© Kamla-Raj 2016
PRINT: ISSN 0975-1122 ONLINE: 2456-6322
Int J Edu Sci, 15(3): 485-495 (2016)
DOI: 10.31901/24566322.2016/15.03.19

Teaching Practice Assessment Indicators: An Index to What is Privileged as Defining Effective Teaching

Sibanda Jabulani[1], Marongwe Newlin[2], Mushoriwa Taruvinga D[3] and Begede Martin P[4]

[1]Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa
[2]Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, South Africa
[3]University of Fort Hare, East London, South Africa ,
[4]University of Swaziland, Kwaluseni, Swaziland
E-mail: [1]<jabusbnd@gmail.com>, [2]<newlynmutetwa@yahoo.com>,
[3]<TMushoriwa@ufh.ac.za>, [4]<mpbegede@gmail.com>

KEYWORDS Assessment Instruments. Assessment Practices. Effective Teaching. Teacher Supervision. Teaching Practice

ABSTRACT This study investigated competences, knowledge, skills and dispositions privileged in five universities' teaching practice (TP) assessment instruments. It content analysed the universities' TP assessment instruments and identified indicators cutting across at least three of the universities' assessment instruments as representative of what they considered effective teaching indicators. Findings revealed universities' lack of consensus on specific indicators of good practice despite general uniformity in the assessment categories. There was greater consensus on input indicators which assessed teacher profile and what they brought into the teaching and learning environment than on the process or output of teaching and learning. Actuated by the need for measurability of assessment indicators, assessment instruments generally assessed the cognitive dimension of teaching at the expense of other dimensions. The study recommends a research-based determination of teacher and teaching quality indicators that best correlate with effective learning and their infusion into universities' teaching practice assessment instruments.

INTRODUCTION

It is generally agreed, whether intuitively or empirically, that the teacher is the single most important school-based learner achievement factor (Pretorius 2012; Santiago and Benavides 2009; Varlas 2009). Teaching Practice (TP), which seeks to develop and ascertain teacher effectiveness, is the hallmark of their initial teacher education (TE) programme. Because the products of the TE system are expected to spend their career lives teaching learners and not writing assignments, the TP experience a teacher education system provides is a key defining feature of the efficacy of the TE system. Teaching Practice seeks to develop and assess myriad competences that define effective teaching. By its nature, TP experience occurs within the school setting away from the TE institution and the responsibility of ensuring the efficaciousness of that experience is delegated, but not relegated, to the school system. By far the dominant method of assessing teachers' teaching effectiveness is classroom observation. The onus is on the TE institution to ensure that what it defines and privileges as effective teaching is what is assessed on students during TP.

Lack of a definitive definition of effective teaching compromises the identification of effective teaching indicators. Layne's (2012) observation, from a review of several studies, that lecturers and students generally hold diverse views on what constitutes effective teaching necessitates the isolation and capture, within the assessment instruments, of indicators to be used for assessing student teachers' teaching. The indicators once identified, would ensure uniformity of assessment expectations between the lecturers and students. According to Krull and Leijen (2015: 916).

There is a need for a clear definition of the expected teaching competences of student teachers, preferably covering all the major facets of teaching. These competences should be reliably measurable and quantifiable in order to assess and analyze student teachers' progress.

Wong and Wong (2011), cited in Pretorius (2012: 312), similarly argued that "Effectiveness is identifiable, teachable and implementable."

The university or certificating TE institution assesses students in conjunction with the cooperating school. The latter adheres to the as-

Address for correspondence:
Dr. Sibanda Jabulani
Rhodes University,
Private Bag 94, Grahamstown, 2140, South Africa
E-mail: jabusbnd@gmail.com

sessment criteria provided by the certificating institution to ensure uniformity of assessment standards. These criteria are normally enshrined in a student teacher supervision assessment form used by both the TE institution (hereafter also referred to as the university) and the school. Because both exhaustive isolation and assessment of all effective teaching indicators is not feasible, universities privilege for assessment, what they regard as non-negotiable skills, knowledge, attitudes and competences effective teachers should possess. These are then captured in the TP assessment tools or rubrics.

