

Using Performance Standards as Criteria to Measure Teacher Effectiveness in Post-apartheid South Africa

Sybert Mutereko¹ and Fayth Ruffin²

*School of Management IT and Public Governance, College of Law and Management Studies,
University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
E-mail: ¹<sybert@ukzn.ac.za>, ²<Ruffin@ukzn.ac.za>*

KEYWORDS Accountability. Appraisals. Integrated Quality Management System. Learner Achievement. Performance Evaluation

ABSTRACT In 2003, the Department of Education adopted the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) as a performance accountability mechanism in South Africa. Since then, scholarly attention has been focused on the implementation of IQMS in schools. Few studies have investigated the criteria, performance standards (PS) that are used in IQMS in order to determine salary progression of Level 1 classroom-based teachers. The researchers surveyed 100 teachers in uMgungundlovu District of KwaZulu-Natal Province in South Africa in order to elicit their views on the importance of the PS in the composite score sheet used to evaluate their performance. Planning, administration and lesson delivery are given prominence by most teachers. Such valued aspects are likely to receive greater attention to the neglect of other criteria that are as important for the development of rounded students.

INTRODUCTION

Teachers are regarded as street-level bureaucrats, a term used by Lipsky (2010) to describe civil servants who not only work directly with citizens and who have considerable discretion in the execution of their tasks, but who also have substantial amounts of autonomy from organizational authority. Circumstances in their daily routines compel them to use such discretion (Hupe and Hill 2007; Lipsky 2010). While educational managers seek ways to restrict workers' discretion in order to secure certain results (Gálvez et al. 2016), teachers seek to manage their work in the ways that suit them. Given that teachers are (or at least should be seen as) professionals, it would be natural for educational managers to allow teachers to do what they deem to be fit and relevant. This faces education managers with professional dilemmas, as they are willing to give teachers the latitude to exercise their profession without undue interference, but also need to make sure that their schools attain the mission goals. Informed by the rise of administrative reforms, particularly the *New Public Management* (Thiel and Leeuw 2002) and the need to maintain standards and to improve the welfare of students, school public sector managers are forced to employ various mechanisms of accountability (Wanzare 2002; Tuytens and Devos 2013; Moletsane et al. 2015; Esch et al. 2016).

In South Africa, the Department of Basic Education (DBE) has at various levels, employed a multiplicity of mechanisms in order to hold schools and teachers accountable to organizational objectives and to improve the quality of schooling for all learners (Heystek 2014). Such mechanisms include the Integrated Quality Measurement System (IQMS) and the Teacher Performance Appraisal (TPA). In recent years the DBE has been developing a performance agreement document to be signed by school principals and their deputies as a performance accountability mechanism (Heystek 2014). Despite the usage of such a mechanism by the DBE, Lipsky (2010) asserts that teachers with discretion and autonomy in the execution of their duties will always possess resources to resist management's excessive control.

Scholarly attention on performance accountability is not recent nor is it restricted to the South African education system. In Canada, extensive work has been done to investigate the challenges of implementing performance accountability (Fagan 1995). In the United States, the *Government Performance and Accountability Act of 1994* empowered agencies to use performance accountability systems in order to improve delivery (Berry et al. 2000). Incisive work by Berry et al. (2000) explored the changes that were brought about by the application of performance accountability in Florida

and found that departments whose workers commanded professional discretion faced challenges in implementing performance accountability mechanisms. In Texas, Cullen and Reback (2006) explored the extent to which schools manipulated the composition of students in the examination classes in order to maximize their rating under performance accountability systems. Liu et al. (2016) demonstrate how performance evaluation that is used as an accountability mechanism might pose potential problems due to its over-reliance on a market-oriented accountability system. What has been a common phenomenon across most of these studies is that, compelled by the need to improve government's performance, performance evaluation has remained critical of politicians and administrators (Thiel and Leeuw 2002). In South Africa, most scholarly attention has focused on the IQMS as a form of performance accountability (See Clercq 2008; Biputh and McKenna 2010; Kutame 2010; Mosoge and Pilane 2014) or standards-based accountability (See Taylor 2009). Most of these studies have been qualitative, small-scale projects, master's dissertations and doctoral theses (Biputh 2008).

