further consultations and refinement, the Revised National Curriculum Statement was declared the new official curriculum policy in April 2002.

The Review Committee's report, and many other contemporary studies, identified several significant problems with C2005 and how it was adopted by teachers. The teachers imagined in the policy, even those with strong professional histories in middle-class schools, did not correspond with the de-professionalised educators teaching in most schools.[241] The demands of C2005 on teachers' skills and professionalism were considerable, and most teachers' training and experience under apartheid education did not sufficiently prepare them for these new expectations with regards to their competencies and roles:

---

[239] Ken Harley et al., "'The Real and the Ideal': Teacher Roles and Competences in South African Policy and Practice," *International Journal of Educational Development* 20, no. 4 (July 2000): 287–304, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(99)00079-6.

[240] Department of Education, "Report of the Review Committee on C2005"; SADTU, "Curriculum Development Capacity Building Project"; Department of Education, "National Evaluation and Monitoring of the Trial of Curriculum 2005 and OBE in Provincial Pilot Schools in South Africa" (Pretoria, 1997); M Kgobe and N Mbele, "A Report of the Case Studies: Transformation of the South African Schooling System" (Braamfontein: Centre for Education Policy Development, 2001).

[241] Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*.

> In particular, their authority and curricular competence were undermined to the point that they were prevented from developing an understanding of the relationship between education and the context in which knowledge and understanding are created and shared. The resultant effect was that their professional identities were distorted, leaving them without the intellectual resources to critically assess their professional practice.[242]

The vast majority of teachers were teaching in under-resourced schools that had not changed materially since the advent of democracy. C2005 proved to be "resource hungry": it required significant resources to be positively realised. Schools most historically advantaged were flourishing, while those most disadvantaged appeared to be floundering. It seemed C2005 was widening the gap between historically advantaged and disadvantaged schools.[243]

Many were concerned with opaqueness and complexity of the policy – critics argued it was confusing, contradictory, and overwhelmingly inaccessible. In one of the most prominent (and controversial) papers on OBE at the time, Jansen wrote:

> A teacher attempting to make sense of OBE will not only have to come to terms with more than fifty different concepts and labels but also keep track of the changes in meaning and priorities afforded to these different labels over time ... The only certainty about OBE and its predecessor language is that it has constantly changed meaning. This language is quite simply inaccessible ... the language of OBE and its associated structures is simply too complex and inaccessible for most teachers to give these policies meaning through their classroom practices.[244]

This was only compounded by "OBE training" that was uneven and inadequate.[245] Teachers, struggling with the new curriculum, received poor support from the provincial departments of education responsible for the implementation of national policy, who were themselves struggling with lack of resources and capacity. The

---

[242] Crain Soudien and Jean Baxen, "Outcomes-Based Education: Teacher Identity and the Politics of Participation," in *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, ed. Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie (Johannesburg: Juta, 1999), 132.

[243] Pam Christie, "OBE and Unfolding Policy Trajectories: Lessons to Be Learned," in *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, ed. Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie (Johannesburg: Juta, 1999), 279–92.

[244] Jonathan D. Jansen, "Why Outcomes-Based Education Will Fail: An Elaboration," in *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, ed. Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie (Johannesburg: Juta, 1999), 147.

[245] SADTU, "Curriculum Development Capacity Building Project."

result of this confusion was poor communication, leaving schools and teachers unaware of policy developments.[246]

Reviews found that teachers were confused about the implications of OBE for their work and identities.[247] C2005 represented a significant shift in the role of the teacher from a classroom authority figure to a "facilitator" of learning:

> Current learning institutions place the teacher in a particular role. The teacher is seen to be in a position of authority to the learner and an authority in terms of content which must be transmitted... .The teacher, as opposed to being the repository of all knowledge and wisdom, must now facilitate and mediate the educational experience... The teacher, now a facilitator of learning, will create relations between learners and facilitator which engender values based on cooperative learning... . The teaching and learning strategies which will mediate the learning are the responsibility of the teacher and must reflect the learning outcome.so[248]

C2005 required a new set of skills, knowledge and values which was foreign to most teachers who had been trained and gained most of their experience in the apartheid system. Jansen argued that when teaching and content were displaced by learning and competencies, the teacher "disappeared". C2005 took away the symbolic space, physical control (i.e. corporal punishment) and textual authority of the teacher:

> The image of teachers as facilitators led, ironically, to the systematic disempowerment of teachers working under conditions where familiar "props" were dismantled at the very time that new professional demands were being made of teachers in the classroom.[249]

The C2005 Review Committee found that teachers' understanding of C2005 was shallow, coupled a 'false clarity' around a mismatch between what teachers claimed to know and their practice.[250] This inadequate understanding of C2005, combined with critical shortcomings in the subject knowledge and skills of many

---

[246] Ken Harley, Volker Wedekind, and Volker Wedekind, "Political Change, Curriculum Change and Social Formation, 1990 to 2002," in *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, ed. Linda Chisholm (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2004), 195–220.

[247] On teacher identity see Jansen and Christie, *Changing Curriculum*; Harley et al., "'The Real and the Ideal'"; Soudien and Baxen, "Outcomes-Based Education: Teacher Identity and the Politics of Participation."

[248] Jansen, "Curriculum Reform in South Africa."

[249] Jansen, "Image-Ining Teachers."

[250] Department of Education, "Report of the Review Committee on C2005."

teachers and inadequate school resources, meant that teachers were largely ill-equipped to make effective use of C2005.

In 1999, Deacon and Parker raised the same concern:

> The kind of peaceful, loving community of reasonable people, with mutual respect for one another that would promote the technologies of pragmatism, is lacking in South Africa. The teacher with the knowledge, skills and values to be a competent outcomes-based educator is all too rare. If the ambitious path to the future that has been laid out in policy is to be achieved, there has to be a massive and radical reeducation of the hundreds of thousands of educators through whose identities, competencies, values and practices change will be mediated.[251]

SADTU responded to the Review Committee's Report with a high degree of hostility.[252] The teacher unions had not been represented on the committee, which they attributed to a growing trend of undemocratic unilateralism in the Department of Education. Although its own research and work had identified many of the same problems, the union felt that the Review Committee was unfairly blaming teachers for the failure of C2005.[253] SADTU was concerned about a perceived detraction from official OBE policy, which it continued to support staunchly, despite acknowledging that "the majority of our teaching corps is ill-equipped to effectively implement OBE in the classroom."[254] In SADTU's view, the problem was not with the curriculum, but in the government's failure to properly train and resource teachers.

The teacher roles and competences inscribed in the NQF and C2005 are incorporated in integrated into the 1998 *Norms and Standards for Educators* document. The document outlines six roles all educators are expected to play and describes the 120 competencies that teacher education programmes should aim to develop. The six roles are:

> Learning mediator
> Interpreter and designer of learning programmes
> Leader, administrator and manager

---

[251] Deacon and Parker, "Positively Mystical: An Interpretation of South Africa's Outcomes-Based National Qualifications Framework," 73.

[252] See Linda Chisholm's account: Chisholm, "The Politics of Curriculum Review and Revision in South Africa"; Linda Chisholm, "The Making of South Africa's National Curriculum Statement," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 37, no. 2 (January 1, 2005): 193–208.

[253] SADTU, "Curriculum Development Capacity Building Project."

[254] SADTU Education Desk, "SADTU Response to the Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005," 2000.

> Community, citizenship and pastoral role
> Scholar, researcher and lifelong learner
> Learning area/phase specialist

Each role is defined in terms of foundational, practical and reflexive competencies. Harley et al.'s analysis of the 1998 *Norms and Standards*, the SACE Code of Conduct and the ELRC developmental appraisal manual (detailed in the following chapter) found that these documents work together to create a coherent and consistent regulatory and developmental system for educators.[255] The documents uphold the democratic and human rights principles enshrined in the Constitution, while in other matters they provide a fair degree of flexibility and sensitivity to different contexts.

However, much like reviews of C2005, their results reflect widespread "policy/practice disjuncture" in terms of these new teacher roles: the policies did not correspond with the realities of teachers and their classrooms. The image of the teacher constructed by these policies

> corresponds more closely with historically advantaged than with historically disadvantaged schools, and that policy might compound an unequalising tendency already noted in South African education. Teachers in rural areas, being the most disadvantaged and least qualified, are most likely to engage in "survival teaching". They are also most likely to feel unrepresented and unsupported by policy and, given their relative isolation and the uncertain relations and poor communication between new national, regional and local education officials, are least likely to experience policy as an opportunity for personal and professional development, and most likely to experience it as intimidating paperwork.[256]

By failing to speak to the realities of South African teachers, policies such as the NQF, C2005 and the Norms and Standards fail to address conditions that endanger their own successful implementation – and in so doing, fail to realise the transformative agenda behind these same policies. Harley et al. warned that "the risk of resistance to change leading to tissue rejection seems so great that policy might ultimately disempower teachers", where it aimed to empower them.

---

[255] Harley et al., "'The Real and the Ideal.'"

[256] Harley et al., 291.

3.4.5: Teacher education

Much of this dissertation – and much of the appraisal policy itself – deals with the problem of teachers who received poor teacher education in the apartheid era. But what of teachers produced in the new South Africa? The post-1994 reforms of higher education were significant, but in the realm of initial teacher education the results have been unimpressive.

One of the first policy initiatives undertaken by the new government was the presentation of a White Paper on Education and Training in 1995 that highlighted the need for an audit of teacher supply, demand, utilisation and costs, and of teacher education, in order to evaluate the situation and suggest policy options.[257] The first comprehensive National Teacher Education Audit was therefore carried out in 1995, which highlighted major issues in teacher education. Teacher education institutions differed considerably in quality, although the quality was judged to be generally poor. They also differed in terms of infrastructure and facilities. The dominant college approach to teacher training was authoritarian and content centred, with little integration of theory and practice, as I discussed in chapter two. The teacher education system was not cost effective or efficient. There were many – the audit's count was 281 – disparate teacher education institutions, which had been controlled by various Departments of Education.[258]

One of the first priorities of the new government was to rationalise the fragmented teacher education system. The audit fed into the work of the National Commission on Higher Education (NCHE), which was appointed in 1995. The 1996 NCHE report recommended that colleges of education should be incorporated into universities, arguing that this would address the concerns raised in the audit and achieve gains in efficiency and equity. This underscored the constitutional provision that tertiary education is an exclusive national competence. Over the next few years, the sector was rationalised, beginning with provinces closing colleges and incorporating them into universities. [259]

---

[257] Department of Education, *White Paper on Education and Training*, Government Gazette No. 16312 (Pretoria: Government printer, 1995).

[258] Hofmeyr and Hall, "The National Teacher Education Audit."

[259] See Council on Higher Education, "Report on the National Review of Academic and Professional Programmes in Education."

This process was made a national policy in December 2000, with the Ministerial Declaration of Colleges of Education as Subdivisions of Universities and Technikons. In time, the former 102 public teacher training colleges, 20 universities and 15 technikons that offered teacher education in the early 1990s were reduced to just 23 institutions. The "closing of the teacher colleges" remains a popular scapegoat for the undersupply and poor performance of teachers in the school system.

The effects of the restructuring of the teacher education system are significant. Firstly, the reduction of teacher education institutions led to a dramatic decline in teacher production. This hurt more rural and under-resourced areas the most, as teacher education had become accessible only within universities, which were located in urban centres. Secondly, the incorporation process differed widely across universities, many of whom did not consider teacher education a high priority academic field. This situation was exacerbated by a funding formula for subsidising higher education, which did not prioritise teacher education (placing it in the lowest possible category, below social sciences and commerce).

This, combined with the downscaling of the teaching corps through the new government's rationalisation policy, created a crisis of teacher supply. Many newly qualified teachers could not find employment as posts in schools were being closed. In the teaching community itself, there was a decline in the prestige and, predictably, the attractiveness of teaching as a profession. This decline manifested itself in the significantly lower numbers of young people choosing to teach as a profession, with real consequences for institutions' enrolments. [260]

Quality in teacher education programmes continues to differ widely across institutions, leaving some newly qualified teachers less prepared than others and reproducing pervasive geographic, race and class inequalities in education provision. The Initial Teacher Education Research Project (ITREP) found that teacher education programmes "lack a strong underlying logic and coherence" and vary widely in their quality and focus on content knowledge and teaching practice.[261]

[260] Council on Higher Education.

[261] "The Initial Teacher Education Research Project: Final Report" (JET Education Services, 2014).

It is important to remember that the school system and teacher education feed into one another. Initial teacher education is particularly important in bridging the gap between generally poorly prepared matriculants exiting the school system and newly qualified teachers embarking on a career of teaching. It is the point at which the "cycle of mediocrity" – where school leavers who were themselves poorly taught are returned to the schools as poorly prepared teachers – can be broken. While there are pockets of excellence in teacher education, the research tells us that no institution is rising fully to the challenge posed by our low-quality school system.

3.5: Conclusion

The policymaking environment at the start of the new democracy in South Africa was highly consultative and democratic. Teacher unions played a strong role in the development of new education policy. SADTU, as the largest union, as well as an important member of COSATU and the Tripartite Alliance, was well positioned to influence education policy at this stage. However, at the same time, grassroots education movements and activists lost momentum and power and were sidelined in the policymaking progress. SADTU, other teacher unions such as NAPTOSA, and the education departments became the primary actors in policy negotiations.

Several new policies were important to teachers and for the teaching profession. The establishment of the ELRC institutionalised collective bargaining and labour rights for teachers, as well as ensuring a level of participation in policymaking. SACE was established to manage the professional aspects of teaching. And a new qualifications framework and curriculum attempted to transform the very nature of teaching in South Africa dramatically.

From the 1990s there was a wide-spread understanding, particularly amongst policy-makers and driven by the "professional unionism" espoused by SADTU, that teachers in South Africa were both *workers* and *professionals*. The eventually negotiated phrasing of this new role came to settle upon the term "educator".

Educators were charged with a number of new, important roles, and envisioned as playing a fundamentally transformative role in the new democracy. Carrim, writing in 2001, analysed the political importance, and real disadvantages, of the imagined "educator":

> South African teachers are positioned as "educators" bearing professional and worker characteristics, noted as being affected by "race", gender and ability and expected to be important agents in the reproduction of democracy in South Africa. This shift from "teacher" to "educator" is important for several reasons. Not only does it reduce the bipolarities between teachers as professionals and workers, but it allows for teachers to be viewed as being more than professionals and workers. At the same time, "the educator" also lays the basis for overcoming the separations among South African teachers under apartheid. However ... the notion of "the educator" continues to homogenise teachers and teaching and is unable to analytically address the specific realities experienced by teachers or the complexities of their identities.[262]

The early policies of the new South African education system generally fell into this trap of homogenisation. While policy texts acknowledge and claim to address the complex realities in which teachers work, they lack the specificities of what it would mean to realise such policies under the particular and different contexts created by the apartheid system. These policies did not correspond within the realities of teaching in South Africa and did not contain the necessary conditions for changing those realities.

Ambitious and idealistic policies such as C2005 were politically and popularly well-received but ultimately failed to achieve their aims. Some teachers and some schools were able to perform well – mostly well-resourced, middle- and upper-class schools – but for most teachers, these policies were confusing, demanding and often overwhelming. Without the requisite administrative and developmental support from the state, they were unequipped to fulfil the ambitious roles set out for them in new education policy.

This is not to say that nothing changed; many positive changes have indeed occurred in South African schooling. But the dire education crisis we find ourselves in today surely has its roots in the failure of these early policies to transform and develop South African teachers effectively.

This chapter described the process of institution making and unmaking in the uncertain and unstable context of negotiation and contestation between the anti-apartheid organisations and movements and the apartheid

[262] Carrim, "From Teachers to Educators."

government during the years of transition. It traced the rise and decline of various negotiating forums and policy institutions during this period, and the way more radical and grassroots perspectives were slowly replaced by more moderate, expert and political concerns.

The education priorities that emerged during this period did not take account of the realities of the South African classroom and the kind of teaching body that had been forged by apartheid. The first major policies imagined a body of teachers that bore little resemblance to the de-professionalised teachers in most schools. Policy language and concepts were opaque and inaccessible, the training provided was inadequate and the roles teachers were expected to fill were dramatically changed and expanded. If anything, despite the vision of transforming apartheid education, these early policies widened the gap between the high performing formerly white schools, and the underperforming black schools.

The centralisation of policymaking during this period, which confined much education policymaking to bargaining between SADTU and the education department at a national level, shaped the way subsequent teacher evaluation policies were formulated and developed, as we shall see in the following chapters.

Chapter 4: The Developmental Appraisal System

In the early 1990s, faced with the real possibility of a new democratic dispensation, teacher unions and education activists began to shift their attention from defiance of apartheid education to more concrete proposals for educational change. One of the areas in which teachers played a substantial policymaking role was in the development of new forms of teacher appraisal.

As discussed in the previous chapter, teachers' widespread rejection of appraisal, inspection and other forms of state authority within schools had become the norm. In most schools, there was no longer any appraisal or evaluation taking place, let alone professional teacher development. However, teachers were not rejecting appraisal in principle; in fact, "the majority of teachers want[ed] appraisal to be an essential part of their professional development – not a mechanism for enforcing state control".[263]

Teachers were looking for an appraisal system that was enabling, that allowed for self-reflection, and that formed an integral part of teaching, unlike the apartheid system in which "the hierarchical tendencies inherent in the prescribed top-down approaches constrain[ed] self-development, collaborative discourses and self-reflection".[264] Furthermore, teachers who were involved in the progressive education movement – the majority of them under the SADTU banner – were looking for a system of evaluation that was democratic, transformative, and that had the potential to redress some of the injustices of apartheid education.

Thus, educators were demanding a uniform, national system of appraisal which was open and equitable, school-based, and which was focused on their professional development, and consequently on the improvement of the quality of schooling and the restoration of a culture of teaching and learning, especially in the most disadvantaged schools.[265]

---

[263] Chetty et al., "Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa."

[264] E. M. Jantjes, "Performance Based Teacher Appraisal: From Judgement to Development," *South African Journal of Education* 16, no. 1 (1996): 50.

[265] Michael Thurlow and Shamella Ramnarain, "Transforming Educator Appraisal in South Africa," in *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance: A Comparative Approach*, ed. David Middlewood and Carol E. M. Cardno (Psychology Press, 2001), 94.

What they demanded, they initiated. Teacher unions began to develop ideas of what a new appraisal system could be in the early 1990s, a process which led to the establishment of the first educator evaluation policy in the new South Africa: the 1998 Developmental Appraisal System (DAS).

This chapter will describe in depth the policy formation process that created DAS, situating it in its policy and socio-historic context. It will then analyse the policy itself, based on a reading of the policy documents as well as the implementation of the system. This chapter will then analyse the impact of DAS on teachers (most represented by SADTU) and their employers (the state), as well as the impact of DAS on the relationship between the two actors. Lastly, this chapter explains why DAS failed to take hold in classrooms or to produce the professional development it sought to achieve.

4.1: Towards DAS: Policy Formation and Negotiation

Appraisal had been a high priority on SADTU's agenda since the union's formation in 1990. SADTU's massive Defiance Campaign in the early 1990s, as detailed above, brought what remained of the apartheid appraisal system to a complete stop. In the context of the national negotiated transition, "the Union leadership felt the need to be proactive in developing alternative practices in schools which would have a bearing on restoring a culture of learning and teaching".[266] So in 1992 SADTU approached the Education Policy Unit (EPU) of the University of the Witwatersrand to assist in developing alternative educator appraisal practices.

A more concrete approach to the evaluation question was tabled at SADTU's second national congress in 1993. The organisation acknowledged that it did not have "a clearly worked out alternative method of teacher evaluation," but that "quick fix solutions are not desirable".[267] SADTU affirmed that:

> Evaluation/appraisal is not separate from the broader system which needs to be restructured.
> The principles which govern a new system of education should guide the process of evaluation/appraisal, and should include:
> That the process is as important as the product

[266] Mokgalane et al., *National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report*, 1.

[267] SADTU, "Minutes of the Second National Congress."

> That the process be a negotiated one
> That the process be based upon a relationship of equality between appraisers and appraisees
> That the process be oriented towards development rather than judgment
> That the process and instruments take into account contextual factors
> That the process be nationally instituted
> That the process be open and transparent
> That evaluators be trained and empowered to do their job
> That there be effective feedback and accessibility to records to the appraisee.[268]

Among other administrative resolutions, SADTU resolved:

> That there be joint planning, control and ownership of the process of teacher evaluation/appraisal
> To link teacher evaluation/appraisal to issues such as conditions of service, school governance, etc. and to deal with immediate issues through the DNE [Department of National Education], while putting the broader issues on the agenda of the NETF
> To produce interim guidelines on appraisal for distribution to membership.
> To prepare in whatever way necessary for the discussion with the DNE on interim guidelines and long term restructuring of the system of evaluation/appraisal.
> To declare a moratorium on evaluation/appraisal pending the outcome of the ongoing negotiations
> The broad principle and guidelines prepared by the EPU be used as a basis for developing an alternative system for evaluation/appraisal [269]

SADTU's initial priorities for a post-apartheid appraisal system mostly centred on fairness and transparency, and on ensuring the process would not be abused as the apartheid inspectorate had been. Another major issue in early SADTU discussions and agendas was the acknowledgement of contextual factors that affected teachers' work: working conditions, school governance, access to resources, class sizes, and so on.

SADTU at the time aimed to change the union's own identity from one of defiance to one of leadership in transformation. This shift in discourse was part of a wider strategy on the part of SADTU to become more of a professional organisation.[270] Simultaneously, it sought to bring about the return of the teacher and teacher

[268] SADTU, 17–18.

[269] SADTU, 18.

[270] Govender, "Teacher Unions, Policy Struggles and Educational Change, 1994 to 2004."

organisations as principal actors in deciding professional issues.[271] As a former SADTU and SACE policy adviser said, "it was felt strongly that teachers should be assisted with progressive enabling policies which would redress the apartheid legacy and empower teachers […] It was important to emphasize our aspirations about what teachers should be able to achieve."[272] This exploration of appraisal policy – and imagining what a democratic, teacher-oriented appraisal process could be – was a critical part of this shift in dynamics.

Both SADTU and the EPU believed that the process needed to be teacher-based and participatory. Between 1993 and the 1994 election, a SADTU negotiating team and an EPU research team met regularly to coordinate a process whereby research conducted by the EPU together with information generated by a series of regional workshops with teachers informed national negotiations over new principles and procedures for teacher appraisal.[273] Joined by other organisations and unions, notably the second largest teacher union NAPTOSA, they participated in an ongoing process of consultation and negotiation.

By 1994, teacher unions had reached a general agreement on the guiding principles for developing a new appraisal instrument, based on early discussions between SADTU and the EPU. These principles were:

> Process is as important as product.
> The process should be negotiated.
> The process should involve peer review.
> The process should be orientated towards development rather than judgement.
> The process should take into account contextual factors.
> The process must be nationally instituted.
> The process must be democratic.
> The process must be conducted openly and not in secrecy.
> All parties involved in the evaluation should be empowered to conduct the appraisal.
> The system of educator appraisal should separate formative and summative evaluation in terms of procedures and personnel.[274]

[271] See Rensberg, "Collective Identity and Public Policy."

[272] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 196.

[273] See Chetty et al., "Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa."

[274] Mokgalane et al., *National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report*, 5.

These principles reflect the weight given to consultation and participation by teacher unions. They reflect some of the teachers' major concerns – that appraisal be transparent and context-sensitive. Perhaps most importantly, they show a decisive shift in thinking about appraisal and accountability. While the apartheid system had mostly consisted of external, bureaucratic accountability, the unions were advocating for internal, developmental and professional accountability.[275]

In the wake of the election and reorganisation of education departments, SADTU leadership felt that the appraisal project should articulate directly with new national political and educational developments.[276] So in August 1994, new ministers of education, departmental officials and representatives from teacher unions and NGOs met on the issue of appraisal. It was resolved to institute a pilot project, jointly owned by the Department of Education (DoE), SADTU and NAPTOSA. The pilot would be conducted by the EPU.

The new instrument proposed had the following features:

> acknowledgement of the significance of context in shaping teacher performance;
> self-appraisal;
> a school-level appraisal team consisting of the principal/deputy, head of department/subject head, a peer nominated by the appraisee and a subject advisor;
> the right of the appraisee to nominate the appraisal team;
> a process of open discussion and feedback between appraisee and appraisers;
> the right to appeal by an appraisee through a moderation team consisting of a subject advisor, an independent body and a representative from the appraisal team;
> a development plan.[277]

SADTU then took this discussion to the newly-formed Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). This appraisal policy was discussed by representatives of SADTU and the new national Department of Education in 1995, leading to the formation of the National Appraisal Task Team (NATT) under the auspices of the ELRC in 1996. Despite the phrase "developmental appraisal" appearing in early documents, and commitment to a developmental policy in discussions, early policy intentions for appraisal in these for a were

[275] These concepts are explained in detail in the first chapter of this thesis.

[276] Mokgalane et al., *National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report*, 1.