Why Focus on TP Assessment Instruments?

Teaching practice assessment instruments define how effective teaching is regarded by the TE institutions and how it would eventually be conceived by students, cooperating schools, and cooperating teachers. The instruments should ideally serve a "…developmental and evaluative purpose" (Reed 2014: 9). That they are standardized gives them a measure of convenience to the assessors and a semblance of objectivity which explains their preference as measures of students' teaching competence. According to Reed (2014), the assessment instruments account to diverse stakeholders how decisions around the certification of the TE products is arrived at to ensure "…greater transparency and public confidence in the delivery of teacher education" (p.13).

These instruments both derive from, and influence the theory taught to the students. They reflect areas of pedagogy to which much time and effort was, and needs to be expended. Because schools generally esteem TE institutions as fountains and repositories of knowledge, the assessment instruments potentially colour the cooperating schools' and teachers' perception of what a good teacher should do, know and be. Schools may even pattern their own assessment instruments and protocols after the TE assessment instruments. While much has been written about TP, there is a dearth of knowledge on what universities privilege as defining attributes of effective teaching that merit assessment as reflected in these ubiquitous TP assessment instruments.

Problem Statement

Ko et al. (2013) problematizes teacher effectiveness under five challenges: the definitional challenge, where defining the concept and its parameters is fluid; the perspective challenge, which questions the perspective from which effective teaching should be viewed; the characterisation challenge, which grapples with how to know effective teaching when one sees it; the measurement challenge, which focuses on how best the characterisation of teacher effectiveness can be assessed or evaluated; and the theorisation challenge which struggles to coalesce research evidence on the contingencies of effective teaching in an all-encompassing framework. The present study investigates the measurement challenge which the researchers assume index the definitional, perspective and characterisation challenges to understanding teacher effectiveness. That there is no consensus on all the five challenges speaks to the need to identify what aspects TE prioritises in TP assessment as a way to infer diverse TE institutions' cognition on teacher effectiveness. This study seeks to infer the competences, skills, knowledge and attitudes that universities esteem as indicators of effective teaching from the TP assessment instruments used by five universities where the researchers taught or once taught. The study is guided by two research questions.

Research Questions

The questions the study sought to answer were:

- What privileged knowledge, skills, competences and dispositions assessed by teacher education institutions on teaching practice transcend teacher education institutional boundaries?
- What do the privileged assessment indicators tell of the foci and definition of effective teaching by the teacher education institutions?

It was the study's considered opinion that the determination of what was privileged in TP assessment was index to what the teacher education systems expended time, effort and expertise on, seeing that all teacher education activities are geared towards producing teachers who would make a mark in the classroom. A review of literature on defining features of effective teaching is instructive to the evaluation of the aspects that universities prioritised in TP assessment.

Review of Literature

Kiggundu and Nayimuli (2009) viewed TP as the 'real interface' between studenthood and membership of the profession as it is 'the crux of their preparation for the teaching profession.' Goe et al. (2008: 2) noted that "methods for measuring teachers have changed as definitions and beliefs about what is important to measure have evolved." Although there is consensus on effective teaching being one of the key, if not the chief determinant of learner achievement, a determination of the key competences that are important to measure has been elusive. Goe et al. (2008) saw the lack of consensus on what constitutes good teaching and the practices of good teachers as confounding the measurement of teacher effectiveness on the basis of particular indicators. Aspects regarded as constituting good teaching are diverse and reliable research on the competences teachers should have is scarce (Krull and Leijen 2015).

Goe et al. (2008) however, identified three key categories from which indicators of effective teaching can be sourced namely; inputs, processes, and outputs. Inputs relate to that which the teacher brings with them to the classroom like "teacher background, beliefs, expectations, experience, pedagogical and content knowledge, certification and licensure, and educational attainment" (p.2). These define teacher quality. Processes relate to the interactions and interaction patterns that occur within the learning environment which impact on student achievement. Outputs refer to what comes out of the learning experience. What eventually gets "… measured is a reflection of what is valued, and as a corollary, what is measured is valued" (Goe et al. 2008: 4).