While the international literature on performance accountability is rich in terms of depth and breadth, its usefulness in informing policy and practice in the South African education system is limited in a number of ways. First, South Africa, as an emerging economy, is at a different level of economic development. Secondly, South Africa is still grappling with the impact of apartheid, which left large gaps of inequalities between different races and geographic regions. As a result, South Africa suffers an acute shortage of teachers in certain subjects. Scholarly literature on performance accountability in South Africa is still in its infant stages and tends to focus on IQMS in its broader sense without unpacking its different components. For instance, using a quantitative approach Kutame (2010) explored the attitudes and perceptions of teachers of the effectiveness of the IQMS assessment system. While this is a plausible study, it gives an impression that IQMS is a single unit. This can be misleading as IQMS has a number of components, which evoke different perceptions and effects. There is a dearth of performance accountability literature, which explores the perceptions of teachers from different racial groups and types of schools found in South

Africa. As a result, the understanding of IQMS as a form of performance accountability mechanism is partial.

Objectives

The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to further the understanding of performance accountability in education by exploring the implementation of IQMS in South Africa. The study does this by analyzing the perceptions of teachers of the seven Performance Standards (PS) of classroom-based teachers contained in the IQMS. The analysis is based on the type of schools at which the respondents taught. This paper reveals that such perceptions are not homogenous across the different types of schools in the uMgungundlovu District, South Africa.

Following this introduction, there is a brief discussion on the conceptualization of performance accountability in order to locate the IQMS within the broader accountability discourses. Thereafter, the researchers consider the position of performance accountability in education. After discussing the methodological approaches adopted in collecting the empirical data, the paper will make a comprehensive quantitative and qualitative analysis of the findings. Based on the insights that emerged from the findings, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are made in the last two sections, respectively.

Performance Accountability in Education

Also termed 'managerial accountability', performance accountability refers to demonstrating and accounting for performance in the light of agreed-upon performance targets (Brinkerhoff 2003). Performance is an internal and external form of accountability, internal to internal supervisors and external to the public. The main focus of performance accountability is on outputs for public bureaucracy requirements. Performance accountability also denotes the notions of efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, quality ('hard accountability') and satisfaction, trust and equity ('soft accountability'). It involves complex processes of setting credible goals and objectives against which performance is judged. The main problem with this is the measurability of public bureaucracies' 'goods'. By definition, street-level bureaucracies (such as

DBE) are large organizations whose outputs are difficult to measure objectively (Lipsky 2010). On the surface, “performance accountability appears deceptively simple: public officials should be accountable for outputs, results, and impacts” (Brinkerhoff 2003: 11). However, such a simplistic view of performance accountability ignores the complex methodological issues that arise in linking performance with outputs.

Using performance accountability as an analytic tool, Leithwood et al. (1999) assert that an educational system must account for the welfare of individual students (1999:18). By ‘welfare’, these scholars imply the pre-eminence of academic achievement. They argue, “such achievement is a necessary if not sufficient part of the meaning of student welfare in the context of schooling” (Leithwood et al. 1999:18). A distinguishing feature of this view is ‘academic achievement’ without which an educational institution may not be said to be accountable. In current policy and practice, Leithwood et al. (1999:18) argue that teachers are often also held accountable for the nature of the organization and the practices of those who it is believed contribute more or less directly to students’ welfare. Under this regime, the most straightforward way of understanding educational accountability seems to be that of “performance reporting, a periodic report of attainments of schools and other educational units” (Levin 1974: 364).

Performance Accountability in South African Education

Performance accountability can be viewed as an external form of accountability, which involves the “scrutiny of the actions of officials and agencies related to the production of outputs, delivery of services, accomplishment of objectives, and/or achievement of results and impacts” (Brinkerhoff 2001: 6). In the South African education system, the performance of teachers is scrutinized in terms of their outputs (for example, the pass rate in Grade 12 and numeracy skills in various grades) and the objectives of DBE. However, the performance and outputs of education bureaucracies are not the same for all the different stakeholders in education. While some stakeholders measure the achievement of schools through pass rates, others measure it in terms of the quality of such passes or the ability of school leavers to cope with university education and find placement in jobs. This has given rise to different ways of measuring performance as well as to indicat-

ing various means of making schools and teachers accountable.