[277] Mokgalane et al., 3.

largely evaluative. The features of the proposed policy focused mainly on making teacher appraisal more open and fair.

When the DoE initially entered discussions with SADTU, they hoped to make inspection more acceptable to teachers. Education departments were also eager to improve the poor culture of teaching and learning existing in many schools through greater monitoring measures. Beyond measures to restore discipline and accountability among teachers, the department needed data on schools and teachers to be able to report on the school system, monitor the implementation of the curriculum and assessment reforms, and decide on how best to allocate scarce resources.[278]

This "employer idea" of making inspection more transparent and agreeable was initially presented to the DoE officials by the SADTU negotiation team.[279] However, SADTU was represented by the union's professional development team, and not the negotiation team, in the NATT. This team "found itself within a democratic dispensation and eager to get rid of the legacy of apartheid" and saw the NATT process as "an opportunity to develop an instrument that could respond to the many ills which existed in black schools, one of which was the presence of unqualified teachers".[280]

The DoE came on board with the more developmental, transformative agenda during the NATT negotiations.[281] The department saw DAS as the beginning of a monitoring process and ensured that what it considered important performance standards for teachers were included in the appraisal instrument. The chief DoE official driving the development of the policy was Duncan Hindle, a previous SADTU president who had worked on creating alternatives to the old appraisal system.[282] The resulting policy was a compromise between the DoE and the teacher unions, but one which was enthusiastically embraced. In 1996,

---

[278] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 207.

[279] See the account of M Gallie in Gallie, "The Implementation of Developmental Appraisal Systems in a Low-Functioning South African School."

[280] Gallie, 99.

[281] Gallie, "The Implementation of Developmental Appraisal Systems in a Low-Functioning South African School."

[282] Shireen Motala, "Reviewing Education Policy and Practice: Constraints and Responses," ed. Linda Chisholm, Shireen Motala, and Salim Vally, *EPU Quarterly Review of Education and Training in South Africa*, South African education policy review: 1993-2000, 5 (1998), http://repository.hsrc.ac.za/handle/20.500.11910/8185.

it was agreed by all actors to use the DAS policy as a "transformative tool unrelated to the previous inspection policy".[283]

A task team made up of experts and representatives of unions and the DoE was set up to produce a draft for the teacher development appraisal framework, and was assisted by the *Education, Training and Development Practices Project* (ETDPP) description of educators' roles and competencies.

These approaches and principles were consistent with proposals made in numerous policy documents during the transition period. The 1992 NEPI *Teacher Education Report* emphasised the importance of a strong working relationship between teacher organisations and the education authorities in developing procedures and criteria for teacher appraisal; the inclusivity of the process; peer assessment; and collegial co-operation in working towards shared goals in professional development.[284] The ANC *Policy Framework for Education and Training* also stressed the involvement of teachers in developing the new system of appraisal.[285] This document saw peer assessment, school-based appraisal, formative evaluation, and new career paths for excellent teachers, as well as new criteria for selection and promotion into the advisory service, as central to a new teacher appraisal system. The DoE's *Implementation Plan for Education and Training* (IPET) Teacher Development and Support Task Team agreed that teacher involvement and ownership, a focus on formative professional development of teachers, and ongoing whole-school strategic planning should form the basis of the development of the new teacher appraisal.[286]

The recommendations for teacher appraisal contained in NEPI, the ANC and IPET were underpinned by the principles of democracy, participation, openness, and transparency. They all strongly stressed the significance of a positive, collaborative relationship between the education authorities and teacher organisations in shaping the new teacher appraisal system. The SADTU-EPU appraisal project reflected these principles, involving teacher organisations, educational authorities and an independent academic research group. The goal of the pilot project was to ensure the continuation of this broadly participatory

[283] Gallie, "The Implementation of Developmental Appraisal Systems in a Low-Functioning South African School," 99.

[284] National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI), *Teacher Education*.

[285] African National Congress (ANC), *A Policy Framework for Education and Training*.

[286] African National Congress (ANC), "Implentation Plan for Education and Training: Summary Report of the IPET Task Teams" (Pretoria, 1994).

process and to ensure the project would be empowering for teachers. Teachers were not to be acted upon, but to conduct the project themselves, in conjunction with the education authorities.

Linda Chisholm, then director of the EPU, stated that "appraisal is not an end in itself but a means to a larger end, the democratisation and enhancement of learning and teaching in schools. The attempt to tie appraisal more narrowly to new forms of control over teachers' work is not part of our vision."[287] Teacher appraisal as articulated in this project was closely tied to the ideas of democratising and transforming education. The intent was to create a new system of appraisal radically different to that of the apartheid state. Appraisal was now about redress and transformation; something that would improve the working conditions and status of teachers.

The pilot project involved eight out of nine provinces (KwaZulu-Natal did not participate) and 93 schools and 186 un-promoted educators.[288] The pilot was limited, but its findings were judged sufficiently positive for the process to proceed. The findings showed unanimous support for the proposed appraisal system. It also concluded that the new educator appraisal system could be applied in all schools in South Africa irrespective of contextual conditions as contextual flexibility was embedded into the process. Furthermore, the pilot found that the new system had improved relationships between teachers and school management, as well as between schools and departmental offices.[289] According to the DoE: "The pilot, thus, validated empirically the nature, philosophy, processes and instrument of the new appraisal system."[290]

The findings of the pilot project were used to inform further ongoing discussions between the unions, the national DoE and provincial departments of education in the newly formed ELRC. It was agreed that the overall nature of the piloted appraisal system should remain, including the guiding principles, the nature of the appraisal process and the use of appraisal panels. Significantly, they also decided that the instrument should be developmental in nature only.[291]

---

[287] Mokgalane et al., *National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report*.

[288] Motala, "Reviewing Education Policy and Practice: Constraints and Responses."

[289] Mokgalane et al., *National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report*.

[290] ELRC, *Developmental Appraisal for Educators* (Pretoria: Government Printer, 1999).

[291] Thurlow and Ramnarain, "Transforming Educator Appraisal in South Africa."

Final agreement on the Developmental Appraisal System was reached in July 1998 and the *Development of Appraisal System*, and an accompanying manual, was produced.

4.2: The DAS Instrument

The *ELRC Resolution 4 of 1998* finalised a national system of development appraisal for all public schools, with various appraisal procedures, criteria and instruments for all educators.[292] The stated aim of DAS was to "facilitate the personal and professional development of educators in order to improve the quality of teaching practice and education management". It was based on "the fundamental principle of life-long learning and development."[293] DAS consisted of five ongoing processes: reflective practice, self-appraisal, peer appraisal, collaboration and interaction within panels.

Each school was to elect a Staff Development Team (SDT) to coordinate the appraisal process. The process would take place over the course of six months (half of a school's staff would participate in the first six months of the year; the second half would participate in the second six months). All educators would need to be trained in developmental appraisal before the system could be implemented to "ensure that the spirit of appraisal is observed in practice".[294]

Appraisal panels were to consist of the appraisee plus at least three others drawn from the following groups: peer, union representative, senior (for example, a head of department, deputy principal or principal), and outside support. Notably, these panels did not include external moderators or inspectors, and the composition of the panel had to be acceptable to the appraisee.

The appraisal instrument comprised of five forms:

1) A *Personal Details Form*, completed by the appraisee, recording personal particulars, qualifications and experience.

---

[292] ELRC, *Resolution No. 4 of 1998: Developmental Appraisal* (Pretoria: Government Printer, 1998); ELRC, *Developmental Appraisal for Educators*.

[293] ELRC, *Resolution No. 4 of 1998: Developmental Appraisal*, 3.

[294] ELRC, *Resolution No. 4 of 1998: Developmental Appraisal*.

2) A *Needs Identification and Prioritisation Form*, used to identify the specific criteria on which the appraisal was based and to record priorities for development.
3) A *Personal Growth Plan (PGP)*, completed by the appraisee. The appraisee was required to set goals for development and to determine proposals for meeting these goals within the time period, the resources needed to meet these goals and which indicators were proposed to demonstrate achievement. The content would be discussed and agreed collaboratively within a panel meeting.
4) A *Discussion Paper*, completed by the appraisee. This was meant to evaluate the extent to which the goals had been achieved, factors which may have negatively affected this, the nature of support received, and what might be needed for further improvement.
5) An *Appraisal Report*, containing prioritised criteria, identified needs, strengths of the educator, a suggested development programme, suggested development programme providers and dates for delivery. The report had to be signed by all members of the panel.

The policy instrument determined a set of core criteria upon which the evaluation was based. However, DAS tried to create flexibility in this system so that the contexts of individual educators could be taken into account. Provision was made for some of these core criteria to be made optional by an appraisal panel, if motivation for reclassification was included in the PGP form. Further additional criteria could be added depending on the needs of the school.

The policy was largely silent on the issue of evidence apart from the appraisee's self-completed forms. The official manual did recommend some form of classroom observation: two visits undertaken by a person(s) from the appraisal panel, although the nature of such observation was not detailed.

The final evaluation was a simple A/B scale for each criterion: *A* signifying "priority need for development" and *B* signifying "performance in keeping with expectation". This final evaluation was to be used only for developmental purposes – the DAS was explicitly not meant to be used to decide on issues such as pay and promotion.

This system (theoretically) ensured that teachers would be appraised based on reasonable criteria that suited their contexts. It also made sure that the system would be democratic, and that teachers would be able to take ownership of the process. Most importantly, DAS was meant to be solely developmental in nature. Instead

of judging and punishing teachers, it would help teachers identify their strengths and weaknesses, set goals for improvement, and formulate realistic plans to achieve those goals with the support of the school and the department.

4.3: Implementation of DAS

Despite the ambition of the education department and teacher unions, DAS was not as effective or as transformative as was hoped. Progress reports developed by the national and provincial departments of education identified significant problems with the implementation process and the operation of DAS.[295]

These implementation problems were evident from the very beginning. The pilot project, as mentioned above, was very limited both in terms of scope and scale. Furthermore, the methodology, findings and recommendations of that pilot project were never independently evaluated. More concerning is that the pilot project only included unpromoted (entry-level) educators, yet the final policy applies to all levels of educator and senior school staff.[296]

A number of problems stemmed directly from the policy documents themselves. The DAS was found to be over-complicated and inaccessible, to the extent that it could not be understood by those who were responsible for different parts of the process. DAS was also isolated from other related policies, such as C2005 and the later Whole School Evaluation – creating duplications of functions as well as confusion and policy overload for many of the actors involved. [297]

The model of training for DAS has also been heavily criticised. The "cascade model" was ineffective and created delays and complications. Further problems included the lack of resources to purchase or access training material and the lack of a training pool from which trainers could be drawn. This meant that those

---

[295] See K.M. Mathula, "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice" (Fifth Annual Educationally Speaking Conference, Birchwood Hotel and Conference Center, Boksburg, 2004).

[296] Thurlow and Ramnarain, "Transforming Educator Appraisal in South Africa."

[297] Mathula, "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice"; Amanda Joy Barnes, "Policy at the Chalk Face: A Case Study of the Implementation of the Developmental Appraisal System in a Primary School" (PhD Thesis (Education), University of Cape Town, 2003), https://open.uct.ac.za/handle/11427/6912; Gallie, "The Implementation of Developmental Appraisal Systems in a Low-Functioning South African School."

responsible for the implementation of DAS at school level were often untrained and did not understand the system, and there was little support to be found from the education departments at any level. As the system was so radically different from the apartheid era evaluation process, this stymied the implementation process significantly.[298]

Another problem with the DAS was the highly concentrated time period prescribed by the appraisal instrument. DAS was meant to be completed within six-month-long cycles. Evidence from other countries suggests that even a cycle of one year (with one appraisee to one appraiser) is difficult to sustain.[299] DAS, with a panel of at least four appraisers to every educator in the school, placed a significant administrative burden on schools, adding to an already highly increased bureaucratic workload.[300] Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that high-quality appraisal and professional development can happen in such a concentrated time period.

Operational challenges also plagued the implementation of DAS. Competing priorities of the department(s) drew attention away from DAS implementation; DAS was often the first project to be abandoned when priorities needed to be balanced. Other problems included lack of human resource capacity, dormant appraisal structures which were set up according to policy but not operationalised, and insufficient lines of accountability within the bureaucracy between different levels of government. Another problem was the lack of an incentive structure for DAS implementation at school level – DAS was a cumbersome administrative system that required new work and the development of new skills and procedures for often already overworked schools.

Significant problems also included what the education department termed "attitude constraints".[301] DAS reviews found persistent "myths and inaccurate perceptions" held by educators. Educators understood DAS as being a performance management and accountability mechanism, not a developmental tool. Educators were afraid of victimisation and did not perceive a significant difference between the new system and the

[298] Mathula, "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice"; Thurlow and Ramnarain, "Transforming Educator Appraisal in South Africa."

[299] Thurlow and Ramnarain, "Transforming Educator Appraisal in South Africa," 106.

[300] See Chisholm et al., "Educator Workload in South Africa."

[301] Mathula, "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice," 9.

much-hated apartheid era process. This was compounded by weak advocacy on the part of the DoE – insufficient steps were taken to promote DAS and to dispel myths and misunderstandings.

Teachers also complained that the DoE did not provide access to genuine development support and professional development opportunities. The criticism that the department of education did not provide any real means for teachers to improve, and that therefore the appraisal process was not fulfilling its developmental purpose, would play a major role in teacher evaluation discussions for years to come.

By the time the Whole-School Evaluation policy was being proposed in 2000, implementation of DAS had been slow and halting. In many places, DAS had simply not been implemented. The Department of Education later judged that DAS (both the policy and the implementation plan) had been unrealistic and over-ambitious. Overall, there was little to no evidence that DAS was achieving any of its stated goals, either in terms of evaluating teacher performance or in terms of supporting teachers' professional development.[302]

Very few departmental policy reviews have interrogated the DAS policy itself beyond the implementation process, or the inaccessibility of the policy documents. The problems experienced in the system were mostly attributed to a failure of policy implementation.[303]

Likewise, the attitude of teachers – mistrustful and defensive – as an obstacle has been attributed to "poor advocacy and communication" by the department. In fact, policy reviews have overwhelmingly interpreted this issue as teachers "misunderstanding" the purpose of DAS, or have blamed teachers for having "victim mindsets" ("[…] reactive mindsets that inhibit personal development, among educators, existed as opposed to those of ownership and proactive development").[304] Neither the DAS policy nor the later policy reviews sufficiently addresses the ways in which apartheid education impacted on the profession, despite acknowledging the need for fundamental changes in teacher competencies and attitudes, as well as in school cultures and organisation. This will be explored in more depth below.

---

[302] Mathula, "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice"; Department of Education, "The National Synopsis" (Pretoria: Government Printer, June 1999); Department of Education, "Review Workshop Report" (Pretoria: Government Printer, May 2000).

[303] Mathula, "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice."

[304] Mathula, 9.

SADTU's analysis of the failures of DAS has been in the same vein as the departmental reviews. SADTU has consistently supported DAS in principle while blaming the department of education for failing to properly implement and prioritise the system.[305] They have subsequently argued against the introduction of any new evaluation processes as it viewed DAS as sufficient, only lacking support from the department. They have also heavily criticised the DoE for failing to provide real opportunities for professional development; if teachers have not been properly supported, SADTU claims, it is illegitimate for the DoE to attempt to judge them.[306]

One critical analysis of the DAS policy that has emerged in the DoE is the argument that DAS failed as it did not "have teeth" – that is, that DAS failed as an appraisal policy because it did not hold teachers accountable for their performance, and did not have serious consequences for poor results.[307] It is unsurprising that this view of DAS became popular only years after the policy had ended: the intended purpose of DAS was fundamentally developmental and not evaluative. It never intended to punish poor performance. This represents a narrative shift in the discourse that we will see more strongly in following chapters: the shift from evaluation policy as a means to develop teachers to appraisal policy as a means to control and measure to teachers' performance.

4.4: Analysing DAS

The DAS was originally presented as an ongoing developmental process for educators, with transparent appraisal criteria, based on some flexibility to accommodate contextual diversities of educational institutions. The principles and features of the new appraisal instrument clearly attempted to address many of the problems that had been identified with the previous appraisal systems.

---

[305] SADTU, "SADTU Calls for Urgent Moratorium on Whole School Evaluation"; SADTU, "SADTU Education Desk Report on Whole School Evaluation (WSE) in 2002" (Report, 2002), SADTU Collection AH3389:AD43, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

[306] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa."

[307] Department of Education, "National Conference on Whole-School Evaluation (Caesar's Conference Centre, Gauteng, 29-30 September 2000)," Report (Pretoria: Government Printer, 2002).

The emphasis on the development of teachers over accountability in DAS is important. It was considered vital not to punish black teachers for poor teacher education and lack of development opportunities under the apartheid system. DAS would allow them instead to drive their own development without inspectors or school managers instructing them. As a former SADTU/SACE policy adviser stated, "SADTU did not want to expose teachers for what they could not do for fear of making them yet again victims of apartheid education."[308]

DAS imagines a process where educators work and reflect together on professional development, and in so doing, improve teaching and learning. This process works through a combination of self- and peer-evaluation in order to identify a teacher's weakness and develop a "growth plan" to improve in these areas. Such a system requires mutual trust, openness and collaboration between educators and other education workers such as office staff, seniors, and departmental officials. The DAS assumes educators are professionals with reflective competencies, a commitment to continuous learning, and a positive attitude. The preamble to the official DAS manual acknowledges this quite clearly:

> In order to achieve the aims of developmental appraisal, the following requirements, inter alia, must be met:
> Democratic organisational climate
> Learning culture at institutions
> Commitment of educators to development
> Openness and trust.[309]

However, these "requirements" were not yet met at the time of implementation of DAS. Considering the state of schooling at the time of transition, these conditions were "fundamental changes in the organisational culture and climate of South African schools [that] imply radical changes to the way in which schools are managed".[310]

Most teachers in South Africa did not possess or practice these necessary reflective competencies. As detailed in chapter three of this thesis, most teacher education under the apartheid system was of poor quality, and

[308] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 196.

[309] ELRC, *Resolution No. 8 of 1998: Duties and Responsibilities of Educators* (Pretoria: Government Printer, 1998).

[310] Thurlow and Ramnarain, "Transforming Educator Appraisal in South Africa."

very few opportunities for meaningful professional development existed. Various studies have shown that the professional qualifications of many educators are unsatisfactory, and educators' lack of subject and pedagogical knowledge remains one of the critical failings of the education system.[311] A well-documented poor culture of learning and teaching continues to exist, especially in poorly functioning and under-resourced schools.[312] Furthermore, teachers' struggles in the classroom and the poor results of their learners has made them extremely defensive towards any form of performance monitoring.[313]

Teachers in South Africa "do not start from positions of innovative and reflective practice, given the history and effects of authoritarian surveillance of teachers' working lives, of political oppression, and a truncated view of their professionalism which has turned on teachers as mere instruments of state ideology".[314] Apartheid education systematically de-professionalised and de-skilled teachers. As a result, most teachers were ill-equipped to make use of developmental appraisal as intended and were highly defensive when it came to the implementation of these policies. The teacher-driven nature of DAS expected teachers to behave and work as professionals with competences, identities and confidence they simply did not have.

Beyond the lack of skills and competencies, the school environment itself had suffered as a result of apartheid education. The apartheid appraisal system, which was the only form of professional evaluation known to most teachers, had victimised and unfairly punished teachers. This created atmospheres of suspicion and competition not just between teachers and the state, but between teachers and their superiors, and between teachers and their peers.[315] This professional environment in which teachers were socialised has created a "deeply entrenched resistance to state surveillance and control of teaching [which] renders any attempt to regulate the profession subject to suspicion if not outright rejection".[316]

---

[311] Taylor and Vinjevold, *Getting Learning Right*; Bloch, *The Toxic Mix*.

[312] See Pam Christie, "Schools as (Dis)Organisations: The 'Breakdown of the Culture of Learning and Teaching' in South African Schools," *Cambridge Journal of Education* 28, no. 3 (November 1, 1998): 283–300, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764980280303.

[313] Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession," March 1, 2004.

[314] Melanie Walker, "Context, Critique and Change: Doing Action Research in South Africa," *Educational Action Research* 3, no. 1 (January 1, 1995): 13, https://doi.org/10.1080/0965079950030102.

[315] See Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession," March 1, 2004; Chisholm, "The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work."

[316] Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession," March 1, 2004, 52.

This has had two major consequences. Firstly, teachers' responses to DAS were suspicious if not outright hostile. They viewed it as another form of punitive state control, and many resisted its implementation. Secondly, school environments were often unconducive to peer review and collaboration, as relationships between teachers and school management, as well as relationships between teachers and the state, had become strained and antagonistic in this working environment.

The adoption of outcomes-based education (OBE), as discussed in the previous chapter, worsened these challenges. OBE created a major change in the work status and identity of teachers, and greatly expanded the scope of teacher's roles and responsibilities. A teacher trained under the apartheid education system was not adequately prepared to negotiate the challenges of OBE. The "core criteria" according to which teachers were evaluated under DAS were developed according to the standards of the OBE teacher, which teachers were simply not able to meet.

The DAS policies exacerbated many of the problems faced by educators and created a system that quickly became merely another administrative burden – adding to an already very high workload.[317] The autonomy and professionalism envisioned by the DAS did not correspond with realities on the ground. It also did not correspond with other government policies. Various policies undermined the status of teachers as professionals, in particular many curriculum and assessment policies that required a large amount of time spent on de-skilled labour and paperwork.

The failure of the education departments in providing real support and opportunities for professional development has left these problems unaddressed. It has also further contributed to teachers' suspicion of DAS and state control, as they did not see any evidence of the "developmental" part of "developmental appraisal". Teachers continued to view DAS as an evaluative and judgemental process that measured their performance instead of improving it.

A history of inadequate teacher support to develop basic knowledge and competencies together with few opportunities to develop the professional attitudes and identities needed explain the poor professional commitment existing among most teachers who did not feel they were directly responsible for the poor-

[317] Chisholm et al., "Educator Workload in South Africa."

quality schooling and their learners' poor achievements.[318] This only served to exacerbate an alarming trend of demoralisation among South African educators.[319]

DAS was based on a number of assumptions, such as an environment of openness and trust within schools, the ability of educators to constructively practice self- and peer-evaluation, the commitment of teachers to professional development, which were fundamentally flawed.[320] The reality of most teachers was not one in which DAS could operate as intended. DAS assumed that these individual skills and competencies could be easily learned and that these institutional environments and cultures could easily be changed. Yet the policy contains no mechanisms – or even suggestions – for doing so.

DAS failed to establish the conditions required for its own institutionalisation. It was not suited to the reality of most teachers' circumstances and abilities and did not provide meaningful developmental support. It failed to achieve buy-in from educators, despite the consistent support of SADTU. DAS was seen as a judgemental evaluation that enforced state control over teachers' work, created a massive administrative burden, and further demoralised educators who were already experiencing a crisis of morale. This was exacerbated by a lack of trust and positive social relations, both between the administration and teachers and within the schools themselves.

4.5: Conclusion

The Developmental Appraisal System was formulated by teacher unions and the state through a consultative negotiation process. It was developed to be the antithesis of – and perhaps an antidote to – the much-reviled apartheid inspectorate system. As a policy, it was meant to be sensitive to history and social relations in school. We can see this in its democratic, collaborative framing, and through features of the appraisal instrument itself, such as its sensitivity to context and emphasis on development. DAS was intended to be a

[318] See Fleisch, *Primary Education in Crisis*; de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa."

[319] Shalem and Hoadley, "The Dual Economy of Schooling and Teacher Morale in South Africa"; OECD, *Reviews of National Policies for Education: South Africa*.

[320] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa."

policy for teacher development, not necessarily for accountability. Textually, it represents a decisive break with the past.

It also represents a new institutional arrangement in policymaking. The participation of unions in formulating the policy, and in particular the domination of SADTU in this process, would be unimaginable in the apartheid system. SADTU and the ANC had similar policy positions and a good relationship. This allowed the policymaking process to be democratic and constructive. The policy was well received and strongly supported on the ground, and viewed as a victory for teachers.

Yet DAS was deemed a failure just a few years later. As much as the policy and policymaking processes had changed, the realities of teachers and teaching had not. DAS had acknowledged but ultimately failed to address the legacy of apartheid teacher training, social structures and economic realities. DAS ultimately failed to work for teachers due to a combination of a process of de-professionalisation and the distrust and demoralisation engendered by both the apartheid system and by the politically charged context of resistance in education in the early 1990s.

As we will see in the next chapter, the failure of the department of education to deliver on DAS strained already-fraying relationships between SADTU and the state, signalling the beginning of a severe deterioration of state-educator relations. DAS would remain in place until 2003 when it was replaced by a new ELRC resolution on appraisal. The new system, the Integrated Quality Management System, incorporated DAS along with other evaluation processes into a new, combined, streamlined policy.