Despite the need for isolating measurable, definitive indicators of effective teaching for assessment and scoring, Goe et al. (2008) noted a dearth of research into such variables. This leaves TE institutions at liberty to define indicators of effective teaching on their own. The TE institutions can only measure a limited number of indicators of effective teaching since the TP assessment is confined to a single lesson per supervision visit (a period ranging from 30 mins to 1hours in the schools in which the universities operated). The assessment instrument reduces the multifaceted classroom experience to a list of indicators which detail the skills, knowledge, competencies and dispositions that must be met for one to qualify as an effective teacher. According to Goe et al. (2008: 13, 14), both the instruments and the performance indicators they assess need to manifest the following qualities, whose definitions are adapted below:

- *Comprehensiveness* (how well the measure/instrument captures all requisite aspects defining effectiveness).
- *Generality* (how well an instrument/measure captures the full range of teachers' contexts).
- *Utility* (specific usefulness of scores from the instrument/measure).
- *Practicality* (measurability of the particular indicator).
- *Reliability* (how well the instrument/measure is consistent in its measurement).
- *Credibility* (how well a measure or instrument is reasonable and appropriate).

The assumption is that such itemised assessment instruments will capture requisite aspects of the extraordinarily complex art of teaching.

METHODOLOGY

In assessing the privilege accorded to particular aspects of teaching by different universities, the study considered competencies privileged by three or more of the five universities. Content analysis was used to analyse data for the present study. Cohen et al. (2007: 475) defined content analysis as "…a strict and systematic set of procedures for the rigorous analysis, examination and verification of the contents of written data." Although content analysis serves multiple purposes, we used it to identify patterns in communicative content. Rather than use pre-existing categories to analyse the supervision instruments, the researchers allowed the categories to emerge from the teacher effectiveness indicators manifested in the texts (supervision instruments). The observable, systematic, replicable and rule-governed characteristic of content analysis appealed to the study. Consistent with Cohen et al.'s (2007) stages of content analysis, researchers identified indicators of effective teaching and the elements that emanated from them. The indicators and elements were then categorised into themes depicting the standards to be attained. Different institutional TP assessment instruments were then juxtaposed

against the standards generated and against each other to determine the cross-institutional themes representative of what is generally valued as teacher-must-have attributes. Conclusions were then drawn up from the manifest content of the text. The TP supervision instruments from the following universities were used: University of Swaziland (Uniswa), Rhodes University (RU), University of Fort Hare (UFH), Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU), Walter Sisulu University (WSU). Apart from NMMU, these were universities the researchers had been, or were, teacher educators. The nature of the study did not raise ethical constraints seeing that, although the supervision reports were not public documents, the authors used them for supervision purposes and for this research purpose, uses of which did not compromise the institutions, their staff or students.

RESULTS

Various assessment items from the assessment instruments were coded and categorised subsequent to the identification of emerging themes. Emerging themes are presented and analysed under an organizing framework based on the chronology of instructional events as follows:

- Pre-teaching preparation
- Teacher's personal qualities
- Lesson Development
- Classroom management and control
- Post-teaching reflections
- Record keeping

Within these stages (as they are referred to in this paper) are themes and categories discussed within the relevant stage to determine which institution prioritised what aspects. Owing to the diversity in aspects assessed by different institutions in a particular category, focus was placed more on the aspects that cut across three or more of the five institutions as representative of what the five TE institutions generally considered requisite knowledge, skills and competencies which merited assessment on TP.

Pre-teaching Preparation

The pre-teaching stage covered aspects that provided evidence that the student had made adequate preparation prior to the lesson. These and their manifestation across institutions are presented in Table 1.