To be able to achieve performance accountability, the DBE uses human resources management tools such as the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) (Weber 2005: 65). Weber notes that the use of IQMS was agreed on by the Department of Education and teacher organizations in the Collective Agreement 8 of 2003: Integrated Quality Management System (Weber 2005: 64). The IQMS has several devices, which include Developmental Appraisal (DA), Performance Measurement (PM) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE) (mentioned here as a component of IQMS). The purpose of DA is to assess individual teachers in a transparent manner with a view to determining areas of strength and weakness and to draw up programs for individual development (Weber 2005: 65). The performance measurement, which is the focus of this paper, is used to secure accountability among teachers. This mechanism mimics the traits of a ‘carrot and stick’ device. Performance measurement is a rewards and incentives tool, which is used to evaluate individual teachers for purposes of salaries and promotion, as well as an affirmation of appointments. Performance measurement has ten Performance Standards. Some of the performance standards for class-based teachers are professional development in the field of work/career and participation in professional bodies, knowledge of curriculum and learning programs, lesson planning preparation and presentation, learner assessment/achievement, and creation of a positive learning environment. These performance standards are often considered very important by most teachers as they are the ones listed on the composite score sheet for use in performance measurement for pay progression and grade progression for the Level 1 teacher. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) reports that the IQMS in South Africa is used as an incentive scheme to determine the teachers’ salary progression. This study is centered on the perceptions of teachers of seven performance standards that are used as part of the criteria to determine their salary progression.

Criteria for Measuring Teacher Performance

The standards used to measure performance are not without controversy. While improvements in the education system depend on the identification of competent teachers (Soar et al.

1983), the identification and measurement of the attributes of such a teacher have continued to be elusive. The accuracy of the principals' judgments of the teachers' performance is subjective and at times misleading (Medley and Coker 1987). Researchers internationally have become aware of the shortcomings of the current models of teacher evaluation (See Milanowski 2004, 2011; Muijs 2006; Kyriakides et al. 2010). Discontentment has emerged in part due to the realization that education outcomes are a product of multifaceted factors, which are (in some cases) beyond the control of the teacher. Although it is widely accepted that it is generally difficult to measure the performance of teachers (Lipsky 2010), education ministries need to devise methods and metrics for evaluating teachers' performance, in their departments.

In the United States, there are a plethora of models for measuring teachers' performance (Podgursky and Springer 2006). One such model is the Milken Family Foundation's Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). This model has some parallels with the performance standards contained in the IQMS in South Africa. TAP consists of four components, namely multiple career paths, ongoing applied professional growth, instructionally focused accountability, and performance-related compensation. A common factor among these models of performance accountability is that they imply prominence of the evaluation of inputs, process, and outputs.

Much research on the issues of performance evaluation (including IQMS in its broader sense) has been carried out, yet there has been very little work carried out on how teachers as street-level bureaucrats, perceive the criteria that are used to measure their performance. More recently, Kairuz et al.'s (2016) work has shown that the teachers' perceptions of such accountability mechanisms negatively affect the teachers' creative, reflective and critical thinking due to the stress they create. In this paper, the researchers examine how teachers view such criteria and show the values, which they attach to each criterion in the evaluation of their work.

METHODOLOGY

This paper forms part of a broader project, which investigated the different accountability mechanisms employed by the DBE in uMgungundlovu District in KwaZulu-Natal Province¹.

The researchers used data from multiple sources, including documents, interviews, questionnaires and observation as well as secondary sources. The total population for this study comprised all the practicing high school teachers and school principals in the uMgungundlovu Education District, (approximately 3240) according to the KwaZulu-Natal Education Management Information System (EMIS). For feasibility purposes, the researchers chose a sample of 100 teachers based on non-probability purposive sampling, which is also known as judgment sampling. Although the purposive sample was deemed appropriate for this study, "it does not pretend to represent the wider population" (Cohen, Manion, and Morison 2005:104). This limitation prevents the generalization of the findings to the whole population. A total of 15 schools were conveniently selected. Three of these schools were from former Model C² schools, three were independent schools and nine were public townships schools. Although this was not accurately proportional, the numbers were determined by the available resources and feasibility of access.

A questionnaire with six sections was used to solicit the perceptions of teachers of relative values they assign to the different performance standards in IQMS. A five point Likert-like scale was used to measure the degree of agreement with given statements with regard to different performance standards where 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree. These questionnaires were hand delivered to the selected respondents. The Cronbach's alpha index was used to measure the internal consistency and reliability of the items in the questionnaire. An alpha value of 0.7 revealed that there was internal consistency.

Face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted with six principals who were purposively selected from high schools in the District. The interviews lasted forty-five minutes to one hour. The interviews served two main purposes. Firstly, they sought to understand the mechanisms of accountability associated with the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS). Secondly, the interviews also elicited the views of school principals on the use of performance accountability mechanisms in education.