Chapter 5: WSE and performance management

Chapter five covers the introduction and implementation of the 2001 *Whole-School Evaluation* (WSE) Policy and the introduction of further performance management policies in 2002-2003. Whole-School Evaluation was short-lived; forceful opposition from SADTU blocked the implementation process and led to the policy being combined with DAS and other performance management schemes in 2003. The resulting policy was the *Integrated Quality Management System* (IQMS), which will be covered in the next chapter.

The first section of this chapter details the changing policy context from 1998, when the DAS policy was created, to the early 2000s, when WSE was being formulated and then implemented. It covers the changing relationships between teacher unions and the state, as well as larger trends in policymaking at the time. The second section follows the formation and implementation of the policy, as well as the conflict surrounding it. The third section provides a descriptive analysis of WSE and how it applied to educators. The fourth section describes further developments in performance management in education during this time period. The final section provides an in-depth analysis of WSE in historical context, as well as creating a firm foundation for understanding the developments to follow.

5.1: A shifting policy context

President Thabo Mbeki, in his reply to the debate on his 1999 State of the Nation address, said: "Teachers must teach. Learners must learn. Managers must manage." As I will discuss below, this statement is emblematic of a shift in the policy context and in the relationship between the ANC and SADTU.

The democratic consultation and partnership between the DoE and teacher unions, so prominent in the mid-1990s, was not to last. This changing tide was heralded by a speech given by Mbeki to the SADTU Congress in 1998, in which he delivered a scathing critique of the teaching profession:

> Thanks to a form of behaviour perhaps among a few of our educators, and especially teachers in our schools, the prestige of the profession is fast disappearing, to be replaced by contempt and derision for you [...] There is a worrying level of unprofessional behaviour that is bedevilling the teaching profession. This includes those who

> describe themselves as members of the revolutionary cadre of our country by virtue of their membership of SADTU, the ANC and COSATU.

He excoriated teachers for drunkenness, ill-discipline, lack of professionalism, the supposed abdication of their responsibility to educate and protect the youth, and overall for being "militant fighters for a better pay cheque at the end of the month".[321] This was the first of many more direct confrontations between SADTU and the state in the years to come. It also reflected a negative shift in public opinion of SADTU and teachers in general; Minister of Education Kader Asmal remarked in an address to a SADTU congress the following year:

> There is an overwhelming consensus that the public is viewing teachers in a negative light [...] The public out there does not see Sadtu as a teachers' union that is working to lead our teachers, as workers, and therefore our country, into the next century. [...] I do not believe the public out there believes you are really worth the money we spend on you. [322]

Asmal, appointed in May 1999, brought a tougher stance on issues of policy implementation and delivery in education. Soon after his appointment, he issued a "Call to Action" in which he laid out the top nine priorities of his administration.[323] This call to action was followed by an implementation plan best known by its slogan, *Tirisano* ("working together").[324]

The provincial and national education departments were becoming more assertive and authoritative and felt more legitimate in tightening their control and exercising their monitoring powers over schools and teachers.[325] This also reflected various efficiency measures being introduced at the time in the public sector,

---

[321] Thabo Mbeki, "Speech at Congress of SADTU 1998" (Speech, September 6, 1998), Website, Thabo Mbeki Foundation, https://www.mbeki.org/2016/06/08/speech-at-congress-of-sadtu-durban-19980906/.

[322] David Greybe, "Asmal Lays Down Law," *Business Day*, September 27, 1999, http://allafrica.com/stories/199909270110.html; Edwin Naidu, "Asmal Blasts Teachers for Bad Behaviour," *IOL News*, September 27, 1999, https://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/asmal-blasts-teachers-for-bad-behaviour-14111.

[323] Department of Education, "Call to Action: Mobilising Citizens to Build a South African Education and Training System for the 21st Century" (Statement by Professor Kader Asmal, Minister of Education, July 27, 1999).

[324] Department of Education, "Implementation Plan for Tirisano."

[325] See Fleisch, *Managing Educational Change*.

as the ANC government had adopted the 1996 GEAR programme and tighter fiscal austerity, alongside a new managerialism.

The DoE began to tighten its regulations over staff and the teaching profession, insisting on greater efficiency and productivity in implementation and delivery. Priority five of the Tirisano plan was titled: "We must develop the professional quality of our teaching force."[326] Notions of efficiency, effectiveness and standards were becoming increasingly prominent, and certain initiatives were taken in that year to institutionalise quality functions and to address quality concerns directly. These include the re-launched Culture of Learning, Teaching and Service (COLTS) campaign, and the establishment of the Chief Directorate of Quality Assurance in the national Department of Education.[327]

The minister often expressed his frustrations with poor quality schooling, the poor culture of teaching and learning in many schools, and the lack of teacher professionalism and accountability. In a 1999 address to a SADTU congress, Asmal criticised "the level of dysfunctionality in the majority of township and rural schools caused by the lack of discipline and professionalism among teachers". He castigated SADTU members who, "using the union as a shield", refused to be disciplined, neglected professional duties and took part in activities such as substance abuse and child abuse.[328]

The education department also began to make more decisions without consulting teacher unions and other actors. The DoE was withdrawing from a previously highly collaborative and democratic approach to policymaking. When initiating unilateral changes to SACE policy in 1999, Asmal declared: "We cannot and should not subject everything to bargaining."[329] These changing attitudes were well captured by a 1999 GDE slogan: "The education of our children shall no longer be negotiated".[330]

---

[326] Department of Education, "Implementation Plan for Tirisano."

[327] Shireen Motala, "Quality and Indicators of Quality in South African Education: A Critical Appraisal," *International Journal of Educational Development* 21, no. 1 (January 1, 2001): 61–78, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(00)00014-6.

[328] Greybe, "Asmal Lays Down Law"; Naidu, "Asmal Blasts Teachers for Bad Behaviour."

[329] Greybe, "Asmal Lays Down Law."

[330] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 216.

The department also began to focus more strongly on accountability. "Schools must be held accountable to their communities for their performance, and I am going to make sure that they do account to the public in terms of clear criteria," Asmal proclaimed soon after his appointment.[331] The new Quality Assurance Directorate in the DoE began work on developing performance indicators and quality assurance processes. The stage was set for "making teachers accountable as professional actors within public schools".[332]

The relationship between SADTU and the ANC was becoming increasingly strained in the area of policymaking. SADTU criticised the ANC for abandoning their commitment to an open and inclusive process; according to SADTU, the participation of stakeholders had been restricted since 1999, replaced by minimal consultation. They pointed to recent policy that had been developed without consultation with teachers, such as new SACE legislation, Whole-School Evaluation, national teacher awards, curriculum reviews, new regulations governing school principals in relation to strike action, and amendments to the Employment of Educators Act. This grievance was stated very strongly at the 2001 SADTU policy review conference:

> Policy and legislation is being introduced which directly bears on teachers, with little attempt to consult meaningfully with teacher representatives. [...] It is a huge irony that the Tirisano programmes have been launched prior to any consultation with teachers – the irony being that 'Tirisano' is supposed to mean 'working together'. Is there any wonder that teachers are now saying: 'Let the teachers speak!'[333]

Also of concern to SADTU at this time was the demobilisation of civil society organisations in education, and the decline of parent and community involvement in educational issues. But on a much broader level, SADTU and the ANC appeared to be moving in different ideological directions. SADTU strongly criticised the ANC for adopting a "conservative economic policy" and fiscal austerity; the 2001 SADTU policy review conference stated that "for education this is, at best, a maintenance budget. There is nothing left over for

---

[331] Greybe, "Asmal Lays Down Law."

[332] Jonathan D. Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession: A South African Case Study," *Research Papers in Education* 19, no. 1 (March 2004): 51–66, https://doi.org/10.1080/0267152032000176972.

[333] SADTU, "National Education Policy Conference (17-21 April 2001, Gallagher Estate, Midrand) 'Education Transformation: From Policy to Practice' Resource Documents," 2001, 8, SADTU Collection, AH3389, R6, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

transformation and redress."[334] They believed the ANC's original agenda for transformation in education had been derailed:

> Our fundamental goals of equity and redress have been largely derailed by conservative economic policy and the acceptance of neo-liberal ideology by significant sections of the liberation movement. At the same time, as the vision of transformation recedes, consultation has increasingly become a mere formality. The return to the original transformation goals of the movement – captured in the Yellow Book[335] – requires a fundamental shift in economic and educational priorities and the rebuilding of the mass democratic education movement to ensure that transformation is carried out. [336]

5.2: Towards WSE

The national and provincial education departments had wanted to introduce a component of evaluation for accountability to address the poor culture of teaching still present in many schools after 1994. The education department was increasingly worried about the quality of the education system, and accountability had all but disappeared from the system since the 1980s. The DoE needed a better monitoring system to assess the performance of the whole school system, as well as more effective quality assurance and accountability measures. In 1999, these priorities were clearly encapsulated in the new Tirisano plan. The DoE's Quality Assurance Directorate began work on developing the National Quality Assurance (NQA) Framework and began work on a number of new policies to address the "quality problem" in South African education.

Negotiations in the ELRC had made it clear that inspection or other means of evaluation for accountability for teachers could not be included in the new Development Appraisal System (DAS), which was centred on redress and teacher development. DAS focused on individual teachers and their development and provided few insights into the functioning of entire schools. Furthermore, as discussed in the previous chapter, various implementation and policy problems with DAS meant it had very little value as a measurement tool. A new system would have to be developed to fulfil these functions.

---

[334] SADTU, 5.

[335] The 1994 ANC Framework on Education and Training

[336] SADTU, "SADTU National Education Policy Conference Resource Documents," 6.

In 2001, to address these needs, the DoE announced the Whole-School Evaluation Policy.[337] WSE processes, based on the United Kingdom's OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education), included school self-evaluation, ongoing district-based support, monitoring and development, and external evaluations.

The DoE had proceeded with the WSE policy alone. Some international consultants, in particular from the UK, advised the DoE on the formulation of a school evaluation system and policy, but neither teacher unions nor professional bodies such as SACE or the ELRC had participated until the policy was written and distributed for comment.[338] Teacher unions quickly announced strong opposition towards the WSE policy. Their main concern was the unilateral introduction of the policy and the failure of the DoE to consult teachers: the system was "imposed upon educators".[339] This continued a trend of unilateral policymaking by the department, as illustrated above.

Further complicating the adoption of WSE was the relationship between WSE and DAS. While SADTU agreed "in principle" to evaluation systems (and even classroom observations), they saw WSE as "punitive" and "non-developmental", and thus antithetical to their stance on appraisal.[340] Meanwhile, DAS – which was seen as progressive and developmental – was not being implemented as planned, which SADTU perceived as a betrayal by the DoE.

SADTU was worried that the policy would target poorly performing schools and the resulting stigmatisation would lead to a "self-fulfilling prophecy". SADTU emphasised the need for a developmental appraisal system, which had been agreed to in the form of DAS, but which had been "unceremoniously reneged upon" by the

[337] Department of Education, "The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation" (Government Printer, July 2001); Department of Education, "Handbook: An Introduction to Whole-School Evaluation Policy" (Government Printer, 2002).

[338] Department of Education, "National Conference on WSE"; SADTU, "SADTU Calls for Urgent Moratorium on Whole School Evaluation."

[339] SADTU, "SADTU Calls for Urgent Moratorium on Whole School Evaluation."

[340] SADTU; SADTU, "SADTU Education Desk Report on Whole School Evaluation (WSE) in 2002."

DoE.[341] SADTU also accused the department of financially prioritising the WSE policy over DAS; according to the union, the DoE had failed to implement DAS due to lack of funding but was funding the new WSE.[342]

They stated that "all assessments of teacher quality can only be measured against the investments (inputs) made by the education department"; in the years to come, SADTU would continue to reject evaluation policies by the DoE if they were imposed without corresponding support from the DoE.[343] A SADTU representative frankly stated:

> Whole-school evaluation is not going to work, and we will not be able to sell it, if we do not couple it with the Development Appraisal Strategy. Whole-school evaluation looks at the organisation, but within that organisation there are individuals who need to be developed. The Development Appraisal Instrument was signed and agreed to and we should take it on board. [344]

Were teachers excluded from the policymaking process? The DoE claimed otherwise, and WSE policymakers have also stated that teacher unions were consulted and involved in the process prior to its implementation.[345] SADTU was included in the 2000 National Conference on Whole-School Evaluation, where they criticised the DoE for waiting too long to consult them. Even if the unions were consulted, the bones of the WSE policy was developed entirely without union and teacher input, and the DoE's failure to sufficiently democratise the process further soured relations between the department and SADTU.

SADTU resolved to oppose the implementation of WSE, calling it "archaic", although the DoE tried to continue with its plan. By May 2002, SADTU called for an urgent moratorium on the WSE implementation, encouraging its members to boycott the WSE process and refuse supervisors access to schools. SADTU also threatened both a programme of mass action, including marches and demonstrations, and legal action.[346]

---

[341] SADTU, "SADTU Calls for Urgent Moratorium on Whole School Evaluation."

[342] SADTU and Department of Education, "Joint Media Statement with Department of Education and SADTU on Whole School Evaluation (WSE)" (Press Release, May 21, 2002), SADTU Website, https://web.archive.org/web/20060926181411fw_/http://www.sadtu.org.za/press/2001/21-5-2002.0.htm.

[343] SADTU, "SADTU Calls for Urgent Moratorium on Whole School Evaluation."

[344] Department of Education, "National Conference on WSE," 54.

[345] See Anusha Lucen, "Tracing the Implementation Trajectory of an Education Policy: The Case of Whole School Evaluation" (Thesis, University of Pretoria, 2006), 127, http://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/28297.

[346] SADTU, "SADTU Calls for Urgent Moratorium on Whole School Evaluation."

Many WSE supervisors did not manage to visit unionised schools and do classroom visits. They also discontinued their evaluation of other schools where SADTU was not dominant, for fear of antagonizing the other unions.

At SADTU's 2002 national congress, the union resolved to:

> Suspend Whole School Evaluation
> Research the concept of Whole School Development and subjected it to further engagement
> Make WSE unworkable and develop mechanisms to protect our members from the State's reprisal
> There must be a concerted campaign against Whole School Evaluation
> Convene a workshop to further clarify issues on WSE and have a common understanding [347]

SADTU combined this vehement rejection of WSE with a renewed commitment to DAS, calling for the DAS process to be reviewed, strengthened, and allocated funding previously assigned to WSE.

Many SADTU-affiliated schools continued to boycott WSE supervisors, even after the policy was incorporated into the IQMS with union agreement in 2003 (see next chapter).[348] No province had successfully implemented WSE by the time it was replaced. On reflection, the department of education acknowledged multiple problems in the implementation of WSE, including the consultation process. They identified the following:

> Flawed consultation process
> Flawed advocacy process
> Level of readiness not established before implementation
> Flawed Implementation management process
> Inconsistent intervention strategies
> Myths and inaccurate perceptions about the use and intentions of WSE
> Fear of victimisation by schools
> Apathy and resistance to change
> Perceived hidden agenda

[347] SADTU, "5th National Congress (ICC Durban, Kwa-Zulu Natal, 08-11 September 2002) Secretariat Report," 2002, SADTU Collection, AH3389, AA10, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

[348] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 219.

> Perceived bad-faith negotiations (lack of trust)[349]

In 2003, following negotiations with teacher unions, WSE was incorporated into the new teacher appraisal system, along with DAS and other performance management policies. This new system, the Integrated Quality Management System, included a WSE component similar to this 2001 policy, but with a few significant changes. These will be detailed in the next chapter.

5.3: Whole-School Evaluation

The 2001 WSE strategy combines internal and external evaluation to analyse the performance of schools. Schools account for their performance by evaluating themselves annually, on the basis of nationally-agreed-upon evaluation criteria. This school self-evaluation leads to a school improvement plan (SIP), submitted to education district offices which, in turn, develop their own District Improvement Plan (DIP), to incorporate the SIPs of their schools.

Schools also submit their self-evaluation and SIP documents, together with other relevant school information, to the provincial office in charge of WSE, which then use it when its WSE team visits schools on a three-to-five year cycle. This team of supervisors assesses the school's strengths and weaknesses, using the same nationally agreed evaluation criteria. These supervisors submit their WSE reports to schools and districts, on the understanding that schools, with the assistance of districts, need to incorporate their recommendations in their next SIP. In this way, all the different levels of the schooling system (national, provincial, district and school) are involved in taking stock of their performance and formulating strategies for improvement.

WSE's stated aims were to:

> Moderate externally, on a sampling basis, the results of self-evaluation carried out by the schools.
> Evaluate the effectiveness of a school in terms of the national goals, using national criteria.
> Increase the level of accountability within the education system.
> Strengthen the support given to schools by district professional support services.

[349] Mathula, "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice," 10.

> Provide feedback to all stakeholders as a means of achieving continuous school improvement.
> Identify aspects of excellence within the system which will serve as models of good practice.
> Identify the aspects of effective schools and improve the general understanding of what factors create effective schools.[350]

The policy was based on the following principles:

> The core mission of schools is to improve the educational achievements of all learners. Whole-school evaluation, therefore, is designed to enable those in schools, supervisors and support services to identify to what extent the school is adding value to learners' prior knowledge, understanding and skills.
>
> All members of a school community are responsible for the quality of their own performance. Whole-school evaluation intends to enable the contribution made by staff, learners and other stakeholders to improve their own and the school's performance, to be properly recognised.
>
> All evaluation activities must be characterised by openness and collaboration. Therefore, the criteria to be used in evaluating schools must be made public.
>
> Whole-school evaluation of a good quality must be standardised and consistent. The guidelines, criteria and instruments must ensure consistency over periods of time and across settings.
>
> The evaluation of both qualitative and quantitative data is essential when deciding how well a school is performing. For this reason, whole-school evaluation is concerned with the range of inputs, processes and outcomes. These are associated with, for example, staffing and physical resources, human and physical, the quality of leadership and management, learning and teaching, and the standards achieved by learners.
>
> Staff development and training are critical to school improvement. A measure used by whole-school evaluation in judging a school's performance is the amount and quality of in-service training undertaken by staff and its impact on learning and standards of achievement. In this way, whole-school evaluation will make an important contribution to securing well-focused development opportunities for school staff.
>
> Schools are inevitably at different stages of development. Many factors contribute to this. A basic principle of this Policy is to seek to understand why schools are where they are and to use the particular circumstances of the school as the main starting point of the evaluation. The Policy recognises that schools in disadvantaged areas, for example, must not be disadvantaged in terms of whole-school evaluation.[351]

---

[350] Department of Education, "National Policy on WSE," 3.

[351] Department of Education, 3–4.

The following were the key areas of evaluation:

- Basic functionality of the school
- Leadership, management and communication
- Governance and relationships
- Quality of teaching and learning, and educator development
- Curriculum provision and resources
- Learner achievement
- School safety, security and discipline
- School infrastructure
- Parents and community

Evaluation was based on indicators covering inputs (the resources, funding and socioeconomic context of the school), processes (actions taken by the school to achieve its goals, including school governance, development and training and resource management, among other factors) and outputs (school achievements such as attendance rates, learner academic achievement, and standards of behaviour). Schools would be rated on a scale of 1 ("needs urgent support") to 5 ("outstanding").

The evaluation of educators seems to fall under criteria four, "quality of teaching and learning, and educator development". There are no criteria for the performance of educators, save a standard form for lesson observation that included the following to be evaluated on a scale of 1 to 5:

- Quality of teaching
  - Planning;
  - Knowledge
  - Strategies
  - Use of time
  - Use of resources
  - Class control
  - Assessment
  - Evaluation and review

and

- Learning and response
  - Knowledge

Skills
Understanding
Attitudes
Behaviour

and

Achievement
Outcomes

This is one of the most important elements of WSE; according to the policy, at least *half* of the WSE process time should be spent on the observation of educators in the classroom.[352]

5.4: Developments in Performance Management

Despite conflict and resistance from teacher unions, the DoE continued to push evaluation performance management monitoring measures through the ELRC. The DoE was keen to introduce a performance-oriented discourse and culture to improve individual public servants' awareness and understanding of their work objectives and performance standards expected of them. This form of performance management was introduced at various levels of the education governance system.

Teacher unions were being pressurised by their members to push for a new form of annual merit awards for teachers, in order to replace the previous automatic annual notch increase (which had been abolished around 1984). The DoE used this opportunity to negotiate a new Performance Management System (PM) for educators at the ELRC. The strategy was to incorporate in an educator performance evaluation a low-stake annual incentive with some salary increases and grade progression. The unions demanded in return that the performance evaluation system for educators be fair and transparent and a basis with which to improve the quality of teaching and education management.[353]

[352] Department of Education, "Handbook: An Introduction to WSE Policy," 8.

[353] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa."

The ELRC Resolution 3 of 2002 on the Performance Management and Development System (PMDS) aimed to evaluate and improve teacher performance against pre-specified goals.[354] Borrowing heavily from new public management discourse, this resolution aimed to create a "performance culture" for public servants.[355] The *Employment of Educators Act* of 1998 was amended to include relevant work and performance standards for educators. The ELRC *Resolution 9 of 2002* and *Resolution 1 of 2003* outline evaluation procedures, processes and performance standards for institution-based educators, in terms of the 1998 *Educators Employment Act* which allowed the Minister to stipulate performance standards for educators. The ELRC *Resolution 3 of 2003* contains guidelines for the process of classroom observation used in WSE and DAS.[356]

The ELRC *Resolution 1 of 2003* outlined evaluation procedures, processes and performance standards for institution-based educators, in terms of the 1998 *Educators Employment Act* which allowed the Minister to stipulate performance standards for educators. *Resolution 1 of 2003* seemed to contain an entirely new educator evaluation process:

> *Steps of the evaluation process*
> Start the process
> One on one meeting between supervisor and evaluee
> Educator's self evaluation
> Supervisor's evaluation
> Discussions
> Evaluation report
> Moderation by School Management Team
> Signing of evaluation report [357]

The policy document contains a new set of evaluation criteria that are illuminating. Educators would be evaluated on twelve standards, depending on their seniority (standards 1-8 for all educators, and 9-12 for

---

[354] ELRC, *Resolution No. 3 of 2002: Performance Management and Development Scheme* (Pretoria: Government Printer, 2002), 2.

[355] Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report."

[356] ELRC, *Resolution No. 9 of 2002: Evaluation Procedures, Processes and Performance Standards for Institution-Based Educators* (Pretoria: Government Printer, 2002); ELRC, *Resolution No. 1 of 2003: Evaluation Procedures, Processes and Performance Standards for Institution Based Educators* (Pretoria: Government Printer, 2003); ELRC, *Resolution No. 3 of 2003: Protocol and Instrument for Use When Observing Educators in Practice for the Purpose of Whole-School Evaluation (WSE) and Developmental Appraisal System (DAS)*, 2003; Republic of South Africa, *Employment of Educators Act No. 76 of 1998* (Pretoria: Government printer, 2008).

[357] ELRC, *Resolution No. 1 of 2003*, 1.

senior management such as HODs, deputy principals and principals), on a scale of 1 (unacceptable) to 5 (outstanding):

> Lesson planning, preparation, presentation and management
> Creation of a learning environment and classroom management
> Monitoring and assessment of learners
> Professional Development in field of work/career and participation in professional bodies
> Human Relations and contribution to school development
> Knowledge of curriculum and subject matter
> Leadership, Communication and Servicing the Governing Body
> Extra-Curricular participation
> Administration
> Personnel
> Decision making and accountability
> Strategic Planning, Financial Planning and Education Management Development

Each standard is evaluated according to certain criteria. The policy document states that performance standards are "mutually agreed criteria used to describe how well work must be done".[358] However, unlike DAS, the criteria do not seem to be flexible or context-dependent, and there is no stipulation that the teacher being evaluated must agree to the criteria. In fact, there are very clear criteria outlined in the policy document and no provision for changes to the assessment instrument. Take the first standard as an example:

> STANDARD 1: Lesson planning, preparation, presentation and management
> Lesson plans are clear, logical and sequential
> Includes teaching methods and procedures appropriate to outcomes
> Uses knowledge of learners to design educational experiences
> Designs lessons to elicit and sustain learners' attention, interest and involvement
> Demonstrates learning area knowledge and conveys this knowledge clearly to learners
> Provides clear instructions and explanations that are matched to learners' needs
> Involves learners in the lesson in a way that supports the development of their skills and knowledge[359]

[358] ELRC, 6.

[359] ELRC, 6.

It is not clear where *Resolution 1 of 2003* fits into either the quality assurance framework or the DoE's teacher development plans. It is not specified if this new evaluation process would replace, for example, the DAS or WSE processes, or run concurrently. The policy does stipulate that "the existing Quality Management Processes be aligned in the ELRC, by 30th June 2003."[360] This would be two months after the signing of the resolution, and the quality management processes were aligned later that year in August, in the new IQMS (see next chapter). It is unclear if any schools did use the educator evaluation processes outlined in *Resolution 1 of 2003* in the few months before it was superseded by the IQMS.