The main form of data analysis was content analysis. Data recorded and coded from the interviews was transcribed before analysis. The-

1 indicates that most of the respondents affirm that learner achievement in assessments is a significant component of performance evaluation. A further analysis of the respondents' perceptions according to the type of school in which they taught is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 indicates that forty-four percent of respondents in independent schools said that learner achievement in assessments is very important for performance evaluation, twenty-eight percent rated this as 'important' and twenty percent believed this to be 'somewhat important'. A very small minority (4%) thought that this consideration is either 'slightly important' or 'not important at all'. Note, however, that those who rated assessment as 'very important' constituted twenty percent of the total of a number of teachers in all types of schools. The majority (58.3%) of respondents in public former Model C schools said that learner achievement is 'very important' in performance evaluation, and they were also the majority (50.9%) of all respondents who took such a standpoint. About 18.8 percent of the respondents in former Model C schools indicated that learner achievement in assessment is 'important' in performance evaluation and they constituted 39.1 percent of all respondents who held such a view. A small proportion (14.6%) in former Model C schools believed that learner achievement in assessments is 'somewhat important' in performance evaluation. Respondents from former Model C schools were a large proportion (46.7%) of all the respondents who took that position. In the 'not important at all' and 'slightly important' categories, there were 4.2 percent in each. The highest proportion (59.3%) of those who believed that learner achievement in assessment is 'very important' in performance evaluation was of the respondents in public township schools, although they comprise a small proportion (29.1%) of all the respondents who took such a view.

The information in Table 1 seems to suggest that there is little variation in the perceptions of respondents according to the type of school. This is confirmed by a chi-square test, which shows that the variations are not statistically significant ($p = 0.914$). It is, therefore, clear that the type of school had no influence on the perception of street-level bureaucrats on the importance of learner assessment in performance evaluation.

Planning, Administration and Lesson Delivery in Performance Evaluation

The third item of performance evaluation of teachers in uMgungundlovu District is 'planning, administration and lesson delivery'. A substantial majority (56%) of all the respondents believed that planning, administration, and lesson delivery are 'very important' in performance evaluation, about twenty-two percent of all the respondents rated this as 'important' and eighteen percent as 'somewhat important'. Only three percent of all the respondents rated this item as 'slightly important' while one percent believed it is 'not important at all'. Generally, Table 2 shows that most respondents confirmed the significance of planning, administration and lesson delivery in the performance evaluation of street-level bureaucrats' work. In order to identify any association between such perceptions of respondents and the type of school in which they teach, the two variables were cross-tabulated. Table 2 shows the results.

About 58.3 percent of all the respondents in public former Model C schools (50% of all such respondents) indicated that planning, administration, and lesson delivery are 'very important' in performance evaluation, 20.8 percent believed that this item is 'important' (45.5% of all respondents who took such a view), 18.8 percent regarded it as 'somewhat important' (50% of the entire sample), whereas only 2.1 percent (only one teacher) viewed this as 'slightly important'. Table 2 suggests that the majority (55.6%) of respondents from public schools in townships constituted a small proportion (26.8%) of all the respondents who indicated that planning, administration, and lesson delivery are 'very important' for performance evaluation, 18.5 percent of respondents in public schools in townships rated this as 'important' (22.7% of the sample) and twenty-two percent viewed the item as 'slightly important' (33% of all such respondents). No one thought that planning, administration, and lesson delivery are not important for performance evaluation. The responses seem to be fairly similar across all types of schools. This is confirmed by a chi-square test ($p = 0.784$). It is generally apparent that planning, administration, and lesson delivery are regarded as crucial elements of performance evaluation of street-level bureaucrats implementing the NCS in uMgungundlovu District.

at all' in their performance evaluation. The highest proportion (47.9%) of respondents who indicated that co-curricular activities were 'very important' in performance evaluation were teachers in the former Model C public schools and they also constituted 65.7 percent of all respondents who took such a viewpoint. In these schools, 27.1 percent rated this item as 'important' (50% of the sample who did so), whereas a small fraction (8.3%) thought that co-curricular activities were 'slightly important' for performance evaluation (18.2% of all respondents who had the same view). The information in Table 3 seems to suggest that there is an association between the perceptions of teachers about the importance of co-curricular activities in performance evaluation and the type of schools in which they are located. Respondents from former Model C schools seemed to place greater value on co-curricular activities than respondents from public township schools. However, a chi-square test showed that this was not statistically significant ($p = 0.177$).

Human Relations and Contribution to School Development in Performance Evaluation

Teachers are expected to maintain good human relations and to contribute to the development of the schools in which they teach. Respondents were asked to rank the importance of this item for their performance evaluation. The findings are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 indicates that a small majority (40%) of all the respondents said that human relations and factors contributing to the development of their school were 'very important' in assessing their performance while twenty-seven percent

said these were 'important'. About twenty-two percent suggested that this item was 'somewhat important', eight percent that it is 'slightly important' while two percent believed it is 'not important at all'. The perceptions were then analyzed according to the type of school at which a teacher was based. Former Model C schools seem to place more value on human relations and on contributing to school development than any other type of school, with 47.9 percent of their respondents constituting 65.7 percent of all the respondents who suggested that this was 'very important'. Furthermore, 27.1 percent of their respondents represented fifty percent of all respondents who felt that this criterion was 'important'. About 14.6 percent indicated that it was 'somewhat important' (28% of those who took such a view). Only one teacher dismissed the importance of this item altogether. Approximately 25.9 percent of respondents in public township schools constituting twenty percent of all respondents believed that human relations and contributing to school development were 'very important' in their performance evaluation. It is clear that teachers in all types of schools attach at least some importance to human relations and to contributing to school development as a means of performance evaluation. Although respondents from former Model C schools seem to attach more value to this than any type of school, a chi-square showed that the association was not statistically significant ($p = 0.177$).

Creation of a Positive Learning Environment for Performance Evaluation

Teachers are expected to create a positive learning environment in their classrooms. They

Table 4: Perceived importance of human relations and contribution to school development as a means of performance evaluation, according to type of school

Type of school	Not important at all	Slightly important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Total
<i>Independent</i>	1 4.0%	5 20.0%	8 32.0%	6 24.0%	5 20.0%	25 100.0%
<i>Public Former Model C</i>	1 2.1%	4 8.3%	7 14.6%	13 27.1%	23 47.9%	48 100.0%
<i>Public Township</i>	3 33.3%	4 36.4%	10 28.0%	7 50.0%	7 65.7%	27 48.0%
<i>Total</i>	3 3.0%	11 11.0%	25 25.0%	26 26.0%	35 35.0%	100 100.0%

Table 6: Perceived importance of knowledge of curriculum content in performance evaluation, according to type of school

Type of school	Not important at all	Slightly important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	No opinion	Total
<i>Independent</i>	1 4.0%	2 8.0%	6 24.0%	3 12.0%	13 52.0%	0 0.0%	25 100.0%
<i>Public Former Model C</i>	1 2.1%	0 0.0%	8 16.7%	10 20.8%	28 58.3%	1 2.1%	48 100.0%
<i>Public Township</i>	1 3.7%	0 0.0%	4 14.8%	7 25.9%	15 55.6%	0 0.0%	27 100.0%
<i>Total</i>	3 3.0%	2 2.0%	18 18.0%	20 20.0%	56 56.0%	1 1.0%	100 100.0%

where respondents taught seemed to have an influence on their perceptions about the importance of knowledge of curriculum content for performance evaluation. Table 6 reveals that fifty-two percent of respondents from the independent schools (23% of all such respondents) indicated that knowledge of curriculum content was 'very important' in their performance. Twelve percent thought that it was 'important' (15% of all respondents who took such a standpoint). This means that sixty-seven percent of respondents from independent schools identified the significant importance of knowledge of curriculum content in performance evaluation. Only twelve percent thought that this was 'somewhat important' while twenty-four percent believed that it was 'slightly important'. A chi-square test showed that there was no significant difference between respondents from different types of school ($p = 0.490$).

Professional Development in Performance Evaluation

The number and type of professional development workshops/training that a teacher attends in a year was the final item for performance evaluation. Respondents were asked to rank the importance of this for their performance evaluation. This is indicated in Table 7.

An analysis of the responses according to the type of school where teachers were located revealed no significant differences in response to this item. Approximately thirty-six percent of the respondents from independent schools (20% of all such respondents) rated professional development as 'very important' for their performance evaluation, and twenty-eight percent (25.9% of all such respondents) regarded this factor as 'important'. Thus, sixty-four percent of the respondents in independent schools sug-

Table 7: Perceptions of the importance professional development for performance evaluation, according to type of school

Type of school	Not important at all	Slightly important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Total
<i>Independent</i>	1 4.0%	2 8.0%	6 24.0%	7 28.0%	9 36.0%	25 100.0%
<i>Public Former Model C</i>	0 0.0%	2 4.2%	9 18.8%	12 25.0%	25 52.1%	48 100.0%
<i>Public Township</i>	1 3.7%	0 0.0%	7 25.9%	8 29.6%	11 40.7%	27 100.0%
<i>Total</i>	2 2.0%	4 4.0%	22 22.0%	27 27.0%	45 45.0%	100 100.0%

gested the significant importance of professional development in their performance evaluation of teachers. Only eight percent of the respondents from independent schools indicated that professional development is 'slightly important' while four percent stated that it was 'not important at all'.