Most of these new administrative measures and agreements on performance management and appraisal used concepts and terminology borrowed from the new public management (NPM) discourse, a managerialist approach to governance which had gained traction in South Africa soon after 1994. NPM emphasises efficiency, transparency and accountability, often through the use of private management ideas such as the provision of more responsive and efficient services, performance agreements including service standards, greater autonomy and flexibility for managers, new financial techniques, and market-based mechanisms aimed at increasing "choice" to citizens.[361]

SADTU was opposed to the language of performance-based accountability in the 2002 PM which it associated with neoliberal managerialism. However, it did not oppose performance management schemes per se, especially if they involved increased remuneration for educators, because it was a long-standing principle of SADTU to participate in any schemes leading to salary increases for their members, many of whom suffered from poor pay.[362] NAPTOSA also favoured performance management schemes, as long as it was done professionally and promoted a form of professional accountability.

---

[360] ELRC, 3.

[361] See Barbara Lipietz and Ivor Chipkin, "Transforming South Africa's Racial Bureaucracy: New Public Management and Public Sector Reform in Contemporary South Africa," PARI Long Essay (Public Affairs Research Institute, February 2012); Vinothan Naidoo, "Changing Conceptions of Public 'Management' and Public Sector Reform in South Africa," *International Public Management Review* 16, no. 1 (2015): 23–42; R. Cameron, "New Public Management Reforms in the South African Public Service : 1999-2009," *Journal of Public Administration* 44, no. Special issue 1 (April 1, 2009): 910–42; R. Cameron, "Public Service Reform in South Africa: From Apartheid to New Public Management," in *The International Handbook of Public Administration and Governance*, ed. Andrew Massey and Karen Johnston (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2015), 135–57.

[362] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa."

As discussed in the following chapter, in 2003 education departments and unions agreed on a performance management and evaluation system which partly met the interests of both parties.

5.5: Policy Analysis

In his foreword to the WSE policy document, Kader Asmal stated: "The adopted model is radically different from the previous school inspection system carried out in South Africa under the apartheid regime."[363] The WSE policy, contained in the official policy document, the DoE's WSE Handbook and the National Conference document, does address some well-known problems of the apartheid evaluation system and attempts to differentiate itself from apartheid inspection.[364]

WSE is presented as a radical break from the past, but teacher unions perceived it as a regression – a move back towards apartheid-era policy. The story of WSE is a good example of how simply "taking history into account" is not always enough. Despite its democratic language, WSE evoked memories of the apartheid inspectorate that provoked a deep suspicion and distrust in teachers and in SADTU. As I will examine, WSE also proved to be inappropriate for the reality in which teachers worked – a reality that was itself a product of interacting past (apartheid) and present policies.

5.5.1: Language

The language of the policy itself is developmental and democratic. For example, the policy states that "the shift in terminology from 'inspection' to 'whole-school evaluation' is important", and makes explicit provision that the system should not be judgmental nor be used as a coercive measure.[365] It emphasises professional development as well as training and development opportunities. It acknowledges contextual factors which may affect performance and provides flexibility in evaluation criteria. It declares the process to be transparent, interactive and collaborative. An extensive "ethics" section of the policy lays out standards

[363] Department of Education, "National Policy on WSE," iii.

[364] Department of Education, "National Policy on WSE"; Department of Education, "National Conference on WSE"; Department of Education, "Handbook: An Introduction to WSE Policy."

[365] Department of Education, "National Policy on WSE," 1–2.

for the conduct of supervisors and school staff, mandating integrity, openness, objectivity, impartiality, sensitively and flexibility – a stark contrast to the image of an apartheid-era inspector. The policy also includes a complaints procedure, by which schools can protest unfair treatment.

At the same time, the WSE policy is couched in objective, technocratic language, and presented as a rational and professional exercise which will improve schools and benefit all actors involved. The instrument itself is relatively administrative and bureaucratic, with its wealth of standards and criteria. In this, its consistency with preceding legislation and policy, such as the NQF and the Tirisano plan, is clear. While acknowledging that there may be conflicts or differences of interpretation among the actors involved, these are assumed to be minor and amenable to rational resolution.[366]

These two approaches – the democratic and developmental on the one hand, and the rational and managerialist on the other – coexist uneasily within the policy documents, belying the tension between these two processes. The "progressive" rhetoric of the education department is easily overwhelmed by the instrument and evaluation procedure, which SADTU, as well as other commenters and researchers, were quick to point out.[367]

5.5.2: Quality and indicators

Unlike DAS, which was explicitly developmental in nature, the WSE policy was articulated in terms of quality assurance. It is in the very first line of the policy ("Assuring quality of the education system is the overriding goal of the Ministry of Education"[368]), and it is specified as the main purpose of the WSE system:

> This Policy is aimed at improving the overall quality of education in South African schools. [...] Whole-school evaluation is the cornerstone of the quality assurance system in schools. [...] Effective quality assurance within the

[366] See Francine de Clercq, "School Monitoring and Change: A Critical Examination of Whole School-Evaluation," *Education as Change* 11, no. 2 (December 1, 2007): 100, https://doi.org/10.1080/16823200709487168.

[367] Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession," March 1, 2004; de Clercq, "School Monitoring and Change."

[368] Department of Education, "National Policy on WSE," iii.

> National Policy on Whole-school Evaluation is to be achieved through schools having well-developed internal self-evaluation processes, credible external evaluations and well-structured support services. [369]

Whole-school evaluation, then, is meant to do two things: provide data to inform improvement and support strategies, and to improve accountability ("part of its responsibility will be to ensure that national and local policies are complied with"; one of the policy's principal aims is to "increase the level of accountability within the education system").

The WSE policy was driven by the Directorate of Quality Assurance in the DoE, which was also responsible for determining indicators of quality and quality measurement systems. The WSE policy fell under the Quality Assurance Directorate's National Quality Assurance (NQA Framework). This WSE framework corresponds strongly to the Department of Education's increased emphasis on quality assurance, as described above. Yet the WSE framework and related documents do not define "quality" beyond its nine general criteria, and the ways in which the policy is supposed to create accountability or quality assurance are incredibly vague.

Both the NQA Framework and the WSE policy are built on a shaky conceptual foundation. The Quality Assurance Directorate had already begun work on quality measurement instruments, while still seeking conceptual clarity on the notions of quality assurance and quality measurement.[370] Definitions of quality, quality assurance and other important concepts differ from document to document, belying a problematic inconsistency. The NQA Framework/WSE criteria can be vague and confusing and do not spell out what is expected in terms of school performance.[371] As these criteria are meant to be the basis upon which objective judgements are made, this impacts on the entire process and renders any evaluation of quality unreliable.

The NQA Framework views indicators as "the heart of a performance monitoring system. They define the data to be collected to measure progress and enable actual results achieved over time to be compared. They are an indispensable management tool for making performance-based decisions about program strategies

[369] Department of Education, 3.

[370] Motala, "Quality and Indicators of Quality in South African Education."

[371] William J. Smith and Wendy Yolisa Ngoma-Maema, "Education for All in South Africa: Developing a National System for Quality Assurance," *Comparative Education* 39, no. 3 (2003): 345–65.

and activities."[372] Despite this and repeated reference to indicators in the WSE policy, neither the guidelines nor the instruments contain any explicit mention of indicators or how they should be used.[373]

A final problem with the criteria and performance indicators was the last of contextual flexibility. The criteria, guidelines and instruments did not provide for differences across schools, nor did they provide for their adaptation by schools to meet local needs. This was starkly different to DAS, in which an analysis of contextually-appropriate criteria was part of the evaluation process. This one-size-fits-all approach was ill-suited to the diversity of the South African school system, but also triggered educators' fears of being judged on problems which were far out of their control.

This lack of specificity, I believe, allows the education departments to make claims that this relatively bureaucratic system could be context-sensitive, fair and developmental, as it did not create explicit, external performance standards against which teachers could be evaluated. But this is self-defeating, as the confusing and vague nature of the criteria and standards renders the system useless as an effective means of gathering data and measuring performance. WSE ultimately fails to either facilitate a developmental appraisal process or accurately measure teaching quality in any way.

5.5.3: Memories of apartheid

Some scholars have attributed SADTU's reaction to the WSE policy to the "deeply entrenched resistance to state surveillance and control of teaching", a result of the historical socialisation of teachers during apartheid education.[374] The inclusion of external evaluators in the system, for the first time since 1994, created mistrust and hostility. SADTU claimed that WSE was a return to apartheid-era inspections. It also claimed out that many WSE supervisors adopted the same fault-finding attitude as the old inspectors, a direct contradiction

[372] Department of Education, "A Policy Framework in the Education and Training System for Quality Assurance in South Africa" (Pretoria: Government Printer, 1998), 10.

[373] For more on quality and indicators in this time period see Motala, "Quality and Indicators of Quality in South African Education"; Smith and Ngoma-Maema, "Education for All in South Africa."

[374] Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession," March 1, 2004.

to the supposed developmental spirit of the WSE policy and causing many teachers to worry that WSE was a return to apartheid-era processes of inspection.[375]

Studies on the implementation of WSE found that the responses of teachers were fear, suspicion and unease towards the visiting evaluators; there was a tendency to resort to "window dressing" to impress external evaluators; and there remained the expectation of some form of reprisal once the evaluators left. Strikingly, once the evaluators left, "teacher appraisal and development ceased altogether in the school environment".[376]

The way in which the WSE policy was isolated from its historical and social context is stark. The WSE policy acknowledged the historical problems associated with teacher evaluation but assumed them to be either solved or dealt with by the system. Much like the preceding DAS, WSE seemed superficially aware of the institutional memory of apartheid inspections and how that may mediate the responses of teachers, but the policy did not contain answers on how to address these deeply held traumas, or how to gain the trust and buy-in of teachers. Government policy reviews largely blamed "misperceptions" and failed advocacy programmes, without examining why these "misperceptions" are so prevalent.[377]

The strong reactions of SADTU and many educators are certainly due, in part, to the history of state control over teachers' work and teacher resistance. Inspection under apartheid was traumatic for many teachers that experienced its vindictive and punitive excesses. That resistance is built into the institutional memory, identity and culture of SADTU.

But there is also clear underlying anxiety and fear of external evaluation itself. Many teachers fear evaluation because many teachers know that they will fail to meet externally set standards; they are themselves victims of apartheid education. SADTU feels that the judgement, and potential humiliation, of poorly performing teachers would be necessarily unfair and punitive, as teachers (in the union's view) are not to blame.

---

[375] SADTU and Department of Education, "Joint Media Statement with Department of Education and SADTU on Whole School Evaluation (WSE)"; SADTU, "SADTU Education Desk Report on Whole School Evaluation (WSE) in 2002."

[376] See Lucen, "Tracing the Implementation Trajectory of an Education Policy," 261.

[377] Mathula, "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice."

5.5.4: Control and democratisation

Control figures prominently in these quality assurance models. The WSE policy (at least superficially) appeared to grant schools greater autonomy to decide on their own progress, plans and priorities for improvement. The policy documents state that "the authority for the professional management issues of the schools will be vested with the principal of the school, supported by the professional staff".[378] This means that the principal and staff should play a key role in the evaluation processes and in the production of a school improvement plan.

However, as Jansen notes, the entire process was very "top-down", with national policy directing provincial departments and their subordinate units, some of which had to be created to respond to this policy.[379] There are critical areas in which the school principal and staff were excluded from the evaluation process. For example, the following exemption regarding principals is clear: "S/he will participate in the evaluation process by attending meetings, interpreting evidence and clarifying uncertainties but will not be part of decision-making when judgments about the school's performance are made".[380] In addition, the external evaluators had the legal authority to enter and act on a school. Furthermore, while schools could lay complaints, the Minister of Education remained "the final arbiter in any complaint's [sic] procedure".[381] The WSE policy was more directive than suggestive, and school self-evaluation seemed preliminary to the real evaluation conducted by outside supervisors.[382] All the final decision-making powers rested with the education department.

[378] Department of Education, "National Policy on WSE," 20.

[379] Jansen, "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession," March 1, 2004.

[380] Department of Education, "National Policy on WSE," 21.

[381] Department of Education, 14.

[382] Smith and Ngoma-Maema, "Education for All in South Africa."

5.6: Conclusion

The WSE policy process was markedly different from the DAS process of 1998. These difference are illuminating in a number of ways.

Firstly, the policymaking approach was unilateral and driven by the state and "experts". Unlike DAS, teacher unions were not involved in the developmental stages of the process. This can be understood as part of a broader shift towards more managerialist (deemed by some to be neoliberal), NPM inspired policies and policymaking. It can also be understood as a result of changing relationships between the state and SADTU, the dominant teacher union. The actions and statements of key departmental personnel like Kader Asmal show growing frustration with SADTU and the politics of negotiation. SADTU's backlash against this "unilateralism" express the union's growing alarm at being shut out of previous collaborative policymaking spaces, which SADTU felt entitled to participate in.

Second, the backlash against the external evaluation in the WSE policy shows the long-lasting impact of apartheid education in three ways. The first is in the entrenched politics of resistance to state control within SADTU and within the teaching profession. The second is in the fear and distrust of external judgement, as a result of teachers' experiences of inspection under apartheid. The third is in the defensiveness and anxiety of teachers, and SADTU, over their own poor performance which they see to be out of their control.

Von Holdt's analysis of the public health bureaucracy in helpful in analysing these dynamics. He argues:

> it is extremely difficult to disentangle skill or knowledge and racial power; indeed, they were inseparable. The consequence in the post-apartheid state has been a degree of ambivalence towards skill and those, mostly white, who have high levels of skill, knowledge and expertise as a consequence of the policies of apartheid.[383]

It is understandable why teachers, systematically de-skilled by the apartheid state, would be fearful of and resent being judged on such skills. This is only compounded by statements, by authority figures from Mbeki to Asmal and others commenters in the media, that characterise SADTU teachers as incompetent, lazy and

[383] Karl von Holdt, "The South African Post-Apartheid Bureaucracy: Inner Workings, Contradictory Rationales and the Developmental State," in *Constructing a Democratic Developmental State in South Africa: Potentials and Challenges*, ed. Omano Edigheji (Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press, 2010).

destructive, as inherently deficient. These critiques (attacks, according to SADTU) often play into the racial gaze, provoking a desire to "save face".[384]

We should also not forget that SADTU, as a union, must be primarily concerned with the material welfare of its members – without its membership, after all, it is nothing. It is therefore in the interests of SADTU to protect its members and their careers. SADTU has its own internal tensions and contradictions that affect its position in policymaking. In this case, that tension is between its nature as a union and its nature as a professional organisation. SADTU has always argued that these are two sides of the same coin, but in the case of appraisal, these identities can contradict one another. I will examine this in more detail in the following chapter.

SADTU's resistance in this case is important to understand because teacher evaluation policies simply cannot succeed without the buy-in of teachers. Previously cosy relations between SADTU and the ANC did not prevent SADTU from threatening mass action, legal action and even "war" against the education departments, should they proceed with the WSE policy.

The WSE debacle signalled a turning point for state-union relations in education, which had been steadily deteriorating since 1999. Although the next appraisal policy process was significantly more inclusive, as I will discuss in the following chapter, this relationship continued to deteriorate significantly as SADTU and the education departments confronted one another in ever more intense conflicts.

[384] von Holdt.

Chapter 6: IQMS

This chapter covers the introduction and implementation of the 2003 *Integrated Quality Management System* (IQMS), which integrated three existing appraisal and performance management policies: DAS, WSE and PDMS.

Finalised in 2003, implemented in 2005, and still in place at the time of this writing (2018), the IQMS has lasted far longer than previous appraisal policies. It has been the subject of multiple studies, policy reviews and interventions. Despite initially being strongly supported by teacher unions and education departments alike, the IQMS quickly became a major point of contention within the education sector. In 2015, following complaints, a SADTU moratorium on IQMS, a teacher development conference, and long negotiations within the ELRC, teacher unions and the DoE agreed upon a replacement – the Quality Management System (QMS), which is yet to be implemented.

The first section of this chapter details the policy context in which IQMS was developed. Unlike the first appraisal policies of the new dispensation (i.e. DAS), which tried to make a decisive break with the past, IQMS built upon its predecessors and was introduced into a heavily populated policy environment. The policymaking process was a return to an earlier style of engagement, more consultative and participatory, following the backlash after the DoE introduced WSE in 2001. The second section briefly describes the policy content of the IQMS and notes significant changes from previous policies. The third section traces the fraught implementation of the IQMS, paying special attention to the responses of SADTU and teachers to the new policy. This section follows developments in this policy to its eventual replacement in 2015 by QMS. The fourth section of this chapter delivers a thorough analysis of the IQMS, focusing on the continuities and changes in this evolving policy area.

6.1: Towards IQMS

The introduction of Whole School Evaluation by the Department of Education, as detailed in the previous chapter, had created significant backlash from SADTU and had further soured the rocky relationship

between the union and the department of education. SADTU had been angered by what it saw as unilateral policy-making by the DoE, particularly in the cases of teacher-centric policy such as WSE being forced on teachers without their consultation and participation. SADTU campaigned forcefully against the WSE policies, threatening legal action as well as mass action. Many teachers refused to implement the policy and barred WSE supervisors from entering schools.

WSE was simply unworkable without SADTU's support. The DoE needed to get the union and its teachers back on board, and committed to reviewing teacher evaluation policies with union participation. The IQMS policymaking process, conducted within the ELRC, was significantly more consultative than the process that had produced the first iteration of WSE.

Negotiations towards the IQMS began in earnest when unions and their members complained about the unnecessary duplications and complexity of evaluation schedules and activities for schools and teachers to navigate.[385] Following years of negotiating, introducing and amending various policies, the system had become cumbersome as there were so many different exercises on appraisal for development, performance management measurement and school evaluation. Teachers were evaluated differently for different, seemingly unrelated purposes, each requiring its own instrument and evaluative framework.

The IQMS was conceived as an answer to these problems. It would streamline and integrate functions of these existing policies into a comprehensive system encompassing developmental appraisal, performance management and whole school evaluation.[386] The policy was negotiated between unions and the DoE within the ELRC. A small team of representatives of education departments and teacher unions finalised the IQMS document, using the *2000 Norms and Standards for Educators* as a vision and a starting point for discussion of the contested area of evaluation instruments and performance standards.[387]

The negotiations towards the IQMS were fierce. SADTU, dedicated to improving the material conditions of their teachers, would not boycott any agreement involving salary or grade progression. Other unions were

[385] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 222.

[386] ELRC, *Resolution No. 8 of 2003: Integrated Quality Management System*, 2003.

[387] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 226. See Department of Education, "Norms and Standards for Educators," *Government Gazette* 415, no. 20844 (February 4, 2000).

keen on more professional development. The DoE wanted to preserve the existence of a low stake appraisal system which could identify and punish poor schools and teachers while rewarding (with a small salary increase) the majority of teachers. The DoE was also keen on consolidating the various reports of different evaluation exercises to acquire a better picture of the performance and development needs of schools and teachers.

SADTU pushed for a four-point rating scale, as it wanted to limit the range so that it would not discriminate against their members working in difficult conditions.[388] SADTU also pushed for educator support to come before evaluation, which is reflected to some degree in the final policy, while evaluates educators' improvement after receiving developmental support.

In de Clercq's interviews with some members of the negotiation team, the SADTU representative said:

> It made sense to start with a vision of teachers and where we want to get. However, in the negotiations over what to evaluate, the differences started to emerge and it became clear that the DoE had other priorities it tried to push the need to monitor the implementation of policies. Unions were wearied about this because we knew the problems that were caused by the lack of departmental support offered to teachers.

The NAPTOSA representative added:

> We started our discussion with a rational approach of using the norms and standards. However, the contestation became fierce over the exact formulation of the instruments and performance standards that what was eventually agreed upon was sometimes not in line with the norms and standards or not exactly what we had in mind in the first place. The major area of conflicts had to do with the widely different contexts and conditions existing in schools and among educators.[389]

The IQMS replaced the DAS, WSE and PDMS policies in 2003 and was implemented in schools in January 2005.

[388] de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa," 248.

[389] de Clercq, 223–24.

6.2: The IQMS instrument

The IQMS integrated three streams of quality assurance policies. According to *Resolution 8 of 2003*:

> The purpose of Developmental Appraisal (DA) is to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner with a view to determining areas of strength and weakness, and to draw up programmes for individual development. The purpose of Performance Measurement (PM) is to evaluate individual teachers for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments and rewards and incentives. The purpose of Whole School Evaluation (WSE) is to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a school – including the support provided by the District, school management, infrastructure and learning resources – as well as the quality of teaching and learning.[390]

The proclaimed purposes of the IQMS were to determine competence, assess strengths and areas for development, provide support and opportunities for development to assure continued growth, promote accountability and monitor an institution's overall effectiveness.

This evaluation system combines educator monitoring and appraisal for development and is based on an instrument with standardised performance areas. The IQMS follows an annual cycle that includes a very lengthy process of 20 stages in two parts.

6.2.1: The WSE component

The WSE component of IQMS is very similar to the original WSE policy introduced in 2001. It has nine performance areas which are evaluated: basic functionality; leadership/management and communication; governance and relationships; quality of teaching and educator development; curriculum provision and resources; learners' achievements; school safety, security and discipline; school infrastructure; and links with parents and the community.

The difference is that there is integration between the school and educator component through the fourth standard, the quality of teaching and educator development, which consists of lesson observation and relies

[390] ELRC, *Resolution No. 8 of 2003: IQMS*, 3.

on similar criteria to those spelled out in the educator component of the IQMS. The observation is also to be done by the WSE supervisor together with a member of the teacher's DSG.

6.2.2: The educator component

The IQMS educator component is an integration of the previous Developmental Appraisal System and Performance Measurement policies. In 2008 this was renamed the Performance Management and Development System (PMDS).

The original aim of DAS was to evaluate educators in order to identify needs for support and development – an explicitly developmental aim. PM, on the other hand, was a bureaucratic accountability measure, aimed at evaluating educators in order to determine salary progression, promotion and other rewards and incentives. This IQMS educator component combined developmental and performance appraisal in order to reduce the complexity and duplicity of the previous system and to ensure that teachers were evaluated against the same conceptualisation of effective teaching, based on the same 12 standards. These 12 standards were drawn from the PMDS rather than DAS, which had more flexible and context-sensitive criteria.

The first part of the instrument is used for lesson observation with four individual-based teaching performance standards. 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 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.[391]

Educators do their on-going self-evaluations on the basis of this instrument, which is then verified by a development support group (DSG), consisting of a head of department and a 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).

[391] 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 education management development.

All teachers' PGPs are consolidated by the Staff Development Team into an Educator Improvement Plan (EIP) whose implementation and training is the responsibility of the district office. The EIPs are then incorporated into the School Improvement Plan (SIP) as one of the nine areas of the WSE school performance areas. 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 for purposes of pay or grade progression. If the educators did not perform satisfactorily, they would not receive the 1% increment in their salary that "good" teachers would receive. If their rating was good three years in a row, they would get 1% each year plus 2% in the third year. It was now possible for teachers to move from one grade to another even though they might not be in a promotion post.

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. The scores of educators are then internally moderated by the senior management team /principal and externally verified by district officials.

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 1st-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

6.3: Implementation of IQMS

The implementation of the IQMS was hampered by a combination of factors, including an 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.

In 2007 the department of education commissioned a review of the IQMS implementation process. The review identified two major challenges. The first was 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 teachers did not understand professional development to be part of the process. The second major challenge was the lack of professional development opportunities for all teachers and a lack of quality assurance of development programmes.[392]

Acting on the results of the review, 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. They found the following problems:

Inadequate coordination and integration.
A lack of proper training of both teachers and education officials with regard to the IQMS processes.
Perceptions that the IQMS mechanisms are confusing and time-consuming.
A lack of quality assurance of development programmes.
A lack of capacity to manage the IQMS processes at various levels, including a failure to allocate necessary budgets.
Resistance by teacher unions to certain IQMS processes.
A lingering memory of top-down and non-participatory apartheid mechanisms.

[392] Class Act Educational Services, "National Review of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)," Report commissioned by National Department of Education, 2007.

A lack of feedback to teachers who did undergo evaluations, and a consequent failure to meet their specific developmental needs.

A focus by teachers on financial rewards rather than professional development.