Table 7 reveals that 40.7 percent of respondents from public schools in townships (24.4% of all such respondents) suggested that professional development was 'very important' for performance evaluation and 29.6 percent that it was 'important' (29.6% of respondents who took such a view). This brought to 70.3 percent the total proportion of respondents who identified the importance of professional development for performance evaluation. Of these, 25.9 percent rated professional development as 'slightly important' for performance evaluation. There is no association between the perceptions of respondents of the importance of professional development and the type of school at which they teach. This is confirmed by a chi-square test ($p = 0.67$), which shows that any such association is insignificant.

The perceptions of respondents from all types of school discussed here are fairly uniform. Most of the respondents in the uMgungundlovu District acknowledged that performance evaluation improved performance accountability among teachers. However, some commented:

Committed and dedicated teachers are accountable all the time. You do not need an in-

strument to ensure accountability. It adds a lot of admin [planning and administration] (Tr53).

Because it is done once [per term], it is not a true reflection. If it is done continuously it can empower teachers for better performance (Tr23).

It [is] not a true reflection of everyday activities as evaluation occurs on limited occasions (Tr59).

Although these responses do not identify any specific criterion of performance evaluation, they do reflect a somewhat negative perception of the system of evaluation.

DISCUSSION

The researchers set out to demonstrate how teachers perceive the criteria that are used to measure their performance in order to ensure their accountability to the DBE mission and goals. As Lipsky (2010) notes, bureaucracies and their managers need to know what they want their workers to do and to be able to rank their preferences and know how to measure the output. The DBE does have performance standards. It is against this background that the researchers have revealed that it is critical to identify crucial aspects of the job of teachers in order to measure their performance. Table 8 displays key aspects (key result areas) of uMgungundlovu District teachers. Drawing on the analyses, the summary of perception of respondents of the importance of these aspects is presented in the order of the value that was attached to each item.

Table 8: Perceptions of respondents of the importance of different items of performance evaluationⁱⁱⁱ

	<i>Not important at all</i>	<i>Slightly important</i>	<i>Somewhat important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Very important</i>	<i>No opinion</i>	<i>Total</i>
Planning and administration and lesson delivery	1%	3%	18%	22%	56%	0%	100%
Knowledge of curriculum and programs	3%	2%	18%	20%	56%	1%	100%
Learner assessment/achievement	4%	3%	15%	23%	55%	0%	100%
Creation of a positive learning environment	1%	6%	20%	25%	47%	1%	100%
Professional development	2%	4%	22%	27%	45%	0%	100%
Human relations and contribution to school development	2%	8%	22%	27%	40%	1%	100%
Co-curricular activities	3%	11%	25%	26%	35%	0%	100%

From Table 8 one can see that performance evaluation, planning, administration and lesson delivery are considered to be 'very important' by fifty-six percent of all respondents surveyed and by twenty-two percent to be 'important'. This perception is generally uniform across different types of schools. This suggests that planning, administration, and lesson delivery were critical for teachers as well as members of School Management Teams (SMTs). Kyriakides et al. (2010) value this aspect and argue that plans must be well-structured showing clarity of presentation. This is fairly consistent with Podgursky and Springer's (2006) findings on the TAP. This criterion implies attention to the inputs into education. Discussing the importance of planning, Milanowski (2011) argues that evaluators should collect artifacts such as lesson and curriculum plans. The assumption is that good and effective teaching is a product of good planning. In some cases, teachers bemoan the amount of administration that is caused by the value that is given to this criterion in performance evaluation. With regards to this challenge, Milanowski (2011) suggests that collection of artifacts must be carefully limited so that teachers are not coerced to provide a full portfolio of evidence. Lesson delivery, which is evaluated through observation by members SMTs, is also deemed to be very important. This is barely distinguishable from Milanowski's (2011) observation in Cincinnati Public Schools where evaluators paid attention to different aspects of instructional practice such as student behavior management, teacher-student interaction, and student engagement. Furthermore, performance assessments that measure teacher activity in the classroom have been found to correlate with teacher effectiveness (Darling-Hammond 2010). However, Kairuz's (2016) recent work suggests that such measures of accountability increases the complexity of teachers' work despite a lack of empirical evidence supporting their appropriateness in the schools.

The next most important item was knowledge of curriculum and programs, which was also considered to be 'very important' by fifty-six percent of the respondents and 'important' by twenty percent. However, in practice, this item may be difficult to measure. It was not clear whether knowledge of the curriculum also included subject content knowledge, which was widely cited as important in performance evaluation (Muijs

2006; Kyriakides et al. 2010; Milanowski 2011). Methods of evaluating the knowledge of a teacher are not easy to find, neither are they well accepted. Achievement in learner assessment was ranked third in Table 8 with fifty-five percent who felt that this measure of performance was 'very important' and by twenty-three percent that it was 'important'. In the fourth position was the creation of a positive learning environment, which was judged to be 'very important' by forty-seven percent and 'important' by twenty-five percent of the respondents. Since a learning environment is not confined to the classroom, this item may be difficult to evaluate. A few observations of lessons by SMTs cannot evaluate this comprehensively. Concerning this, Lipsky notes that "teaching is done in the classrooms that principals and supervisors do not normally enter, and if they do, they provide a notice so that the teaching, like performance, may be changed by the presence of audience" (Lipsky 2010:169).

The fifth position was professional development, which was considered to be 'very important' by forty-five percent and important by twenty-seven percent. Again the measurement of this item was based on the number of professional development workshops attended by a teacher as opposed to what was learnt (content) and how much the teacher understood. To put it another way, it was purely based on attendance. Professional development has some parallels with what Kyriakides et al. (2010) term *responsiveness to change*, which they found to be important in performance evaluation among Cypriot teachers. The sixth position was 'human relations and contribution to school development', which was considered 'very important' by forty percent and 'important' by twenty-two percent, and the last position in the ranking was co-curricular activities, which were considered 'very important' by thirty-five percent, many of whom were from former Model C schools (wealthier schools), and 'important' by twenty-five percent. This may suggest that respondents from less privileged schools do not see co-curricular activities as important in performance evaluation. Although the literature does not show the value of the contribution to school development, Kyriakides et al.'s (2010) study demonstrates that teacher's *personal traits* and *self-efficacy* were valued in performance evaluation.

While it is clear that the use of different quality management systems in schools has in-

creased since the advent New Public Management paradigm in the public sector, their purposes are not well-shared by different stakeholders. Gálvez et al. (2016) question the usefulness of such systems in the attainment of quality education and effective schools.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the criteria used to measure the performance evaluation in the IQMS are fairly consistent with that used internationally. Although there is a general discontentment among the teachers who are evaluated, there are some performance standards, which they value more than others. There is compelling evidence that of all the criteria, teachers, and members SMTs value planning, administration, lesson delivery and knowledge of curriculum and programs. Human relations and contribution to school development and participation in co-curricular activities did not receive positive responses from the respondents. The co-curricular aspect was perceived to be the least important among respondents from less wealthy schools. Insights gained from this study have important implication for school managers and policymakers. It can be argued that teachers tend to put more effort into what they perceive to be important. This may lead to tokenism or total neglect of areas such as co-curricular activities, which are important for the development of well-rounded students. Much emphasis on records and plans in the name of planning administration may take away valuable teaching time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Drawing from insights of these findings, the study recommends that the demand for artifacts must be done with care so as to avoid burnout among teachers. School managers need to find ways of ensuring that the performance standards that are less valued by teachers in performance evaluation are not neglected in practice. There is a need for further studies to explore and demonstrate how performance standards used in measuring the teachers' performance affect the different aspects of the teachers' work and the quality of teaching and learning in South Africa and beyond. Such studies could take the form of case studies in different provinces of the country and triangulation of findings from students,

teachers, education managers and documentary analysis of relevant educational records. Findings from such studies can inform policy and practice with regard to the implementation of IQMS.

NOTE

- i. This paper is based on a doctoral project conducted for at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. Detailed analyses of the findings produced this paper.
- ii. Former Model C schools are those that were reserved for white students during apartheid. Although this has changed in the new democratic dispensation, these schools are better resourced than township schools and some independent schools.
- iii. Table 8 is a summary based on the data from Table 1 to 7.