The inflation of evaluation scores.[393]

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. Their 14 key findings were:

1) that there is broad recognition of the crisis in education and the limitations of existing evaluation instruments to, in themselves, remedy the situation
2) that there is widespread consensus on the need for stronger accountability measures alongside developmental support to be introduced into the school system
3) that there is reluctance in some quarters to change existing monitoring and evaluation initiatives not only because of the potential disruption but also because recent measures (such as IQMS) have not yet had enough time for expression in educational practice
4) that there is considerable variation in the capacity of provinces and schools for the interpretation and implementation of existing evaluation and development measures
5) that both authority and expertise at all levels (teacher, HOD, principal, school, district, province, national) remain important requirements for effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation
6) that deeper and more fundamental problems (e.g. curriculum organisation, time on task, school dysfunctionality) undermine sophisticated efforts to monitor and evaluate school and teacher performance
7) that the system of evaluating teachers and schools is still considerably immature, with the incapacity for self-scrutiny among many (though certainly not all) professionals
8) that the issue of excessive complexity in existing evaluation instruments is still not resolved inside the crowded ecology of evaluation, appraisal, and development policies, plans and processes
9) that the existing system for evaluation and appraisal faces a growing credibility crisis because of the functional breakdown between school/teacher evaluation and developmental follow-through actions to effectively address problems identified
10) that the co-mingling of developmentally-focused evaluation and remuneration-focused appraisal compromises the validity of measures of school or teacher performance
11) that in practice the evaluation instruments do not monitor the impact of policy on teaching and learning; they monitor policy compliance

[393] Department of Basic Education and Department of Higher Education and Training, *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa 2011-2025: Technical Report*, (Pretoria, 2011), 73–74

12) that the failure to separate curriculum support and advisory roles from curriculum monitoring roles constrains the credibility of both
13) that there is an unspoken complicity between school and district that compromises the monitoring of IQMS educator performance
14) that leadership is critical at provincial and school level to make the best out of the complexity of evaluation and development efforts and instruments.[394]

This NEEDU review found "no evidence that IQMS in its present form will be able to serve as an effective mechanism for accountability."[395]

Following continuous problems with the IQMS and teacher development more generally, DBE and DHET organized a Teacher Development Summit in 2009. The summit was attended by all major stakeholders, including representatives from teacher unions and currently working educators. The summit was meant to examine all challenges to teacher development and propose strategies to address them.

Much of the discussion centred on the IQMS specifically. The summit found broad consensus on appraisal issues – an across-the-board dissatisfaction with IQMS and its lack of results in the area of teacher development. The summit found that "education departments and teachers' unions have invested heavily in the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) but the outcomes have not yet justified the effort."[396] Other issues included that teachers were overloaded by policy and collective agreement requirements; policy was unclear and not focused enough on classroom practices; poor communication flows; and lack of opportunities for professional development.[397]

That IQMS was flawed and had many inconsistencies was articulated by multiple stakeholders. There were three major areas of discontent. The first, and by far the biggest, issue was the linking of pay and career progression to evaluation (in other words, the conflation of formative and summative evaluation). It was argued that the IQMS creates an active disincentive for teachers to be honest about their needs and

[394] Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report," 43–61.

[395] Department of Education, 47.

[396] ELRC, "Perfecting the Art of Teaching: Teacher Development Summit 29 June - 2 July 2009 Report," 2009; SADTU, "Teacher Development Summit Resource Documents," June 2009, SADTU Collection, AH3389, I4, Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

[397] ELRC, "Teacher Development Summit Report," 62–63.

shortcomings, as the same evaluations used for professional development are used for rewards, promotions and remuneration.

The second issue, closely linked, was that the IQMS locates teachers as both referees and players, with no systems in place to monitor implementation. The third issue was a lack of coordination and support at a departmental level combined with too much bureaucratic control by the DBE. Policies are implemented hurriedly; and before the policy catches on, the department embarks on reviewing it, which confuses the teachers.

Stakeholders at the summit resolved in a declaration:

> A clear, coherent policy and regulatory environment will be designed for both teacher appraisal and teacher development, which teachers and other role-players can easily understand and with which they can readily engage.
> Teacher appraisal for purposes of development will be delinked from appraisal for purposes of remuneration and salary progression.
> IQMS will be streamlined and rebranded. Mechanisms for identifying and responding to teacher development needs will be improved, particularly in relation to developing curriculum competence that will enhance the quality of teaching and learning in our schools. This should be done in a way that secures the trust and confidence of teachers, so that they are able to discuss their own challenges in a non-punitive environment and are able to access relevant mentoring, support and training that is targeted to their needs.[398]

By 2011, the department had undertaken multiple reviews and diagnostic interventions into the IQMS, all with the same or similar findings: implementation problems, fundamental inconsistencies and contradictions within the mechanism itself, and next to no tangible improvement in the quality of teaching.

Following the Teacher Summit, the DBE and the DHET launched the *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development (ISPFTED) in South Africa 2011–2025* in April 2011. The primary outcome is "to improve the quality of teacher education and development in order to improve the quality of teachers and teaching".[399] ISPFTED advocates the creation of new structures, including a National

[398] ELRC, "Teacher Development Summit Report."

[399] Department of Basic Education and Department of Higher Education and Training, *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011-2025* (Pretoria: Department of Basic Education : Department of higher education & Training, 2011).

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 delinks teacher appraisal for development from appraisal for remuneration and salary progression.

For the first few years after the adoption of IQMS, SADTU was largely supportive of the system. Any problems were consistently viewed as implementation problems that the DBE needed to fix, and not problems inherent to the evaluation system. SADTU often rejected other attempts at appraisal mechanisms on the basis that IQMS was a good system that just needed to be implemented properly – any further evaluation policies would be duplicative and unnecessary.

However, around 2009 SADTU began to object strongly to several fundamental aspects of the IQMS. SADTU was mostly concerned about the policy's dual functions (both formative and summative evaluation); the lack of support and meaningful development opportunities from the department; and the burden on educators.

In 2011, the National General Council of SADTU resolved to "reject the Teacher Performance Appraisal in its current form". They further resolved:

> To cause the ELRC to commission the study on the IQMS in order to identify the strengths and the challenges related to its implementation;
> That Learner performance should not be included as part of appraising Educators
> That there should be one performance appraisal system for all School-based Educators;
> To insist on the re-packaging of the IQMS to reflect the de-linking aspect as resolved by the Teacher Development summit with a view of strengthening it by 2012.[400]

SADTU's rejection of the IQMS was unequivocal by 2014. A SADTU discussion document expresses the union's regret at having signed the policy initially. It is worth quoting at length:

> Since its inception and operationalisation certain aspects which are embedded in the agreement have proved to be an albatross around the teacher's neck. SADTU signed this agreement without intensive interrogation of some issues and conceptualise the consequences of what will be the outcome. SADTU's most area of interest and strategic thinking at that time was to focus on having a appraisal management system that is biased in favour of

[400] SADTU, "Declaration of the National General Council of the South African Democratic Teachers Union," November 27, 2011.

> teacher professional development and personal growth. This blurred its vision in seeing beyond this point when signing the agreement. It was only in the process of involvement in implementation and practise of IOMS by their members that certain aspects in the IQMS became thorny.
>
> Any performance programme like IQMS that is developed and hazily parachuted into operation without going into a process of piloting, experimentation and evaluation is bound to stagger and stumble in the implementation route. It is a fact that SADTU as a union was understandably in a hurry to have a new paradigm shift in working conditions of their members and to see them developed professionally because they had not long ago emerged from an education system that left them underdeveloped and their profession eroded. The education Department was also under pressure to implement teacher education policies and programmes that would bring a new era of change and development in the country. It had the burden of distributing scarce resources and addressing socio-economic disparities of the past. There was an attempt to tackle too many problems at once with little resources and rushed planning which led to inefficiencies and even a paralysis of the transformation process. The new democratic government brought in administrative personnel and new political bureaucrats in government with insufficient level of knowledge and skills. All these brought unintended consequences which were too ghastly to contemplate.[401]

The ELRC was tasked with the responsibility to streamline and rebrand the IQMS. Accordingly, a new Quality Management System (QMS) was developed by a task team of the ELRC. SADTU was heavily involved in the development of the new QMS following the recommendations of the Teacher Summit and ISPFTED. They are currently refusing to sign the collective agreement on QMS as a means of bargaining with the DBE on salary-related issues. The QMS, which was accepted by all parties in 2015, has still not been adopted for this reason.[402]

6.4: Analysis of IQMS

It has become increasingly clear that the IQMS has failed to live up to expectations. In the most basic assessment, it appears that IQMS has failed in its primary function – that of accurately assessing the quality

---

[401] SADTU, "Performance Management System, Performance Based Reward and the Professional Development of Teachers: Some Critical Implementation Challenges in Education" (Discussion document, September 19, 2014), https://sadtu.org.za/docs/disc/2014/performance_based_reward.pdf.

[402] Centre for Development and Enterprise, "Teacher Evaluation in South African Schools," trans. CDE, Building on What Works in Education (Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise, 2015), http://www.cde.org.za/teacher-evaluation-in-south-african-schools/.

of teaching in South Africa. The 2007 Class Act review on the IQMS found serious problems of reliability in educators' scores.[403] The 2011/2012 department of education report on IQMS found, for example, that the performance level of the vast majority educators from 2009 to 2011 was 'good' or 'outstanding', despite the poor quality of education at most South African schools.[404] The Auditor General of South Africa, in their education sector reports from 2014 to 2016, also determined that most IQMS information was unreliable.[405] The decision to replace IQMS with QMS shows that the policy has not been successful.

IQMS was meant to be a tool of quality assurance, which would assist the department of education in improving the quality of education in schools. Given the failure of IQMS to accurately evaluate teaching, it is impossible to see if IQMS has indeed been good for quality. Despite higher matriculation scores, which are not a good measurement standard, studies of the quality of education and learner achievement in South Africa have been damning.[406]

The following section will analyse some of the challenges in the IQMS process.

6.4.1: Conflation of summative and formative evaluation

One of the central issues in the discussion of the IQMS has been the combination of summative and formative evaluation within a single instrument. This was by design; the previous separation of appraisal forms was considered too complex and burdensome for educators.[407] However, this proved to be one of the most strongly criticised aspects of the system. This conflation is most obviously seen in the linking of appraisal for purposes of development and appraisal for purposes of remuneration and salary progression,

---

[403] Class Act Educational Services, "National Review of the IQMS."

[404] Department of Basic Education, "IQMS Annual Report 2011/2012" (Department of Basic Education, n.d.).

[405] Auditor General of South Africa, "Education Sector Report for 2015-16."

[406] Meshack Qetelo Moloi and Mark Chetty, "The SACMEQ III Project in South Africa: A Study of the Conditions of Schooling and the Quality of Education," SACMEQ Educational Policy Research Series (Pretoria: Ministry of Basic Education, 2010); Muller et al., "PIRLS 2016 International Results in Reading"; "Value in the Classroom: The Quantity and Quality of South Africa's Teachers" (Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise, 2011), http://www.cde.org.za/value-in-the-classroom-the-quantity-and-quality-of-south-africa-s-teachers/; van der Berg et al., "Identifying Binding Constraints in Education"; Spaull, "South Africa's Education Crisis."

[407] Department of Education, "Report to the Portfolio Committee on the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)," June 20, 2006.

as well as appraisal for accountability. These two ends are often opposed – as was pointed out extensively in the Teacher Development Summit and subsequent proposals for reform.[408]

The issue of accountability (besides technocratic issues of implementation) is what has garnered the most attention from educationists and other academics.[409] The argument put forward by teacher unions and researchers is that the linkage of evaluation to remuneration and reward renders the IQMS useless as a meaningful tool for performance measurement. IQMS involves extensive self- and peer-evaluation. Teachers are discouraged from critically and genuinely engaging with their weaknesses in order to qualify for promotions and raises, or at least to avoid punishment for their shortcomings. The inflation of evaluation scores for this reason is well known.[410] This defeats both ends of the policy – the DoE cannot hold teachers to account based on unreliable, inflated scores, and professional development cannot take place if teachers do not engage authentically with the process.

This is not a practical implementation problem; it is inherent to the design of the policy. While there may be ways to mitigate these contradictory incentives, teacher unions and the DoE have all called for developmental appraisal and accountability appraisal to be de-linked.[411]

6.4.2: Internal professional evaluation in the South African classroom

A set of contradictions and weaknesses in the policy render meaningful "accountability" through self- and peer-evaluation unlikely. The type of accountability promoted the IQMS is what the NEEDU report termed "a mild form of internal professional teacher accountability."[412] Much like the DAS, the IQMS process is

---

[408] ELRC, "Teacher Development Summit Report"; SADTU, "Performance Management System, Performance Based Reward and the Professional Development of Teachers: Some Critical Implementation Challenges in Education."

[409] Francine de Clercq, "Teacher Quality, Appraisal and Development: The Flaws in the IQMS," *Perspectives in Education* 26, no. 1 (March 2008): 7–18; Barath Biputh and Sioux McKenna, "Tensions in the Quality Assurance Processes in Post-apartheid South African Schools," *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 40, no. 3 (May 1, 2010): 279–91, https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920902955892.

[410] Class Act Educational Services, "National Review of the IQMS"; Department of Basic Education, "IQMS Annual Report 2011/2012."

[411] ELRC, "Teacher Development Summit Report"; SADTU, "Declaration of the National General Council of the South African Democratic Teachers Union."

[412] Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report," 25.

driven by self-evaluation. There are two fundamentally problematic assumptions that underpin this process. The first is that teachers are pro-active professionals committed to improving their teaching, and able to conduct honest and accurate reflexive evaluations. The second is that schools have an open, trusting and collaborative climate and culture where educators and other staff work together in professional development.[413]

The first assumption fails to take into consideration the real competencies and attitudes of most teachers in South Africa. In chapter four, I discussed a similar failing in the 1998 DAS policy. In that analysis, I argued that educators often lack the necessary skills to evaluate themselves and their peers effectively. There is still a significant number of un- and under-qualified teachers in the system. Although this number has decreased since the days of DAS, it is still a problem in the current context.[414] But even teachers who have the requisite qualifications lack the skills and training needed to make sure of internal evaluation effectively. IQMS reviews have found that most teachers and their DSGs do not know how to conduct an effective analysis of teacher performance and prioritise their development needs.[415] Neither have they been given the necessary training and opportunities to help them meet make use of these instruments.

This has been exacerbated by changes in curriculum (the change to OBE and then the change to CAPS, explored below) which have dramatically changed conceptions of "good teaching", and which have represented major changes in educators' work status, identity and demands.[416] These policies require educators in poorly functioning schools in particular to acquire much higher levels of professional competence, but the DoE has not sufficiently provided the means for teachers to achieve this. For example, many teachers did not understand the principles and pedagogy behind OBE – they surely would not be able to evaluate their performance in delivering the curriculum. OBE's replacement, CAPS, a much more

[413] See de Clercq, "Teacher Quality, Appraisal and Development"; de Clercq, "Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa."

[414] In 2017, the DBE official counted 5139 un- and under-qualified teachers. Minister of Basic Education, "Written Reply: Question NW1938 to the Minister of Basic Education" (Parliamentary Monitoring Group, June 23, 2017), https://pmg.org.za/committee-question/6105/.

[415] Class Act Educational Services, "National Review of the IQMS"; Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report"; Centre for Development and Enterprise, "Teacher Evaluation in South African Schools."

[416] Harley et al., "'The Real and the Ideal.'"

prescriptive curriculum, emphasises content learning. But many South African teachers have very low levels of content knowledge and do not have the knowledge to evaluate themselves or their peers.

IQMS assumes that educators are able to carry out reflexive professional evaluation but does not create the conditions necessary for this to happen. The IQMS implementation process included training for educators and other staff on the use of the system but this training has remained largely ineffective, and support from district- and higher-level officials has been broadly lacking.

The second assumption – that teachers have an open, collaborative and trusting work environment – is also necessary for the IQMS to work as intended. The evaluation process requires teachers to evaluate each other honestly and to work in teams to hold each other to account. This assumption fails to understand the attitudes and work environments of many educators. I have discussed in previous chapters how the teaching profession has been shaped by history. Many teachers are distrustful and suspicious of the state, but also of their peers and supervisors. This working environment is far from conducive for the kind of reflexive, collaborative self-assessment imagined within the IQMS.

6.4.3: Ideological tension

Major ideological tensions are evident in the IQMS policy documents themselves: the result of many years of negotiations (and conflict) between unions and the state in the ELRC and outside of it. The final policy and instrument are reflective of compromises reached through collective bargaining and show contradictions.

There is a contradiction between ideologies of education – a tension between a bureaucratic, human capital approach to education and an approach encapsulated by the People's Education movement in the liberation struggle. These two approaches are fundamentally opposed. Both SADTU and the ANC repeatedly re-affirm their commitment to the principles of People's Education in various policy documents, press releases and speeches. During negotiations, SADTU repeatedly calls for a democratic and developmental programme of teacher quality management, while the state stresses the need for government-led accountability and evaluation. These two ideas – development and accountability – co-exist uneasily within the IQMS.

The call to democratise teacher appraisal is evident within the IQMS, whose processes emphasise self- and peer-evaluation. At the same time, the policy documents borrow heavily from a familiar international language – that of new public management. The language ("accountability", "management", "monitoring", "performance measurement", "quality assurance,", "competence") used is consistent with this global trend of education reform.[417] The evaluations themselves take the form of predetermined and prescriptive checklists – the process is bureaucratic and linear, emphasising chains of authority in practice rather than democratising the process.

In reality, the developmental function of the IQMS is rarely seen. Much like DAS, the lack of real development opportunities and meaningful feedback resulting from the evaluations has been a significant complaint raised by educators and unions. The implementation process of the IQMS, as well as some other shortcomings detailed below, have emphasised the bureaucratic, managerial elements of the system and neglected the developmental, supportive aspects.

6.4.4: Compliance and engagement

NEEDU, Class Act and other reviews of IQMS have found that the system monitors, at best, compliance with the IQMS instrument and not the quality of teaching.[418] Biputh and McKenna's 2010 study found that most educators viewed the IQMS as a bureaucratic, paper exercise rather than a reflective and developmental process, and that they viewed it as something with which they had to comply at a surface level rather than something with which they had to engage at a deeper level.[419]

Consequently, the IQMS fails to monitor the impact of policy and policy reforms on the quality of teaching. However, departmental reviews of the IQMS focus on compliance and implementation in their reporting and evaluation of the system.[420] Interventions by the DBE, such as the appointment of external monitors in

[417] Everard Weber, "New Controls and Accountability for South African Teachers and Schools: The Integrated Quality Management System," 2005, http://reference.sabinet.co.za/document/EJC87315.

[418] Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report"; Class Act Educational Services, "National Review of the IQMS"; Department of Education, "Report to the Portfolio Committee on the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)."

[419] Biputh and McKenna, "Tensions in Quality Assurance Processes."

[420] Department of Basic Education, "IQMS Annual Report 2011/2012."

2008 or strategies adopted in the 2009 Teacher Development Summit, also focus on improving compliance with the system and not on the system's ability to fulfil its fundamental purpose – to improve to quality of teaching and schooling.

The focus on compliance has created further issues. The increased bureaucratic workload on teachers has been a major consequence of IQMS, which places further constraints on the time and energy of teachers. Teachers, especially teachers in poorer, black schools, are faced with more and more administrative and supervision work. Given the conditions in rural and poor areas, teachers also have to spend a lot more time on pastoral care. All this means that teachers spend less time teaching, and those who teach in poor schools are disproportionately overloaded.[421]

The lack of support from the department and lack of development opportunities (covered later), further create a perception of IQMS as a useless task to be completed.

Studies have shown that educators do view IQMS as a task of compliance and not as a process of professional development. Some educators feel strongly that "the entire IQMS process was a strategy to ensure compliance with departmental regulations and requirements under the guise of being a developmental exercise".[422] This compliance discourse contributes to an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion already felt strongly by many teachers.

6.4.5: Unclear and inappropriate performance measures

The IQMS evaluation instrument itself is a bureaucratic, one-size-fits-all checklist. The performance measures are often vague and open to interpretation. The language in the IQMS policy documents, as well as the training manuals and other supplementary literature, is ambiguous and abstract, leading to multiple possible interpretations of basic units of evaluation in the instrument. For example, the performance areas make reference to a "conducive learning environment" without elaborating on what this might mean in some

[421] See Chisholm et al., "Educator Workload in South Africa."

[422] Biputh and McKenna, "Tensions in Quality Assurance Processes," 287.

schools' contexts of extreme poverty. The lack of clarity of these measures is further compounded by inadequate communication between teachers, schools, districts and the DoE.[423]

However, it is clear that more fundamental problems with the measures exist. Teachers have reported in multiple forums and submissions to review committees that the performance measures do not adequately capture "the most important core function of schooling", namely the level of learning achieved in schools among their particular learners.[424] In fact, learners are completely absent from the evaluation framework – the standards contain no criteria for the response of learners to lessons. They also do not include any criteria relating to the improvement of teaching and learning or school-based professional development.

Considering the aspects of teachers' work on which the IQMS focuses, it seems that the most salient factors in teacher effectiveness research are ignored. These factors include content and pedagogical content knowledge, time on task, use of textbooks and materials, conducive relationship between teachers, learners and teaching materials.

Unions, in particular SADTU, have been adamant that learner performance should not be part of teacher evaluations as they fear teachers will be blamed for poor results that are due to socio-economic contextual factors.[425] Nevertheless, the lack of learner-focused variables in the evaluation framework remains a major cause of concern for both teachers and educationists.

The performance measurement areas were not amended after the CAPS curriculum was rolled out. This is concerning as CAPS expects a different set of teachers' skills, knowledge and outcomes to its predecessor; teaching under CAPS should not be evaluated in the same way as teaching under C2005 or RNCS. Some of the criteria are too vague to be applied helpfully, while others may prove to be inappropriate under a new curriculum model.

---

[423] ELRC, "Teacher Development Summit Report."

[424] Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report," 60.

[425] Sphiwe Mboyane, "SADTU Rejects New Evaluation System," City Press, May 19, 2002.

6.4.6: Complexity and confusion

The "excessive" complexity of the system has been cited in all DBE reviews as a major challenge for the implementation of IQMS. IQMS was meant to streamline three existing policies which were confusing and often duplicated functions, yet ended up replicating many of the initial challenges faced by DAS, WSE and PMDS. There is considerable confusion by educators and other practitioners in the field about the status of these policies and how they refer to one another. Years after the initial adoption of IQMS there were still provinces conducting separate WSE processes according to the outdated WSE policies. Another significant area of confusion was the distinction between School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and School Development Plans (SDPs) and corresponding plans at district level. .[426]

The purpose and location of these policies contribute to this excessive complexity. By 2009, IQMS and WSE were still located in different directorates at the national level. Similarly, at the provincial level, these monitoring and evaluation functions fall under a range of different units and directorates each with their own logic, resources and capacities. Departmental documents frequently reference teachers' "perceptions" and "misconceptions" about the IQMS as an obstacle to successful implementation. Further studies on the perceptions and responses of teachers to IQMS show that this is indeed a significant problem: there is a fundamental confusion about the purpose of various arms of the evaluation policy.[427] At best this leads to an ineffective implementation that cannot fulfil the goals of IQMS – at worst, this confusion contributes to an atmosphere of mistrust and defensiveness.

6.4.7: Teacher and resistance

The DoE has consistently reported problems with teacher resistance and what the department terms "perceptions" about the nature of IQMS. Without the willingness of educators to engage with evaluation in good faith, the IQMS cannot work as it is supposed to. While there is no mass resistance to the IQMS, many

[426] Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report," 54; Sphiwe Mboyane, "SADTU Rejects New Evaluation System."

[427] Biputh and McKenna, "Tensions in Quality Assurance Processes"; Thobela Nozidumo Queen-Mary and Oliver Mtapuri, "Teachers' Perceptions of the Integrated Quality Management System: Lessons from Mpumalanga, South Africa," *South African Journal of Education* 34, no. 1 (2014): 1–14; de Clercq, "Teacher Quality, Appraisal and Development."

teachers are defensive and unconvinced of the developmental nature of the IQMS, and thus do not take it seriously.[428] NEEDU found in their investigation a "generally positive attitude among teachers and principals toward monitoring and evaluation through interventions like IQMS". This was undermined by the lack of follow-up from the department – teachers saw no developmental gains for their work.[429]

IQMS has not provoked the same hostility and defensiveness as WSE, but it has not truly succeeded in securing the buy-in of teachers. Teachers who engage with the evaluation system in good will do not see any results in terms of support and development. In such a situation, the conflation of summative and formative evaluation becomes almost impossible to resolve – why should teachers risk pay and promotions in engaging their weaknesses honestly when there is no benefit in doing so? It is little wonder that most teachers see the IQMS evaluations as rote exercises of compliance.

6.5: Conclusion

While IQMS has not changed since 2003, SADTU's support of it has changed dramatically over time. SADTU initially strongly supported the IQMS and defended it as a developmental, democratic appraisal system that just needed time and better implementation strategies to become effective. Nine years later SADTU resolved to reject the system in its entirety, criticising the policy for conflating formative and summative appraisal and for failing to provide teachers with genuine support for professional development.

It is clear that the IQMS retains many of the problems of its predecessors, DAS and WSE. In fact, many of the fundamental policy constraints I identified in my analysis remain unchanged. But IQMS has introduced a slew of new complications into the system by trying to be all things to all people. The document is clearly a product of contestation, negotiation and compromise. We can see that in its conflation of formative and summative evaluation, in its vague and inappropriate standards and criteria, in its contradictory ideologies and in its excessive complexity.

[428] Biputh and McKenna, "Tensions in Quality Assurance Processes"; ELRC, "Teacher Development Summit Report."

[429] Department of Education, "NEEDU Final Report," 56.

Due to these unresolved contradictions and tensions, the IQMS seems to have had a minimal effect on teaching. While schools are implementing the system, this achieves little more than compliance for its own sake. It has been ineffective as a tool for professional development. It has also failed to produce reliable, measurable data on teaching quality, and it hasn't been able to function effectively as a tool for bureaucratic accountability.

The relationship between SADTU and the state also changed during this time period, although in many ways it has remained the same. SADTU came into repeated conflicts with the department of education on various proposed policies such as performance contracts for principals, the declaration of education as an essential service, the biometric tracking of teachers in schools, and the introduction of Annual National Assessments (ANAs).

In 2008, SADTU called for the resignation of Education Minister Naledi Pandor after she announced salary increases without consulting unions.[430] In 2013, SADTU called for the resignation of Education Minister Angie Motshekga and Director-General Bobby Soobrayan for "undermining collective bargaining" and "dismal performance" after Soobrayan withdraw from a collective agreement concerning salary increases that the department claimed had been signed in error.[431] SADTU has repeatedly attacked Motshekga over policy issues, accusing her department of waging a "well-orchestrated low-intensity war against the unions", calling her a "DA agent trying to reverse what the Freedom Charter propagated."[432]

The department of education, meanwhile, has pushed back against and conceded to SADTU in turns. In 2017, the DoE announced ANAs would go ahead despite SADTU's threats to boycott, then backtracked almost immediately. The 2016 Ministerial Committee "Jobs for Cash" report, released by the DoE, appeared to be a damning indictment of SADTU's involvement in the sale of posts as well the "stranglehold" SADTU

[430] Staff Reporter, "Union Angrily Rejects Teachers' Pay Hike," *Mail and Guardian*, June 5, 2008, https://mg.co.za/article/2008-06-05-union-angrily-rejects-teachers-pay-hike.

[431] SADTU, "SADTU Memorandum of Demands: In Defense of Collective Bargaining and Quality Public Education" (Press statement, April 25, 2013), http://www.politicsweb.co.za/documents/sadtus-memorandum-of-demands-full-text.

[432] Batlile Phaladi, "Angie Is a DA Agent, Says Sadtu," *The Citizen*, June 9, 2016, http://citizen.co.za/news/south-africa/1152425/angie-is-a-da-agent-says-sadtu/; Bongani Nkosi, "Sadtu: Boycott National Assessments in Schools," *Mail & Guardian Online*, September 2, 2015, http://mg.co.za/article/2015-09-02-sadtu-calls-for-boycott-of-national-assessments/.

had over the education system.[433] Motshekga walked this back too, claiming there was no evidence to implicate SADTU in any wrongdoing. In 2017, seemingly back on good terms with the union, she was a keynote speaker at a SADTU National General Council and pointedly thanked SADTU in an address to parliament.

This chaotic relationship between SADTU and the education department reflects more than just contestations over policy. The political power and massive membership of SADTU, as well the proliferation of SADTU members at every level of the education bureaucracy, mean that it is almost impossible for the department of education to introduce new teacher policy without SADTU's agreement. SADTU has the ability to bring the education system to a standstill, and a clear willingness to do so if it deems it necessary. While SADTU has been able to block individual policy proposals, however, it seems to be losing its position of domination in ANC policymaking; SADTU responds to ANC positions instead of contributing to their development. Meanwhile, repeated attacks on SADTU in the media and from opposition parties force the ANC to defend its alliance partner.

The state and unions alike have agreed that the IQMS needs to be revised or replaced. This process began years ago; in 2015 the Quality Management System (QMS) was agreed in the ELRC. Though all parties have agreed to it, the system has not been implemented because SADTU refuses to sign the agreement until government has agreed to a pay increase in a separate negotiation. The department does not need legally require SADTU's signature, but to attempt to implement the QMS without SADTU's acquiescence would be impossible. This policy process seems to have stalled completely since then – in which time I have started and completed this dissertation.

[433] Department of Basic Education, "Ministerial Task Team Report on Sale of Educator Posts."

Chapter 7: Conclusions

7.1: Key observations

7.1.1: Conflicts and negotiations

The development of appraisal policy has reflected the complex relationship between SADTU, the state and the ANC. As these relationships have changed, so too has the policymaking process.

DAS was developed during a period of high collaboration and support between the ANC and SADTU, and when the department of education was dominated by former SADTU leaders. The process was highly participatory and democratic, and the final policy reflects the significant input from SADTU. WSE was developed unilaterally by the department of education, which worsened an already deteriorating relationship and resulted in significant backlash from the union. The consultative development process of IQMS, then, was an attempt to ameliorate this situation and to get SADTU back on board. The IQMS reflects these politics of compromise and negotiation, trying to be all things to all people, ending up riddled with internal tensions and contradictions. These policy positions change over time, too; SADTU went from being a staunch supporter of the IQMS to vehemently rejecting it.

The QMS process has ground to a halt, perhaps reflecting the stagnation in education policy in general, but definitely demonstrating that policymaking and implementation process are not isolated – in this case, SADTU uses appraisal policy as a bargaining chip in unrelated negotiations. The politics of these processes extend far beyond the immediate contestation of policy issues. The delay in the QMS process also demonstrates the SADTU's ability to block policy implementation.

The historical approach helps us understand these actors with greater depth and nuance. SADTU's history of resistance to state control, fighting for recognition and balancing (often uneasily) professionalism and unionism has informed its policy positions, identity and relationships. Similarly, we cannot understand post-1994 appraisal policies without understanding the greater policy context of the transition. DAS, for example, was a product of this policy context which was highly symbolic and democratic but weak on issues of

implementation and educational change. WSE was also a product of its policy context – the shift away from People's Education discourse towards a more managerialist, neoliberal paradigm.

Last year Cyril Ramaphosa courted the union as he continued with his campaign for the ANC presidency, calling the union "great and powerful":

> SADTU occupies a special place in the struggle as it fought and won the battle for recognition of teacher unions in SA. There are some who look at SADTU and say the union is too powerful, is a burden, and is not contributing to the transformation of the education system. Well ... I know that SADTU has been a partner in the transformation of our education system. This I know for a fact.[434]

SADTU's power in education policymaking is undeniable, and this does not look set to change any time soon as long as the ANC and SADTU are inextricable from the each other and the state.

7.1.2: Confronting history in policymaking

Teacher appraisal policies have tried to confront the legacy of apartheid education while addressing contemporary challenges, to varying degrees of success.

DAS was presented as a decisive break with the apartheid inspectorate system – as democratic, developmental and transformative. It discarded all the elements of the previous system that were perceived as authoritarian and oppressive, such as its lack of transparency, inspections, bureaucratic checklists, punishments, and inappropriate performance standards. DAS was, instead, an internal evaluation system based on self- and peer-evaluation, meant to promote professionalism and a collaborative mode of professional development. It was highly context-sensitive and teachers were involved with every stage of the process.

While DAS represented an entirely new mode of appraisal, it failed to address the realities of a teaching profession trained and socialised under apartheid education. Teachers struggled to use DAS effectively as a developmental tool, as they did not have the skills and professional competencies needed to critically and reflexively engage with the system. Schools had not developed a culture of trust, openness and collegiality.

---

[434] Bekezela Phakathi, "Sadtu Is a 'Great and Powerful Union', Cyril Ramaphosa Says," *Business Day*, May 15, 2017, https://www.businesslive.co.za/bd/national/2017-05-15-sadtu-is-a-great-and-powerful-union-cyril-ramaphosa-says/.

Teachers were highly suspicious and mistrustful of evaluations. This was further complicated by new curriculum and education policy has created a new, unfamiliar standard of a "good teacher". Meanwhile, little had changed materially for teachers who were still teaching in poor working conditions, without much resource or developmental support from the state.

DAS ultimately failed to confront these very real legacies of apartheid education. The conditions for its successful implementation and institutionalisation had not been met when the policy was introduced – and the policy itself did not contain the means to create those conditions.

WSE failed to confront this history in a very different way. WSE was a more bureaucratic, external form of evaluation, although it was carefully presented as being very different to apartheid-era inspections. Nevertheless, the policy provoked extreme backlash from SADTU and teachers. WSE evoked memories of the apartheid inspectorate, provoking suspicion, hostility and fear from teachers. These anxieties about control, victimisation and humiliation were reproduced in the new education system despite political changes. For teachers who had not been given further training and development opportunities, their poor performance as a result of apartheid-era teacher training has remained static.

WSE attempted to deal with some of these problems by couching the policy in "progressive" language and keeping standards and criteria vague. It was not successful in making the policy more palatable, and these ambiguous and confusing quality standards were counterproductive in the attempt to create a reliable system of measurement.

IQMS, in bringing together WSE, DAS and PM, tried to respond to the concerns of teachers and unions by reworking and streamlining policy to make it more accessible and understandable. But in attempting to please all groups involved in these negotiations, IQMS was riddled with contradictions and tensions. This was evident in its language, its excessive complexity, its unclear and inappropriate criteria, and its conflation of summative and formative evaluation. It repeated previous policy mistakes by failing to address the realities of teachers and their work, and produced compliance with policy more than real teacher development or accountability.

QMS is another attempt at streamlining and reworking evaluation policy. Time – and SADTU's signature – will tell if it engages differently with these questions.

7.2: Reckoning with failure

Why, ultimately, have these policies failed?

It is clear that they have failed: both in terms of implementation, in that they have not been successfully operationalised and institutionalised, and in terms of results, in that they have not achieved their goals of (variably) improving teacher accountability, aiding in the professional development of teachers, and in improving the quality of education in South African schools. While there are certainly pockets of good practice and workable teacher evaluation, these are exceptions. Where teacher evaluation is extant, it is usually seen as burdensome and punitive, and treated as such by educators.

I argue that, beyond the failure of each individual policy initiative, the policymaking process as a *whole* has failed. Each appraisal policy has been distinct, but all of these policies have followed a particular logic and have been shaped by a particular institutional arrangement. We have seen a process of developing a national, centralised evaluation policy, attempting to achieve uniformity with ever-more complex and unimplementable instruments designed to fit all schools and all contexts and circumstances. The unique political arrangement, and particularly the power wielded by SADTU, has forced policymakers to cater to multiple competing, often mutually exclusive demands. This has produced various policy weaknesses common to all the policies I have examined.

The first is that inherent tensions between the accountability and development functions of appraisal have been reproduced in the policies, which all attempt to achieve both ends in one instrument. These contradictory goals work against each other, drastically weakening the policy's ability to achieve either. DAS was purported to be an entirely developmental system, but government departments were soon frustrated by its lack of teeth, and teachers were not convinced that the system would not punish them for underperformance. WSE's accountability mechanisms belied its claims to be developmental and aroused the suspicions and distrust of SADTU. IQMS, in explicitly combining these functions, achieved neither.

The second weakness is in the national, centralised nature of these policies. The policies have been made generic and flexible so as to account for the vast diversity of South African schools, but this has had the opposite effect. Instead of being universally applicable, they do not make sense for any school's context. They have been made so generic as to be functionally useless. Where the policies have specified performance criteria, they have not managed to be sensitive to the different socioeconomic contexts of individual schools. It is perhaps impossible for one single, central policy to work for all South African schools, given their vast disparities.

The third weakness is consistent unworkability. Implementation plans have been made detailed and elaborate in an attempt to address on-the-ground deficiencies in staff, training and expertise. Again conversely, these plans have become convoluted, confusing and difficult to implement. This has been exacerbated by poor communication, training and support from the department.

Fourthly, these policies have consistently misjudged the realities of teaching in South Africa. Union and state policymakers alike have based policy ideas on illusory ideas of what teachers, principals and administrators are capable of, especially given their training, resources and working conditions. Teachers' roles and responsibilities have changed and expanded dramatically since 1994, but little has been done to adequately train and prepare teachers to be able to meet these expectations. DAS did not manage to create trusting, collaborative working environments in schools, nor did it manage to provide teachers with the skills needed to meaningfully engage with and benefit from self- and peer-evaluation. WSE and IQMS have built on DAS, without rectifying this flawed foundation.

Fifthly, these policies have never addressed the trauma of the apartheid inspectorate, and the distrust, defensiveness and fear that teachers still exhibit in response to external evaluation. While each policy does make reference to apartheid inspectors, this has been superficial, usually as a means to signal that the new policy is different and progressive. The policymaking process has not sufficiently engaged with the way that the apartheid education system socialised teachers in a specific way. These policies have not been supported by strategies to rebuild trust between teachers and the state, to create open and collaborative cultures of work within schools, or restore pride, professionalism and confidence to teachers. This is why any external

evaluation – even when professed to be democratic and non-judgemental – has been met with fear and hostility.

Why are these weaknesses consistently reproduced, even though policies are reviewed, critiqued, renegotiated and reformulated?

Part of the answer lies in the institutional arrangement of policymaking in education. The decline and side-lining of grassroots education movements and groups in the 1990s shifted the conversation into the domain of experts, moderates and national bodies – far away from real classrooms and working teachers. SADTU gained significant power through its massive member base and its relationship to the ANC, ensuring that SADTU plays a critical role in policymaking. Where the state has ignored SADTU, as in the case of WSE in 2001, they have demonstrated their ability to block these measures entirely.

As much as SADTU, the ANC and the state may have similar interests in improving South African schooling, their main interests are always fundamentally opposed. The department of education seeks to assess and control teachers and teachers' work. SADTU seeks to represent its member base: teachers who, by and large, are not able to meet performance standards, who are not able to access real opportunities to improve, and who have very real material concerns about salaries, working conditions and the like. Because of this institutional arrangement, policymakers have been forced to compromise so much as to render these policies self-contradictory and self-defeating.

The level at which these policies are negotiated – national – means that SADTU adopts singular policy positions about the entire schooling system. This makes it almost impossible to properly engage with the geographical, social and economic disparities of the South African education system. The focus on national, centralised policy has its roots in the education activism of the 1980s and 1990s. The fragmented apartheid education system pushed activists to call for unified, equal and national education policies. But the results of that fragmentation are still apparent is the considerable diversity of South African schools, and uniform policies are unable to engage with those unique contexts.

Overall there seems to be a strong reluctance – on both the state and the union's parts – to fully grapple with the consequences of apartheid education.

The spectre of apartheid still haunts the South African school. Teachers are still, by and large, ill-prepared and ill-equipped to deal with the expectations of the new South Africa. These expectations are great – teachers are expected not only to teach subject knowledge, but to act as community leaders, social workers, pastors, mediators and to play a vital role in the transformation of South African society. They often simply do not have the professional knowledge and skills they need to fulfil these roles and meet these expectations competently. The state has failed to provide adequate teacher education, in-service training and support for professional development, leaving even the most well-intentioned educators without the means to acquire these new competencies. It is no wonder, then, that many teachers are hostile towards state attempts to push accountability measures. This has resulted in the reproduction of the same teacher-state relations that flourished under apartheid: suspicion, fear of humiliation, punishment and victimisation, competition and hostility. Teachers and education officials are not working together to improve education, as envisaged in early ANC/SADTU policymaking, but are often locked in battles with no end.

As a consequence, all of these policies have failed to either make teachers more accountable for their performance, or to aid in the professional development of teachers. By not fully confronting the historical causes of teacher underperformance, these policies have been unable to identify and address the real problems. By attempting to address these problems in a superficial way, these policies have in fact reproduced and sometimes exacerbated those problems.

How then do we move forward? A coherent set of recommendations is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but I have some observations that may, I hope, be useful.

Teachers deserve compassion and understanding. Trust needs to be built between teachers and the education departments. Policies need to be made to be accessible and workable. Teachers need real support and professional development opportunities. Plainly, evaluation policies need to be immediately applicable and sensitive to classroom realities. These are not new ideas; in fact, they are articulated in every piece of policy work I have examined. But future policies need to contain strategies for achieving these conditions, instead of assuming they will eventually be met.

It may be time to stop looking for a single solution to evaluation, accountability and development. Each iteration of evaluation policy has been an attempt to standardise and streamline the one before it; but they

instead grow in complexity and elaboration in order to account for the diversity of our schools. The QMS negotiations have made it clear that the systems requires two separate policies for accountability and development; this is a start. Perhaps policy negotiations need to be taking place at provincial or local levels, so that evaluation tools can be tailored to real schools and classrooms. Smaller level processes also force local education departments and teachers to engage with the resources and capacities immediately available to them, and may build trust, relationships and mutual accountability.

7.3: Further questions

In this dissertation, I have tried to examine the history of appraisal policies in post-apartheid South Africa in order to understand the nature – and dysfunction – of our current appraisal system. This historical approach has allowed me to trace the changing relationship between SADTU, the ANC and the state, in order to explain how politics and negotiations have shaped these policies. Appraisal policies reflect these complicated dynamics, while the policies themselves and their outcomes further complicate those union-state relationships.

This historical approach has also allowed me to analyse the successes and failures of these policies in depth and context. Each of these policies has been shaped by, has tried to respond to, and has ultimately failed to confront the challenges of the past. They must also be understood to be a part of that history, each one building upon and responding to the last.

But there is still more work to be done. This study, like all studies, has been limited in some ways.

An area that is worthy of further research is the internal dynamics of SADTU. It is a massive, incredibly powerful union that is central to our education system. My analysis of SADTU in this dissertation has been necessarily generalised and has drawn from the statements and actions of the national body. But the complexity of SADTU – across its branches, at its various levels, and between its leadership and rank-and-file – is direly under-studied. How does SADTU mobilise its membership base effectively? Do rank-and-file members agree with the national leadership? Do SADTU teachers have the same policy priorities as the

union? Answers to these questions would add important depth and nuance to discussions on SADTU and its place in the education system.

Another institution that deserves further study is the department of education. The relationship between the department and SADTU has been difficult to unravel, partly because so many current and former SADTU members work within the education bureaucracy. It would be useful to understand how these competing loyalties and positions are navigated by departmental officials, and how those within the department of education work with SADTU and perceive its role in this space.

This dissertation has focused on national policymaking. But the education system is incredibly uneven in many ways. Schools, union branches, and education policy all differ between provinces. A more localised examination of these dynamics would add important nuance and specificity to this work.

Lastly, it is clear from my analysis that teacher appraisal policies – however they are conceived, developed and implemented – can only do so much. These policies have failed, in a large part, because the education system in South African remains fundamentally dysfunctional. Until there are systematic, structural changes in the ways teachers are trained, resourced and supported, attempts at improving teaching quality through appraisal will be little more than superficial. How to achieve this change is one of the most important issues facing us today. There is a wealth of work being done on this question in South Africa. I hope it growths from strength to strength, and I hope that my work in this dissertation has contributed in some small way to our understanding of how educational change does and does not happen.

Sources

7.4: Primary sources

7.4.1: ELRC Agreements

ELRC. *Resolution No. 1 of 2003: Evaluation Procedures, Processes and Performance Standards for Institution Based Educators*. Pretoria: Government Printer, 2003.

———. *Resolution No. 3 of 2002: Performance Management and Development Scheme*. Pretoria: Government Printer, 2002.

———. *Resolution No. 3 of 2003: Protocol and Instrument for Use When Observing Educators in Practice for the Purpose of Whole-School Evaluation (WSE) and Developmental Appraisal System (DAS)*, 2003.

———. *Resolution No. 4 of 1998: Developmental Appraisal*. Pretoria: Government Printer, 1998.

———. *Resolution No. 6 of 2016: Constitution*. Pretoria: Government Printer, 2016.

———. *Resolution No. 7 of 1998: Workload of Educators*. Pretoria: Education Labour Relations Council, 1998.

———. *Resolution No. 8 of 1998: Duties and Responsibilities of Educators*. Pretoria: Government Printer, 1998.

———. *Resolution No. 8 of 2003: Integrated Quality Management System*, 2003.

———. *Resolution No. 9 of 2002: Evaluation Procedures, Processes and Performance Standards for Institution-Based Educators*. Pretoria: Government Printer, 2002.

7.4.2: National legislation

Republic of South Africa. *Employment of Educators Act No. 76 of 1998*. Pretoria: Government printer, 2008.

———. *Labour Relations Act No. 66 of 1995*. Pretoria: Government printer, 1995.

———. *National Education Policy Act No. 27 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government printer, 1996.

———. *South African Council for Educators Act No. 31 of 2000*. Pretoria: Government printer, 2000.

———. *South African Qualifications Authority Act No. 58 of 1995*. Pretoria: Government printer, 1995.

———. *South African Schools Act No. 84 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government printer, 1996.

7.4.3: Department of Education and government

Class Act Educational Services. *National Review of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)*. Report commissioned by National Department of Education, 2007.

DBE. *IQMS Annual Report 2011/2012*. Department of Basic Education, n.d.

Department of Basic Education. *A National Framework for Teacher Education in South Africa: Report of the Ministerial Committee on Teacher Education*, June 16, 2005.

———. *Action Plan to 2014: Towards the Realisation of Schooling 2025*. Pretoria, n.d.

———. *Action Plan to 2019: Towards the Realisation of Schooling 2030*. Pretoria, 2015.

———. "Memorandum Of Agreement Between The Department Of Basic Education And Trade Unions On Professional Development For Teachers," June 2012.

———. *Ministerial Committee on a National Education Evaluation and Development Unit: Final Report*. Government Gazette. Pretoria, January 16, 2009.

———. *Report of the Ministerial Task Team Appointed by Minister Angie Motshekga to Investigate Allegations into the Selling of Posts of Educators by Members of Teachers Unions and Departmental Officials in Provincial Education Departments*. Translated by DBE, May 18, 2016.

Department of Basic Education, and Department of Higher Education and Training. *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa 2011-2025: Technical Report*. Translated by DBE and DHET. Pretoria, 2011.

Department of Education. *A Policy Framework in the Education and Training System for Quality Assurance in South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer, 1998.

———. *A South African Curriculum for the Twenty-First Century: Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005*. Pretoria, 2000.

———. "Call to Action: Mobilising Citizens to Build a South African Education and Training System for the 21st Century." Statement by Professor Kader Asmal, Minister of Education. Pretoria, July 27, 1999.

———. *Changing Management to Manage Change in Education*. Report of the Task Team on Education Management Development. Department of Education, December 1996.

———. "Handbook: An Introduction to Whole-School Evaluation Policy." Government Printer, 2002.

———. *Implementation Plan for Tirisano January 2000-December 2004*. Pretoria: Government Printer, 2000.

———. *National Conference on Whole-School Evaluation (Caesar's Conference Centre, Gauteng, 29-30 September 2000)*. Report. Pretoria: Government Printer, 2002.

———. *National Evaluation and Monitoring of the Trial of Curriculum 2005 and OBE in Provincial Pilot Schools in South Africa*. Pretoria, 1997.

———. *National Policy on Whole School Evaluation*. Government Gazette no. 22512. Pretoria: Government printer, 2001.

———. "Norms and Standards for Educators." *Government Gazette* 415, no. 20844 (February 4, 2000).

———. *Report to the Portfolio Committee on the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)*, June 20, 2006.

———. *Review Workshop Report*. Pretoria: Government Printer, May 2000.

———. "The National Policy Framework For Teacher Education and Development in South Africa: 'More Teachers; Better Teachers,'" 2006.

———. "The National Policy on Whole-School Evaluation." Government Printer, July 2001.

———. *The National Synopsis*. Pretoria: Government Printer, June 1999.

Mathula, K.M. "Performance Management: From Resistance to IQMS – From Policy to Practice." Birchwood Hotel and Conference Center, Boksburg, 2004.

Minister of Basic Education. "Written Reply: Question NW1938 to the Minister of Basic Education." Parliamentary Monitoring Group, June 23, 2017. https://pmg.org.za/committee-question/6105/.

Ministerial Committee for Development Work on the NQF. *Lifelong Learning through a National Qualifications Framework*. Discussion document. Pretoria: SAQA Bulletin 12(2): Key readings: the South African NQF 1995 - 2011, 2012.

National Planning Commission South Africa. *Our Future: Make It Work: National Development Plan, 2030*. Pretoria: National Planning Commission, 2012.

Republic of South Africa. *White Paper on Reconstruction and Development*. Government Gazette no. 16085. Cape Town: Government printer, 1994.

South African Qualifications Authority. *2014 Assessment of the Impact of the South African National Qualifications Framework*. Full Report. Pretoria, March 2017.

SACE

Education Policy Unit. "The State of Teacher Professionalism in South Africa." Paper prepared for the South African Council for Educators (SACE), October 2005.

SACE. "IQMS: Personal Growth Plans and Developmental Needs of Educators" presented at the SACE Mini-Seminar, October 28, 2014.

South African Council for Educators. *Redefining Role and Functions of the South African Council for Educators (SACE)*. Position Paper, March 2011.

South African Council for Educators (SACE). "Strategic Plan 2011-2014," n.d.

South African Council of Educators. "Code of Professional Ethics," n.d. Accessed June 26, 2017. https://www.sace.org.za/pages/the-code-of-professional-ethics.

———. "Handbook for the Code of Professional Ethics," 2002.

7.4.4: SADTU Documents (selection)

Chisholm, Linda. "Teacher Evaluations: What SADTU Should Negotiate with the State Bureaucracy." Document submitted to SADTU, June 1993. SADTU Collection, AH3389, AB39. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

Congress of South African Trade Unions. "SADTU to Demonstrate Against WSE." Press statement. Johannesburg, May 24, 2002. AllAfrica. http://allafrica.com/stories/200205240655.html.