REFERENCES

- Bergen A, While A 2005. 'Implementation Deficit' and 'Street-level Bureaucracy': Policy, practice and change in the development of community nursing issues. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 13: 1-10.
- Berry FS, Brower RS, Flowers G 2000. Implementing performance accountability in Florida: What changed, what mattered, and what resulted? *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 23: 338-358.
- Biputh B 2008. *An Investigation of Teachers' Perceptions of the Integrated Quality Management System in South African Schools*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Durban: Durban University of Technology.
- Biputh B, McKenna S 2010. Tensions in the quality assurance processes in post apartheid South African schools. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 40: 279-291.
- Brinkerhoff D 2003. *Accountability and Health Systems: Overview, Framework, and Strategies*. Maryland, Patners for Health Reformplus.
- Brinkerhoff DW 2004. Accountability and health systems: Toward conceptual clarity and policy relevance. *Health Policy and Planning*, 19: 371-379.
- Clercq FD 2008. Teacher quality, appraisal and development: The flaws in the IQMS. *Perspectives in Education*, 26: 7-18.
- Cohen L, Manion L, Morrison K 2005. *Research Methods in Education*. 5th Edition. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Cullen JB, Reback R 2006. *Tinkering Toward Accolades: School Gaming Under a Performance Accountability System*. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Darling-Hammond L 2010. Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness How Teacher Performance Assessments Can Measure and Improve Teaching. Centre for American Progress. From <www.americanprogress.org> (Retrieved on 5 June 2016).
- Esch EV, Wei LQ, Chiang FFT 2016. High-performance human resource practices and firm perfor-

- mance: The mediating role of employees' competencies and the moderating role of climate for creativity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31: 44-56.
- Fagan LP 1995. Performance accountability in the Newfoundland School System. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 20: 65-76.
- Gálvez IE, Cruz FJF, Díaz MJF 2016. Evaluation of the impact of quality management systems on school climate. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30: 474 - 492.
- Heystek J 2014. Principals' perceptions about performance agreements as motivational action: Evidence from South Africa. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42: 889-902.
- Hupe P, Hill M 2007. Street-level bureaucracy and public accountability. *Public Administration Review*, 85: 279-299.
- Kairuz T, Andries L, Nickloes T, Truter I 2016. Consequences of KPIs and performance management in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30: 6-25.
- Kutame AP 2010. Evaluating the link between learner assessment and teacher development: Implementation of Integrated Quality Management System in South Africa. *Caribbean Educational Research Journal*, 2: 96-103.
- Kyriakides L, Campbell RJ, Christofidou E 2010. Generating criteria for measuring teacher effectiveness through a self-evaluation approach: A complementary way of measuring teacher effectiveness. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 13: 291-325.
- Leithwood K, Edge K, Jantzi D 1999. *Educational Accountability: The State of the Art*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Foundation Publishers.
- Levin HM 1974. A conceptual framework for accountability in education. *The School Review*, 82: 363-391.
- Lipsky M 2010. *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Liu S, Zhao D, Xie W 2016. Chinese teachers' attitudes toward performance pay: The cases of three schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 30: 16-34.
- Medley DM, Coker H 1987. The accuracy of principals' judgments of teacher performance *The Journal of Educational Research*, 80: 242-247.
- Milanowski A 2004. The relationship between teacher performance evaluation scores and student achievement: Evidence from Cincinnati. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79: 33-53.
- Milanowski A 2011. Strategic measures of teacher performance: Moving from our current haphazard system of teacher evaluation to a more systematic approach. *Kappan*, 92: 1 -8.
- Moletsane R, Juan A, Prinsloo C, Reddy V 2015. Managing teacher leave and absence in South African rural schools: Implications for supporting schools in contexts of multiple-deprivation. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 43: 386-399.
- Mosoge MJ, Pilane MW 2014. Performance management: The neglected imperative of accountability system in education. *South African Journal of Education*, 34: 1- 18.
- Muijs D 2006. Measuring teacher effectiveness: Some methodological reflections. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12: 53-74.
- Podgursky MJ, Springer MG 2006. Teacher Performance Pay: A Review. National Centre on Performance Incentives. From <www.performanceincentives.org.> (Retrieved on 5 June 2015).
- Soar RS, Medley DM, Coker H 1983. Teacher evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65: 239 -246.
- Taylor N 2009. Standards-based accountability in South Africa. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 20: 341-356.
- Thiel SV, Leeuw FL 2002. The performance paradox in the public sector. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 25(3): 267-281.
- Tuytens M, Devos G 2013. The problematic implementation of teacher evaluation policy: School failure or governmental pitfall? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42: 155-174.
- Wanzare ZO 2002. Rethinking teacher evaluation in the third world: The case of Kenya. *Educational Management and Administration*, 30: 213-229.
- Weber T 2005. The anatomy of accountability. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20: 189-208.
- Yeung SYS 2011. A school evaluation policy with a dual character: Evaluating the school evaluation policy in Hong Kong from the perspective of curriculum leaders. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 40: 37-68.
- Yin RK 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Newbury Park: CA Sage.

Paper received for publication on August 2015
Paper accepted for publicaion on July 2016