SADTU. "4th National Congress (ICC, KwaZulu Natal, 6-9 September 1998)," 1998. SADTU Collection, AH3389, L8. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. "5th National Congress (ICC Durban, Kwa-Zulu Natal, 08-11 September 2002) Secretariat Report," 2002. SADTU Collection, AH3389, AA10. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. "6th National Congress (Gallagher Estates, Midrand, 1-2 September 2006)," 1998. SADTU Collection, AH3389, L17. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. "Curriculum Development Capacity Building Project." Research report, 2000.

———. "First National Congress (NASREC, Johannesburg, 10-12 October 1991)." Report, October 1991. SADTU Collection, AH3389, AA2. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. "Joint QMS & NDP Workshop." Protea Hotel, OR Tambo, Johannesburg, August 27, 2013. SADTU Collection, AH3389, U36. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. "Meeting on Whole School Evaluation, Pretoria, 20 May 2002." Meeting record, May 20, 2002. SADTU Collection, AH3389, M12.11. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. "Minutes of the Second National Congress of SADTU Held on 5-7 July 1993 in Johannesburg," 1993. SADTU Collection, AH3389:M3.6. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. "National Council Meeting 3/4/5 November 1994," 1994. SADTU Collection, AH3389, M4.14. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. "National Education Policy Conference (17-21 April 2001, Gallagher Estate, Midrand) 'Education Transformation: From Policy to Practice' Resource Documents," 2001. SADTU Collection, AH3389, R6. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. “Performance Management System, Performance Based Reward and the Professional Development of Teachers: Some Critical Implementation Challenges in Education.” Discussion document, September 19, 2014. https://sadtu.org.za/docs/disc/2014/performance_based_reward.pdf.

———. “Reconciling Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE).” Press release, August 19, 2002. SADTU Website. https://web.archive.org/web/20060926181540fw_/http://www.sadtu.org.za/press/2001/22-8-2002.0.htm.

———. “SADTU and Recognition.” Pamphlet, May 1991. Colin Purkey Collection A1984:C16.15. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. “SADTU Before and After Transition Discussion Document: A Strategic Perspective,” October 27, 1993. AH3389, South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU), Records, 1990-2013, AB52. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. “SADTU Calls for Urgent Moratorium on Whole School Evaluation (WSE).” Press statement. Johannesburg, May 17, 2002. SADTU Website. http://www.sadtu.org.za/press/2001/17-5-2002.0.htm.

———. “SADTU Education Desk Report on Whole School Evaluation (WSE) in 2002.” Report, 2002. SADTU Collection AH3389:AD43. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. “SADTU Hosts a Succesful Policy Conference.” Press statement, March 27, 2012. http://www.politicsweb.co.za/party/sadtu-rejects-performance-contracts-for-teacherspr.

———. “SADTU Memorandum of Demands: In Defense of Collective Bargaining and Quality Public Education.” Press statement, April 25, 2013. http://www.politicsweb.co.za/documents/sadtus-memorandum-of-demands-full-text.

———. “SADTU NEC Media Statement.” Press statement, May 21, 2012. http://www.sadtu.org.za/content/sadtu-nec-media-statement.

———. “SADTU Rejects Teacher Performance Appraisal in Current Form.” Press statement, November 27, 2011. http://www.politicsweb.co.za/documents/sadtu-rejects-teacher-performance-appraisal-in-cur.

———. “SADTU Response to a Meeting Between the State President and Teacher Organisations Constituting NAPTOSA on 25 July 1991.” Press statement, July 1991. Vadi Ismael Collection, A11.1. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. “SADTU Response to the NEEDU Report: Top Heavy on Evaluation, Light on Developmen.” Press statement, 2009. www.sadtu.org.za/show.php?id=2493.

———. “Teacher Development Summit Resource Documents,” June 2009. SADTU Collection, AH3389, I4. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. “Third National Congress (World Trade Centre, Kempton Park, Johannesburg, 11-13 July 1995).” Report, July 1995. SADTU Collection, AH3389/L2. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

———. “Towards a Restructured System of Teacher Appraisal in South Africa: An Approach. Paper Prepared for SADTU Workshop,” February 13, 1993. SADTU Collection, AH3389, U1. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

SADTU, and Department of Education. “Joint Media Statement with Department of Education and SADTU on Whole School Evaluation (WSE).” Press Release, May 21, 2002. SADTU Website. https://web.archive.org/web/20060926181411fw_/http://www.sadtu.org.za/press/2001/21-5-2002.0.htm.

SADTU Education Desk. “SADTU Response to the Report of the Review Committee on Curriculum 2005,” 2000.

SADTU/DET/Teacher Organisations Working Committee. “Conference: Teacher Appraisal, Supervision, Development and New Syllabi-Interim Curriculum,” June 7, 1995. SADTU Collection, AH3389, R1. Historical Papers Research Archive, University of the Witwatersrand.

“South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU): Professionalism and Unionism.” *New Nation*, April 3, 1992, sec. Learning Nation. Http://saldru.lib.msu.edu. SALDRU Clippings Collection 1975 - 2000.

“The Need for Quality Teaching: Ideas from the SADTU Teachers’ School.” *New Nation*, June 12, 1992, sec. Learning Nation. Http://saldru.lib.msu.edu. SALDRU Clippings Collection 1975 - 2000.

7.4.5: Newspaper articles

Bongekile Macupe. “Sadtu Digs in over a Matter of Principal.” *Mail and Guardian*, June 23, 2017. https://mg.co.za/article/2017-06-23-00-sadtu-digs-in-over-a-matter-of-principal.

Davis, Rebecca. “SADTU: SA’s Most Controversial Union Faces Human Rights Probe.” *Daily Maverick*, May 11, 2017. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2017-05-11-sadtu-sas-most-controversial-union-faces-human-rights-probe/.

eNCA. “ANAs Terrorise and Demoralise Teachers: Sadtu.” *ENCA*, September 21, 2015. https://www.enca.com/south-africa/anas-terrorise-and-demoralise-teachers-sadtu.

Greybe, David. “Asmal Lays Down Law.” *Business Day*. September 27, 1999. http://allafrica.com/stories/199909270110.html.

Grootes, Steven. “Op-Ed: For South Africa to Have a Future, Motshekga Must Win the War against Sadtu.” *Daily Maverick*, September 21, 2015. http://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2015-09-21-op-ed-for-south-africa-to-have-a-future-motshekga-must-win-the-war-against-sadtu/#.VuZ5WZx97IU.

Mataboge, Mmanaledi. "Lindiwe Sisulu's Public Service Plans Raise Sadtu's Ire." Accessed March 14, 2018. https://mg.co.za/article/2013-03-08-00-lindiwe-sisulus-public-service-plans-draw-flak.

Mohlala, Thabo. "Is Pandor Panicking?" *Mail and Guardian*, August 7, 2006. https://mg.co.za/article/2006-08-07-is-pandor-panicking.

Motshekga, Angie. "Sadtu Does Not Rule." *City Press*, October 13, 2014. https://www.news24.com/Archives/City-Press/Sadtu-does-not-rule-20150430.

Muller, Sean. "Teacher Monitoring and the Failure of the Public Sector." *PoliticsWeb*, March 14, 2013. http://www.politicsweb.co.za/news-and-analysis/teacher-monitoring-and-the-failure-of-the-public-s.

Munusamy, Ranjeni. "Motshekga vs. Sadtu: More Trouble Brewing in Education." *Daily Maverick*, February 27, 2013. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2013-02-27-motshekga-vs-sadtu-more-trouble-brewing-in-education/.

Mvoko, Vuyo. "Sadtu Vows War Against New System." *Business Day*. May 20, 2002. AllAfrica. http://allafrica.com/stories/200205200298.html.

Naidu, Edwin. "Asmal Blasts Teachers for Bad Behaviour." *IOL News*, September 27, 1999. https://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/asmal-blasts-teachers-for-bad-behaviour-14111.

Nicolson, Greg. "Education as Essential Service: Sadtu's Really, Really Not Happy." *Daily Maverick*, February 13, 2013. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2013-02-13-education-as-essential-service-sadtus-really-really-not-happy/.

Nkosi, Bongani. "Sadtu: Boycott National Assessments in Schools." *Mail & Guardian Online*, September 2, 2015. http://mg.co.za/article/2015-09-02-sadtu-calls-for-boycott-of-national-assessments/.

———. "Sadtu Takes Big Blow at ANC NGC." *Mail & Guardian Online*, October 13, 2015. http://mg.co.za/article/2015-10-13-sadtu-takes-big-blow-at-anc-ngc/.

———. "Teachers Give Minister Motshekga the Finger." *Mail and Guardian*, March 1, 2013. https://mg.co.za/article/2013-03-01-teachers-give-minister-the-finger/.

Paton, Carol. "SA Schools under Sadtu Dominion." *Business Day Live*, January 20, 2016. http://www.bdlive.co.za/opinion/2016/01/20/sa-schools-under-sadtu-dominion.

Phakathi, Bekezela. "Sadtu Is a 'Great and Powerful Union', Cyril Ramaphosa Says." *Business Day*, May 15, 2017. https://www.businesslive.co.za/bd/national/2017-05-15-sadtu-is-a-great-and-powerful-union-cyril-ramaphosa-says/.

———. “Sadtu Reiterates Rejection of Appraisals for Principals.” *Business Day*, May 4, 2017, Online edition. https://www.businesslive.co.za/bd/national/labour/2017-05-04-sadtu-reiterates-rejection-of-appraisals-for-principals/.

———. “Teachers’ Unions Want No Limit on the Right to Strike.” *Business Day Live*, September 22, 2017. https://www.businesslive.co.za/bd/national/labour/2017-09-26-teachers-unions-want-no-limit-on-the-right-to-strike/.

Phaladi, Batlile. “Angie Is a DA Agent, Says Sadtu.” *The Citizen*, June 9, 2016. http://citizen.co.za/news/south-africa/1152425/angie-is-a-da-agent-says-sadtu/.

Staff Reporter. “Union Angrily Rejects Teachers’ Pay Hike.” *Mail and Guardian*, June 5, 2008. https://mg.co.za/article/2008-06-05-union-angrily-rejects-teachers-pay-hike.

TMG Editor. “Sadtu Opposes Competency Test for Matric Markers.” *The Herald*, August 11, 2014. http://www.heraldlive.co.za/news/2014/08/11/sadtu-opposes-competency-test-matric-markers/.

7.5: Secondary sources

7.5.1: Books

Allais, Stephanie. *Selling Out Education National Qualifications Frameworks and the Neglect of Knowledge*. Rotterdam: SensePublishers, 2014. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-578-6.

Bloch, Graeme. *The Toxic Mix: What’s Wrong with South Africa’s Schools and How to Fix It*. 1st ed. Cape Town: Tafelberg, 2009.

Bruns, Barbara, Deon Filmer, and Harry Anthony Patrinos. *Making Schools Work: New Evidence on Accountability Reforms*. The World Bank, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8679-8.

Carnoy, Martin, Linda Chisholm, and Bagele Chilisa, eds. *The Low Achievement Trap: Comparing Schooling in Botswana and South Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press, 2012.

Chisholm, L., S. Motala, and S. Vally. *South African Education Policy Review: 1993-2000*. Heinemann, 2003. http://repository.hsrc.ac.za/handle/20.500.11910/8185.

Chisholm, Linda, ed. *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2004.

Fiske, Edward B., and Helen F. Ladd. *Elusive Equity: Education Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2004.

Fleisch, Brahm. *Managing Educational Change: The State and School Reform in South Africa*. 1st ed. Johannesburg: Heinemann, 2002.

———. *Primary Education in Crisis: Why South African Schoolchildren Underachieve in Reading and Mathematics*. Cape Town: Juta, 2008.

Frymier, Jack. *Accountability in Education: Still an Evolving Concept. Fastback 395*. Phi Delta Kappa, 408 N, 1996.

Hartshorne, Kenneth B. *Crisis and Challenge: Black Education 1910-1990*. Cape Town ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

———. *The Making of Education Policy in South Africa*. Oxford University Press, 1999.

Hoadley, Ursula. *Pedagogy in Poverty: Lessons from Twenty Years of Curriculum Reform in South Africa*. First edition. London: Taylor and Francis, 2017.

Hyslop, Jonathan. *Classroom Struggle: Policy and Resistance in South Africa 1940-1990*. Pietermaritzburg; Johannesburg: University Of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 1999.

Jansen, Jonathan D., and Pam Christie, eds. *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Juta, 1999.

Jansen, Jonathan D., and Yusuf Sayed, eds. *Implementing Education Policies: The South African Experience*. Cape Town : Johannesburg: UCT Press ; [Distributed by] Thorold's Africana Books, 2001.

Jansen, Jonathan, and Nick Taylor. *Educational Change in South Africa 1994-2003: Case Studies in Large-Scale Education Reform*. The World Bank. Accessed March 14, 2018. http://agris.fao.org/agris-search/search.do?recordID=US2012410319.

Kallaway, Peter. *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans*. Ravan Press, 1984.

———, ed. *The History of Education under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning and Culture Shall Be Opened*. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa, 2002.

Kallaway, Peter, Glenda Kruss, Aslam Fataar, and Gari Donn, eds. *Education after Apartheid: South African Education in Transition*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 1997.

Kraak, Andre, and Michael F. D. Young, eds. *Education in Retrospect: Policy and Implementation since 1990*. Pretoria : Johannesburg: Human Sciences Research Council in association with the Institute of Education, University of London ; Thorold's Africana Books [distributor], 2000.

Kros, Cynthia. *The Seeds of Separate Development: Origins of Bantu Education*. Pretoria: Unisa Press, 2010.

Lewin, Keith, Michael Samuel, and Yusuf Sayed, eds. *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in South Africa: Policy, Practice and Prospects*. Johannesburg: Heinemann, 2003.

Motala, Enver, and John Pampallis, eds. *The State, Education, and Equity in Post-Apartheid South Africa: The Impact of State Policies*. The Making of Modern Africa. Aldershot, Hampshire, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002.

Nkomo, Mokubung, ed. *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Pr, 1990.

OECD. *Reviews of National Policies for Education: South Africa*, n.d.

Pinar, William F. *Curriculum Studies in South Africa: Intellectual Histories & Present Circumstances*. Springer, 2010.

Taylor, N, S Van der Berg, and T Mabogoane. *Creating Effective Schools*. Pearson Education South Africa, 2013.

Taylor, Nick, Johan Muller, and Penny Vinjevold. *Getting Schools Working: Research and Systemic School Reform in South Africa*. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa, 2003.

Unterhalter, Elaine, Harold Wolpe, and Thozamile Botha, eds. *Education in a Future South Africa: Policy Issues for Transformation*. Africa World Press, 1992.

Unterhalter, Elaine, Harold Wolpe, Thozamile Botha, Saleem Badat, and Benito Khotseng, eds. *Apartheid Education and Popular Struggles*. Johannesb: Ravan Press, 1991.

7.5.2: Book sections

Chisholm, Linda. "Continuity and Change in Education Policy Research and Borrowing in South Africa." In *History of Education Under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning & Culture Shall Be Opened*, edited by Peter Kallaway, 94–108. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2002.

———. "The Restructuring of South African Education and Training in Comparative Context." In *Reaction and Renewal in South Africa*, 170–91. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 1996. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24772-1_8.

———. "The State of Curriculum Reform in South Africa: The Issue of Curriculum 2005." In *State of the Nation: South Africa, 2003-2004*, edited by John Daniel, Adam Habib, and Roger Southall, 268–89. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press, 2003.

Chisholm, Linda, and Michael Cross. "The Roots of Segregated Education in Twentieth Century South Africa." In *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa*, edited by Mokubung Nkomo. Africa World Press, 1990.

Chisholm, Linda, and Paul Kgobe. "Gearing up for an Integrated Education and Training System: September 1993." In *EPU Quarterly Review of Education and Training in South Africa*, edited by Linda Chisholm, Shireen

Motala, and Salim Vally, Vol. 1. South African Education Policy Review: 1993-2000, 2003. http://repository.hsrc.ac.za/handle/20.500.11910/8185.

Christie, Pam. "OBE and Unfolding Policy Trajectories: Lessons to Be Learned." In *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, edited by Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie, 279–92. Johannesburg: Juta, 1999.

Clercq, Francine de. "Effective Policies and the Reform Process: An Evaluation of South Africa's New Development and Education Micro Policies." In *Education after Apartheid: South African Education in Transition*, edited by Peter Kallaway, Glenda Kruss, Aslam Fataar, and Gari Donn, 143–68. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 1997.

Deacon, Roger, and Ben Parker. "Positively Mystical: An Interpretation of South Africa's Outcomes-Based National Qualifications Framework." In *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, edited by Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie, 59–75. Johannesburg: Juta, 1999.

Enslin, Penny. "Science and Doctrine: Theoretical Discourse in South African Teacher Education." In *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa*, edited by Mokubung Nkomo, 1. print., 77–92. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Pr, 1990.

———. "The Role of Fundamental Pedagogics in the Formulation of Educational Policy in South Africa." In *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans*, edited by Peter Kallaway, 139–47. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1984.

Essop, Ahmed. "Introduction." In *Back to Learning: The National Education Conference 1992*. Johannesburg: Sached Trust; Ravan Press, 1992.

Fleisch, Brahm. "State Formation and the Origins of Bantu Education." In *History of Education Under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning & Culture Shall Be Opened*, 37–52. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2002.

Garson, P. "Labour Relations in Education." In *Public Service Labour Relations in a Democratic South Africa*, edited by Glenn Adler. National Labour & Economic Development Institute. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 2000.

Govender, Logan, and Logan Govender. "Teacher Unions, Policy Struggles and Educational Change, 1994 to 2004." In *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, edited by Linda Chisholm, 267–91. Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2004.

Harley, Ken, and Ben Parker. "Integrating Differences: Implications of an Outcomes-Based National Qualifications Framework for the Roles and Competencies of Teachers." In *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, edited by Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie, 181–200. Kenwyn : Johannesburg: Juta ; [Distributed by] Thorold's Africana Books, 1999.

Harley, Ken, Volker Wedekind, and Volker Wedekind. "Political Change, Curriculum Change and Social Formation, 1990 to 2002." In *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, edited by Linda Chisholm, 195–220. Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2004.

Holdt, Karl von. "The South African Post-Apartheid Bureaucracy: Inner Workings, Contradictory Rationales and the Developmental State." In *Constructing a Democratic Developmental State in South Africa: Potentials and Challenges*, edited by Omano Edigheji. Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press, 2010.

Hyslop, Jonathan. "Teacher Resistance in African Education from the 1940s to the 1980s." In *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa*, edited by Mokubung Nkomo, 93–119. Africa World Press, 1990.

Jacklin, Heather. "Teachers, Identities, and Space." In *Being a Teacher: Professional Challenges and Choices: Reader*, by Mike Adendorff and John Gultig. Braamfontein: South African Institute for Distance Education and Oxford University Press, 2002.

Jansen, Jonathan D. "The Race for Education Policy after Apartheid." In *Implementing Education Policies: The South African Experience*, edited by Jonathan D. Jansen and Yusuf Sayed, 12–24. Cape Town : Johannesburg: UCT Press ; [Distributed by] Thorold's Africana Books, 2001.

———. "Why Outcomes-Based Education Will Fail: An Elaboration." In *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, edited by Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie, 145–56. Johannesburg: Juta, 1999.

Kruss, Glenda. "Teachers, Curriculum 2005 and the Education Policy-Making Process." In *Vision and Reality: Changing Education and Training in South Africa*, edited by W. E. Morrow and Kenneth King, 96–112. Cape Town: UCT Press, 1998.

Mattson, Elizabeth, and Ken Harley. "Teacher Identities and Strategic Mimicry in the Policy/Practice Gap." In *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in South Africa: Policy, Practice and Prospects*, edited by Keith Lewin, Michael Samuel, and Yusuf Sayed. Johannesburg: Heinemann, 2003. http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/19755/.

Moll, Ian. "The South African Democratic Teachers' Union and the Politics of Teacher Unity in South Africa, 1985-90." In *Apartheid Education and Popular Struggles*, edited by Elaine Unterhalter, Harold Wolpe, Thozamile Botha, Saleem Badat, and Benito Khotseng. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1991.

Molteno, Frank. "The Historical Foundations of the Schooling of Black South Africans." In *Apartheid and Education: The Education of Black South Africans*, edited by Peter Kallaway, 45–107. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1984.

Motala, Shireen, and Salim Vally. "People's Education: From People's Power to Tirisano." In *The History of Education under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning and Culture Shall Be Opened*, edited by Peter Kallaway, 174–94. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa, 2002.

Nkomo, Mokubung. "Post-Apartheid Education: Preliminary Reflections." In *Pedagogy of Domination: Toward a Democratic Education in South Africa*, edited by Mokubung Nkomo, 291–323. Africa World Press, 1990.

Parker, Ben. "Roles and Responsibilities, Institutional Landscapes and Curriculum Mindscapes: A Partial View of Teacher Education Policy in South Africa." In *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in South Africa: Policy, Practice and Prospects*, edited by Keith Lewin, Michael Sarmuel, and Yusuf Sayed, 16–44. Johannesburg: Heinemann, 2003.

Pillay, D. "Negotiating a Way out of the Education Crisis." In *Back to Learning: The National Education Conference 1992*, 29–46. Johannesburg: Sached; Ravan Press, 1992.

Samuel, Harold. "A History of the Search for Teacher Unity in South Africa." In *The Global Assault on Teaching, Teachers, and Their Unions Stories for Resistance*, edited by Mary Compton and Lois Weiner, 227–35. Palgrave Macmillan US, 2008. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230611702_25.

Sayed, Yusuf, Sajjadllah Alhawsawi, Shadreck Mwale, and Robert Van Niekerk. "The State and Education Policy Change in South Africa: Walking the Tightrope between Choice and Equity." In *Neo-Liberal Education Reforms: A Critical Analysis*, edited by David A. Turner and Hüseyin Yolcu, 204–20. Oxford: Routledge, 2014. http://eprints.brighton.ac.uk/13638/.

Sayed, Yusuf, and Yusuf Sayed. "The Case of Teacher Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Politics and Priorities." In *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, edited by Linda Chisholm and Yusuf Sayed, 247–66. Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2004.

Soudien, Crain. "Biographies, Autobiographies, and Life Stories: Teachers' Responses to the Introduction of Apartheid Education." In *History of Education Under Apartheid, 1948-1994: The Doors of Learning & Culture Shall Be Opened*, edited by Peter Kallaway, 211–23. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2002.

———. "Notions of Teacher Professionalism in the Context of a Racially Divided Society: The Case of South Africa." In *Changing Patterns of Teacher Education in South Africa: Policy, Practice and Prospects*, edited by Keith Lewin, Michael Sarmuel, and Yusuf Sayed. Heinemann, 2003.

———. "'What to Teach the Natives': A Historiography of the Curriculum Dilemma in South Africa." In *Curriculum Studies in South Africa*, 19–49. International & Development Education. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2010. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-230-10550-8_2.

Soudien, Crain, and Jean Baxen. "Outcomes-Based Education: Teacher Identity and the Politics of Participation." In *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, edited by Jonathan D. Jansen and Pam Christie. Johannesburg: Juta, 1999.

Taylor, Nick. "Monitoring, Accountability and Professional Knowledge." In *Monitoring the Quality of Education in Schools*, 43–52. SensePublishers, Rotterdam, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-453-4_4.

Thurlow, Michael, and Shamella Ramnarain. "Transforming Educator Appraisal in South Africa." In *Managing Teacher Appraisal and Performance: A Comparative Approach*, edited by David Middlewood and Carol E. M. Cardno. Psychology Press, 2001.

Vally, Salim, and Console Tleane. "The Rationalisation of Teachers and the Quest for Social Justice in Education in an Age of Fiscal Austerity." In *The State, Education, and Equity in Post-Apartheid South Africa: The Impact of State Policies*, edited by Enver Motala and John Pampallis, 172–202. The Making of Modern Africa. Aldershot, Hampshire, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002.

7.5.3: Journal articles

Allais, Stephanie Matseleng. "Why the South African NQF Failed: Lessons for Countries Wanting to Introduce National Qualifications Frameworks." *European Journal of Education* 42, no. 4 (2007): 523–47.

Amoako, Samuel. "Teacher Unions in Political Transitions: The South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU) and the Dying Days of Apartheid, 1990–1993." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 49, no. 2 (April 1, 2014): 148–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909613479302.

Arends, Fabian, Lolita Winnaar, and Mogege Mosimege. "Teacher Classroom Practices and Mathematics Performance in South African Schools: A Reflection on TIMSS 2011." *South African Journal of Education* 37, no. 3 (January 1, 2017). https://www.ajol.info/index.php/saje/article/view/160871.

Badat, Saleem. "Educational Politics in the Transition Period." *Comparative Education* 31, no. 2 (June 1, 1995): 141–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050069529083.

Barasa, FS, and E Mattson. "The Roles, Regulation, and Professional Development of Educators in South Africa: A Critical Analysis of Four Policy Documents." *Journal of Education* 23, no. 1 (1998): 41–72.

Barbara Lipietz, and Ivor Chipkin. "Transforming South Africa's Racial Bureaucracy: New Public Management and Public Sector Reform in Contemporary South Africa." PARI Long Essay. Public Affairs Research Institute, February 2012.

Beinart, William. "Beyond 'Homelands': Some Ideas about the History of African Rural Areas in South Africa." *South African Historical Journal* 64, no. 1 (March 1, 2012): 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/02582473.2012.642225.

Biputh, Barath, and Sioux McKenna. "Tensions in the Quality Assurance Processes in Post-apartheid South African Schools." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 40, no. 3 (May 1, 2010): 279–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920902955892.

Bisschoff, Tom, and Bennie Grobler. "The Management of Teacher Competence." *Journal of In-Service Education* 24, no. 2 (June 1, 1998): 191–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/13674589800200041.

Buckland, Peter. "The Education Crisis in South Africa: Restructuring the Policy Discourse." *Social Dynamics* 8, no. 1 (June 1, 1982): 14–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/02533958208458312.

Burrows, Roger. "Beyond the Blackboard: Teacher Associations and Politics." *Indicator South Africa* 3, no. 4 (January 1, 1986): 14–17.

Cameron, R. "New Public Management Reforms in the South African Public Service : 1999-2009." *Journal of Public Administration* 44, no. Special issue 1 (April 1, 2009): 910–42.

Carnoy, Martin, and Fabian Arends. "Explaining Mathematics Achievement Gains in Botswana and South Africa." *PROSPECTS* 42, no. 4 (December 1, 2012): 453–68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-012-9246-6.

Carrim, Nazir. "From Teachers to Educators: Homogenising Tendencies in Contemporary South African Educational Reforms." *International Journal of Educational Development* 21, no. 1 (January 1, 2001): 45–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(00)00012-2.

Chisholm, Linda. "Bantustan Education History: The 'Progressivism' of Bophutatswana's Primary Education Upgrade Programme (PEUP), 1979–1988." *South African Historical Journal* 65, no. 3 (September 1, 2013): 403–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/02582473.2013.787642.

———. "Change and Continuity in South African Education: The Impact of Policy." *African Studies* 58, no. 1 (July 1, 1999): 87–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/00020189908707906.

———. "Diffusion of the National Qualifications Framework and Outcomes-Based Education in Southern and Eastern Africa." *Comparative Education* 43, no. 2 (2007): 295–309.

———. "The Democratization of Schools and the Politics of Teachers' Work in South Africa." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 29, no. 2 (June 1999): 111–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305792990290202.

———. "The Making of South Africa's National Curriculum Statement." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 37, no. 2 (January 1, 2005): 193–208. https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027042000236163.

Chisholm, Linda, and Bruce Fuller. "Remember People's Education? Shifting Alliances, State-building and South Africa's Narrowing Policy Agenda." *Journal of Education Policy* 11, no. 6 (November 1996): 693–716. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093960110604.

Chisholm, Linda, Crain Soudien, Salim Vally, and Dave Gilmour. "Teachers and Structural Adjustment in South Africa." *Educational Policy* 13, no. 3 (July 1, 1999): 386–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904899013003003.

Christie, Pam. "From Crisis to Transformation: Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Australian Journal of Education* 36, no. 1 (1992): 38–52.

———. “Global Trends in Local Contexts: A South African Perspective on Competence Debates.” *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 18, no. 1 (April 1, 1997): 55–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630970180104.

———. “South Africa in Transition: Educational Policies, 1990-93.” *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 14, no. 2 (April 1, 1994): 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930140204.

Christie, Pam, and Colin Collins. “Bantu Education: Apartheid Ideology or Labour Reproduction?” *Comparative Education* 18, no. 1 (March 1, 1982): 59–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006820180107.

Clercq, Francine de. “Policy Intervention and Power Shifts: An Evaluation of South Africa’s Education Restructuring Policies.” *Journal of Education Policy* 12, no. 3 (May 1, 1997): 127–46. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093970120302.

———. “Professionalism in South African Education: The Challenges of Developing Teacher Professional Knowledge, Practice, Identity and Voice.” *Journal of Education*, no. 57 (2013): 31–54.

———. “School Monitoring and Change: A Critical Examination of Whole School-Evaluation.” *Education as Change* 11, no. 2 (December 1, 2007): 97–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/16823200709487168.

———. “Teacher Quality, Appraisal and Development: The Flaws in the IQMS.” *Perspectives in Education* 26, no. 1 (March 2008): 7–18.

Cross, Michael. “A Historical Review of Education in South Africa: Towards an Assessment.” *Comparative Education* 22, no. 3 (1986): 185–200.

Cross, Michael, Claude Carpentier, and Halima Ait-Mehdi. “Unfulfilled Promise: Radical Discourses in South African Educational Historiography, 1970–2007.” *History of Education* 38, no. 4 (July 1, 2009): 475–503. https://doi.org/10.1080/00467600801975239.

Cross, Michael, Ratshi Mungadi, and Sepi Rouhani. “From Policy to Practice: Curriculum Reform in South African Education.” *Comparative Education* 38, no. 2 (May 1, 2002): 171–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060220140566.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, and Maria E. Hyler. “The Role of Performance Assessment in Developing Teaching as a Profession.” *Rethinking Schools* 27, no. 4 (2013): 10–15.

Delius, Peter, and Stefan Schirmer. “Historical Research and Policy Making in South Africa.” *African Studies* 59, no. 1 (July 1, 2000): 5–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/713650977.

Evans, Laura. “South Africa’s Bantustans and the Dynamics of ‘Decolonisation’: Reflections on Writing Histories of the Homelands.” *South African Historical Journal* 64, no. 1 (March 1, 2012): 117–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/02582473.2012.655941.

Fleisch, Brahm. "The Politics of the Governed: South African Democratic Teachers Union Soweto Strike, June 2009." *South African Review of Education* 16, no. 2 (2010): 117–31.

Glaser, Clive. "Champions of the Poor or 'Militant Fighters for a Better Pay Cheque'? Teacher Unionism in Mexico and South Africa, 1979–2013." *Safundi* 17, no. 1 (January 2, 2016): 40–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/17533171.2015.1118868.

Govender, Logan. "Teacher Unions' Participation in Policy Making: A South African Case Study." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 45, no. 2 (March 4, 2015): 184–205. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2013.841467.

Harley, Ken, Fred Barasa, Carol Bertram, Elizabeth Mattson, and Shervani Pillay. "'The Real and the Ideal': Teacher Roles and Competences in South African Policy and Practice." *International Journal of Educational Development* 20, no. 4 (July 2000): 287–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(99)00079-6.

Heystek, J., and M. Lethoko. "The Contribution of Teacher Unions in the Restoration of Teacher Professionalism and the Culture of Learning and Teaching." *South African Journal of Education* 21, no. 4 (2006): 222–27. https://doi.org/10.4314/saje.v21i4.24907.

Jansen, Jonathan D. "Autonomy and Accountability in the Regulation of the Teaching Profession: A South African Case Study." *Research Papers in Education* 19, no. 1 (March 1, 2004): 51–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267152032000176972.

———. "Curriculum as a Political Phenomenon: Historical Reflections on Black South African Education." *The Journal of Negro Education* 59, no. 2 (1990): 195–206. https://doi.org/10.2307/2295645.

———. "Curriculum Reform in South Africa: A Critical Analysis of Outcomes-based Education." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 28, no. 3 (November 1, 1998): 321–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764980280305.

———. "Image-Ining Teachers : Policy Images and Teacher Identity in South African Classrooms." *South African Journal of Education* 21, no. 4 (November 1, 2001): 242–46.

———. "Political Symbolism as Policy Craft: Explaining Non-Reform in South African Education after Apartheid." *Journal of Education Policy* 17, no. 2 (April 2002): 199–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930110116534.

———. "The School Curriculum since Apartheid: Intersections of Politics and Policy in the South African Transition." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 31, no. 1 (January 1, 1999): 57–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/002202799183296.

Levin, Richard. "People's Education and the Politics of Negotiations in South Africa." *Perspectives in Education* 12, no. 2 (1991): 1–18.

Motala, Shireen. "Quality and Indicators of Quality in South African Education: A Critical Appraisal." *International Journal of Educational Development* 21, no. 1 (January 1, 2001): 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(00)00014-6.

———. “Reviewing Education Policy and Practice: Constraints and Responses.” Edited by Linda Chisholm, Shireen Motala, and Salim Vally. *EPU Quarterly Review of Education and Training in South Africa*, South African education policy review: 1993-2000, 5 (1998). http://repository.hsrc.ac.za/handle/20.500.11910/8185.

Motilal, Geeta. “Lessons Learnt from Practice: The Implementation of DAS.” *Education as Change* 8, no. 2 (December 1, 2004): 146–67.

Msibi, Thabo, and Sihle Mchunu. “The Knot of Curriculum and Teacher Professionalism in Post-Apartheid South Africa.” *Education as Change* 17, no. 1 (May 1, 2013): 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2013.773924.

Naidoo, Vinothan. “Changing Conceptions of Public ‘Management’ and Public Sector Reform in South Africa.” *International Public Management Review* 16, no. 1 (2015): 23–42.

Ramatlapana, K., and J. P. Makonye. “From Too Much Freedom to Too Much Restriction: The Case of Teacher Autonomy from National Curriculum Statement (NCS) to Curriculum and Assessment Statement (CAPS).” *Africa Education Review* 9, no. sup1 (December 1, 2012): S7–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2012.753185.

Roux, Adré le. “‘We Were Not Part of Apartheid’: Rationalisations Used by Four White Pre-Service Teachers to Make Sense of Race and Their Own Racial Identities.” *South African Journal of Education* 34, no. 2 (June 2014): 01–16.

Sayed, Yusuf. “Changing Forms of Teacher Education in South Africa: A Case Study of Policy Change.” *International Journal of Educational Development*, Researching Teacher Education: The Multi Site Teacher Educations Project (MUSTER), 22, no. 3 (April 1, 2002): 381–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(01)00062-1.

Sayed, Yusuf, and Nazir Carrim. “Inclusiveness and Participation in Discourses of Educational Governance in South Africa.” *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 2, no. 1 (January 1, 1998): 29–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360311980020103.

Sebakwane, Shirley M. “The Contradictions of Scientific Management as a Mode of Controlling Teachers’ Work in Black Secondary Schools: South Africa.” *International Journal of Educational Development* 17, no. 4 (October 1, 1997): 391–404. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0738-0593(97)00008-4.

Sebola, M. P., and P. W. Malema. “South African Teachers’ Perception of Integrated Quality Management Systems: Mopani District Secondary Schools, Limpopo Province.” *Journal of Social Sciences* 41, no. 2 (2014): 231–42.

Seekings, Jeremy. “Trade Unions, Social Policy & Class Compromise in Post-Apartheid South Africa.” *Review of African Political Economy* 31, no. 100 (June 2004): 299–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305624042000262301.

Shalem, Yael, and Ursula Hoadley. “The Dual Economy of Schooling and Teacher Morale in South Africa.” *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 19, no. 2 (June 1, 2009): 119–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210903257224.

Shalem, Yael, and L Slonimsky. "Can We Close the Gap? Criteria and Obligation in Teacher Education." *Journal of Education* 24 (1999): 5–30.

Soudien, Crain. "Racial Discourse in the Commission on Native Education (Eiselen Commission), 1949-1951 : The Making of a 'Bantu' Identity." *Southern African Review of Education with Education with Production* 11, no. 1 (January 1, 2005): 41–57.

———. "The 'A' Factor: Coming to Terms with the Question of Legacy in South African Education." *International Journal of Educational Development* 27, no. 2 (March 2007): 182–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2006.07.006.

Spaull, Nic. "Accountability and Capacity in South African Education." *Education as Change* 19, no. 3 (September 2, 2015): 113–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2015.1056199.

Spaull, Nicholas. "South Africa's Education Crisis: The Quality of Education in South Africa 1994-2011." *Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise*, 2013.

Spreen, Carol Anne, and Salim Vally. "Outcomes-Based Education and Its (Dis)Contents : Learner-Centred Pedagogy and the Education Crisis in South Africa." *Southern African Review of Education with Education with Production* 16, no. 1 (September 1, 2010): 39–58.

———. "Prospects and Pitfalls: A Review of Post-apartheid Education Policy Research and Analysis in South Africa." *Comparative Education* 46, no. 4 (November 1, 2010): 429–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2010.519478.

Taylor, Nick. "Standards-Based Accountability in South Africa." *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 20, no. 3 (September 1, 2009): 341–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450902916704.

Tikly, Leon. "Changing South African Schools?: An Analysis and Critique of Post-election Government Policy." *Journal of Education Policy* 12, no. 3 (May 1, 1997): 177–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093970120305.

———. "Governmentality and the Study of Education Policy in South Africa." *Journal of Education Policy* 18, no. 2 (April 1, 2003): 161–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093022000043074.

Vadi, Ismael. "Apartheid Education and Non-Racial Teacher Unionism: SADTU's Campaign for Recognition." *Perspectives in Education* 14, no. 1 (93 1992): 81–87.

Venkat, Hamsa, and Nic Spaull. "What Do We Know about Primary Teachers' Mathematical Content Knowledge in South Africa? An Analysis of SACMEQ 2007." *International Journal of Educational Development* 41 (March 1, 2015): 121–30.

Weber, Everard. "New Controls and Accountability for South African Teachers and Schools: The Integrated Quality Management System," 2005. http://reference.sabinet.co.za/document/EJC87315.

———. “Shifting to the Right: The Evolution of Equity in the South African Government’s Developmental and Education Policies, 1990–1999.” *Comparative Education Review* 46, no. 3 (August 1, 2002): 261–90. https://doi.org/10.1086/341158.

Wieder, Alan. “They Can’t Take Our Souls: Teachers’ League of South Africa Reflections of Apartheid.” *Race Ethnicity and Education* 4, no. 2 (June 1, 2001): 145–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/713693051.

———. “White Teachers/Black Schools: Stories from Apartheid South Africa.” *Multicultural Education* 8, no. 4 (2001): 14–23.

———. “White Teachers/White Schools: Oral Histories from the Struggle against Apartheid.” *Multicultural Education* 10, no. 4 (2003): 26–31.

Young, Michael. “The Educational Implications of Introducing a NQF for Developing Countries.” *Journal of Education and Work* 24, no. 3–4 (September 2011): 223–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2011.584684.

7.5.4: Unpublished sources

Barnes, Amanda Joy. “Policy at the Chalk Face: A Case Study of the Implementation of the Developmental Appraisal System in a Primary School.” PhD Thesis (Education), University of Cape Town, 2003. https://open.uct.ac.za/handle/11427/6912.

Cereseto, Anthea. “Caught in the ‘Nest’ : Teachers’ Experiences of Layered Regulation of Quality Improvement : A Case Study of Teachers Working in Five ‘Achieving’ Public Secondary Schools in Gauteng.,” 2010. http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/7567.

Clercq, Francine de. “Teacher Appraisal Reforms in Post-1994 South Africa: Conflicts, Contestations and Mediations.” PhD Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 2011. http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/10135.

Gallie, Muavia. “The Implementation of Developmental Appraisal Systems in a Low-Functioning South African School.” PhD Thesis (Education), University of Pretoria, 2007. http://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/25650.

Govender, Logan. “Teachers’ Participation in Policy Making: The Case of the South African Schools Act.” Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 2009. http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/6764.

Hofmeyr, Jane Mary. “An Examination of the Influence of Christian National Education on the Principles Underlying White and Black Education in South Africa: 1948 - 1982.” Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1982. http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/18190.

Hyslop, Jonathan. "Social Conflicts over African Education in South Africa from the 1940s to 1976." PhD Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1990. http://nrfnexus.nrf.ac.za/handle/20.500.11892/107484.

Kihn, Paul. "Players or Pawns?: 'Professionalism' and Teacher Disunity in the Western Cape, 1980-1990." M. Phil. (Education), University of Cape Town, 1993.

Lucen, Anusha. "Tracing the Implementation Trajectory of an Education Policy: The Case of Whole School Evaluation." Thesis, University of Pretoria, 2006. http://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/28297.

Mathebe, Ponko Collen. "Teachers' Perceptions of Union Leadership in Limpopo Province." Dissertation, University of Pretoria, 2016. https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/52948.

Pym, June. "Initiating a School Based Teacher Appraisal Process: A Study in Educational Innovation in South Africa." PhD Thesis (Education), University of the Western Cape, 1999. http://etd.uwc.ac.za/xmlui/handle/11394/1346.

Rensberg, Ihron. "Collective Identity and Public Policy: From Resistance to Reconstruction in South African, 1986-1995." PhD Dissertation, Stanford University, 1996.

Shalem, Yael. "Educated Labour: A Study of White English-Speaking Teachers in Secondary Government Schools on the Witwatersrand." PhD Thesis (Education), University of the Witwatersrand, 1990.

Sibanyoni, Tsholofelo Tebogo. "The Impact of South Africa's New Educational Expectations on Mamelodi Teachers Role Perceptions," 2014. http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/14475.

Silbert, Patricia. "Understanding Influences in Policy-Making: Whole-School Evaluation and Discourse - a Critique." Thesis, University of Cape Town, 2008. https://open.uct.ac.za/handle/11427/8224.

Swartz, Ronald B. "The South African Democratic Teachers' Union, Collective Bargaining, and Education Transformation." M.Ed. Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1994.

Whittle, Granville. "The Role of the South African Democratic Teachers Union in the Process of Teacher Rationalization in the Western Cape, 1990 and 2001." PhD Thesis, University of Pretoria, 2007.

Zengele, Thulani. "The Involvement of Teacher Unions in the Implementation of the Employment of Educators' Act 76 of 1998." PhD Dissertation, The University of South Africa, 2009. http://uir.unisa.ac.za/handle/10500/3189.

7.5.5: Research reports

Abelmann, Charles, Richard Elmore, Johanna Even, Susan Kenyon, and Joanne Marshall. "When Accountability Knocks, Will Anyone Answer?" CPRE Research Report Series. Consortium for Policy Research in Education, 1999. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED428463.

Allais, Stephanie. "Quality Assurance in Education." Booklet. Issues in Education Policy. Johannesburg: Centre for Education Policy Development, 2009. http://vodppl.upm.edu.my/uploads/docs/QA%20in%20education2009.pdf.

Auditor General of South Africa. "Education Sector Report for 2015-16," 2017.

Berg, Servaas van der, Nicholas Spaull, Gabrielle Wills, Martin Gustafsson, and Janeli Kotzé. "Identifying Binding Constraints in Education: Synthesis Report for the Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy Development (PSPPD)." Research on Socio-Economic Policy (ReSEP), May 24, 2016.

Cameron, Robert, and Brian Levy. "The Potential and Limits of Performance Management: Improving Basic Education in the Western Cape." Working Paper. Manchester, UK: University of Manchester: Effective States and Inclusive Development Research Centre (ESID), July 2016. http://www.effective-states.org/working-paper-62/.

Cameron, Robert, and Vinothan Naidoo. "When a 'Ruling Alliance' and Public Sector Governance Meet: Managing for Performance in South African Basic Education." Occasional Working Paper. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Graduate School of Development Policy and Practice, December 2016. https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2835487.

Centre for Development and Enterprise. "Teacher Evaluation in South African Schools." Translated by CDE. Building on What Works in Education. Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise, 2015. http://www.cde.org.za/teacher-evaluation-in-south-african-schools/.

———. "Teacher Professional Standards for South Africa: The Road to Better Performance, Development and Accountability?," August 2017.

———. "Teachers in South Africa: Supply and Demand 2013-2015." In Depth. Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise, 2015. http://www.cde.org.za/teacher-supply-and-demand-2013-2025/.

Centre for Education Policy Developement (CEPD). "The Implementation of C2005 at National and Provincial Levels," 2000.

Chetty, Dianaraj, University of the Witwatersrand, Education Policy Unit, and National Education Crisis Committee (South Africa). "Rethinking Teacher Appraisal in South Africa: Policy Options and Strategies." Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand/NECC, 1993.

Chisholm, Linda. "An Overview of Research, Policy and Practice in Teacher Supply and Demand 1994-2008." Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2009.

———. "The Politics of Curriculum Review and Revision in South Africa." In *Culture, Context and the Quality of Education*. Oxford, 2003.

———. "The Quality of Primary Education in South Africa." Research report, April 13, 2004.

Chisholm, Linda, Ursula Hoadley, Heather Brookes, Mbithi wa Kivulu, Cas Prinsloo, Asnath Kgobe, Dan Mosia, Hersheela Narsee, and Stephen Rule. "Educator Workload in South Africa." Report prepared for the ELRC. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 2005.

Class Act Educational Services. "National Review of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)." Report commissioned by National Department of Education, 2007.

Council on Higher Education. "Report on the National Review of Academic and Professional Programmes in Education." HE Monitor No. 11. Pretoria, South Africa: Council on Higher Education, 2010.

Department of Basic Education. "Ministerial Committee on a National Education Evaluation and Development Unit: Final Report." Government Gazette. Pretoria, January 16, 2009.

Department of Education. "Ministerial Committee on National Education Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU) Final Report." Pretoria, April 17, 2009.

Govender, Logan. "Teacher Professionalism and Accountability in South Africa: A Review of the Literature." Working paper. Cape Pensinsula University of Technology: Centre for International Teacher Education, February 2016.

———. "The Mediation of Teacher Unions' Participation in Policy Making: A South African Case Study," 2012.

Gustafsson, Martin. "Teacher Supply and the Quality of Schooling in South Africa. Patterns over Space and Time." Working Paper. Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University, Department of Economics., 2016.

Hoadley, Ursula. "A Review of the Research Literature on Teaching and Learning in the Foundation Phase in South Africa." Working Paper. Stellenbosch: Research on Socio-Economic Policy (ReSEP), 2016.

Hofmeyr, Jane, and G Hall. "The National Teacher Education Audit: Synthesis Report." Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD), 1995.

Hyslop, Jonathan. "Aspects of the Failure of Bantu Education as a Hegemonic Strategy: School Boards, School Committees and Educational Politics 1955-1976." Working Paper. The Making of Class, 9-14 February 1987. Johannesburg: Wits History Workshop, 1987. http://digi.nrf.ac.za/handle/10539/7856.

Jansen, Jonathan D., and Nick Taylor. "Educational Change in South Africa 1994-2003: Case Studies in Large-Scale Education Reform." Country Studies. Geneva: World Bank, 2003.

Mokgalane, Ella, Nazir Carrim, Michael Gardiner, and Linda Chisholm. *National Teacher Appraisal Pilot Project Report*. Johannesburg: Education Policy Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, 1997.

Moloi, Meshack Qetelo, and Mark Chetty. "The SACMEQ III Project in South Africa: A Study of the Conditions of Schooling and the Quality of Education." SACMEQ Educational Policy Research Series. Pretoria: Ministry of Basic Education, 2010.

Moloi, Meshack Qetelo, and Jacob Strauss. "The SACMEQ II Project in South Africa: A Study of the Conditions of Schooling and the Quality of Education." Harare: SACMEQ, 2005.

Muller, Ina V.S., Michael O. Martin, Pierre Foy, and Martin Hooper. "PIRLS 2016 International Results in Reading." TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College and International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), 2017.

Shalem, Yael. "Why Professionalism?: A Study of the Relationship between Teachers' Work, Teachers' Power and Teachers' Struggle." Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand, Education Policy Unit, 1990.

Shepherd, Debra Lynne. "Learn to Teach, Teach to Learn: A within-Pupil across-Subject Approach to Estimating the Impact of Teacher Subject Knowledge on South African Grade 6 Performance." Working Paper. Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers. Stellenbosch University, Department of Economics, 2015.

———. "The Impact of Teacher Subject Knowledge on Learner Performance in South Africa: A within-Pupil across-Subject Approach." Cantanzaro, 2013.

Taylor, Nick. "National Report 2012: The State of Literacy Teaching and Learning in the Foundation Phase." National Education Evaluation & Development Unit, April 2013. http://www.shineliteracy.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/NEEDU-Report.pdf.

———. "What's Wrong with South African Schools?" JET Education Services, 2008.

Taylor, Nick, and Stephen Taylor. "Teacher Knowledge and Professional Habitus." In *What Makes Schools Effective? Report of the National Schools Effectiveness Study*, edited by Thabo Mabogoane, Nick Taylor, and Servaas Van der Berg, 202–23. Cape Town: Pearson Education, 2012.

"The Initial Teacher Education Research Project: Final Report." JET Education Services, 2014.

"TIMSS 2007 International Mathematics Report: Findings Form IEA's Trend in International Mathematics and Science Study at the Fourth and Eighth Grades." Chestnut Hill, Mass: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College, 2008.

"Value in the Classroom: The Quantity and Quality of South Africa's Teachers." Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise, 2011. http://www.cde.org.za/value-in-the-classroom-the-quantity-and-quality-of-south-africa-s-teachers/.