In the pre-lesson preparation, the drawing up of objectives to guide the lesson was unanimously assessed by all five institutions, followed by students' adherence to the prescribed formats or design (4/5 institutions) and logical presentation of the lesson (3/5 institutions). That 3 out of 18 indicators assessed in this category

Table 1: Pre-teaching preparation assessment indicators

Category	*Indicators*	*NMMU*	*RU*	*UNISWA*	*UFH*	*WSU*
Schemes and Lesson Plans/ Planning and Preparation	Up to date Schemes/Lesson plans			√		
	Use of prescribed formats/ lesson design		√	√	√′	√
	Statement of objectives	√	√	√′	√	√
	Matching objectives with activities			√	√	
	Logical presentation of lesson plan		√	√	√	
	Content knowledge	√				
	Activities	√			√′	
	Creativity	√				
	Assessment	√				
	Approaches				√	√
	Teaching aids/materials					
	• Purposeful and appropriate		√		√	
	• Large enough for all to see		√			
	• Well designed				√	
	Suitability of subject matter				√	√
	Reflection on previous lesson and how it informs future lesson		√			
	Previous lesson's learner assessment and how it informs future lesson		√			
	Suitability of worksheet (if used)		√			
	Quality of preparation notes, and general neatness				√	

transcended three or more of the five institutions and that 10 out of 18 of these were assessed by a single institution was indicative of the variability in what universities considered students' must-have pre-teaching competencies. That the five institutions conceived of the teaching and evaluation process hinging on instructional objectives was evident. Objectives could be seen as determining instructional and learning activities, choice of instructional media and lesson evaluation. Most lesson plan formats, like the widely used Danielson (2013) framework, begin with, or contain a statement of objectives and universities were apparently not immune to the perceived influence of instructional objectives in effective teaching. Examples are those that are widely used. The strict requirement regarding adherence to prescribed formats as a measure of good lesson preparation assumes that the lesson plan formats prescribed by the universities are fool-proof and lesson plans consistent with these formats evince sound preparation for effective teaching. Because preparation for a lesson happens in the lecturer or assessor's absence, TE institutions seek to infer the amount of that preparation from what the student documents, which speaks to the identifiability, quantifiability and measurability alluded to earlier. Table 2 identifies the teacher's personal qualities that were considered requisite for effective teaching.

Teacher's Personal Qualities

Only the professional discipline of the teacher (which in most cases was not qualified) was assessed by all the five institutions. Because the 'Professional discipline of teacher' indicator was all-encompassing, comprising even the other aspects which were captured separately, it precluded the identification of more and specific indicators of teacher quality. Within the category, dress code and grooming were privileged in three of the institutions bringing to only 2 teacher personal qualities assessed by at least three of the five universities out of the 8 qualities. Again, there was greater divergence than convergence in the indicators privileged for assessment. That only 8 aspects from the 5 institutions related to the personal qualities of the teacher was reflective of the low regard with which the personal qualities of the teacher indexed effective teaching. Who the teacher is less important than what she/he knew and could do. The few indicators could possibly be because of the difficulty of identifying indicators that could objectively determine a teacher's personal qualities from an hour's encounter with them in the classroom. Again, the issue of measurability potentially influenced the choice of indicators of effective teaching. The bulk of the indicators were for each of the institutions related to the actual lesson delivery as Table 3 shows.

Lesson Development

While in four institutions' assessment tools there was an acknowledgement of the need for a clear delineation of the parts of the lesson presentation in terms of the introduction lesson development and conclusion; what was privileged under each of the headings was quite diverse. In terms of the indicators of a good introduction, the only point of agreement from three institutions was the need for an introduction to capture interest. There was manifest diversity in the other 8 indicators of what a good introduction should do or be like. In terms of the lesson development, 5 out of 25 indicators were assessed by at least three of the five universities. These indicators and the number of institutions in which they were assessed were:

Table 2: Teacher's personal qualities

Category	*Indicators*	*NMMU*	*RU*	*UNISWA*	*UFH*	*WSU*
Personal Qualities of the Teacher	How learners relate to student		√			
	How student relates to learners		√			
	Rapport with learners		√		√	
	Professional discipline of teacher	√	√ '	√	√	√
	Dress code and grooming			√	√	√
	Ability to motivate				√	
	Enthusiasm	√			√	
	Confidence	√ '			√	

Table 3: Lesson presentation

Category	*Indicators*	*NMMU*	*RU*	*UNISWA*	*UFH*	*WSU*
Introduction	Creating relationships					√
	Actualisation of pre-knowledge					√
	Posing the problem					√
	Capturing interest	√			√	√
	Creativity	√				
	Brevity				√	
	Relation to the lesson	√			√	
	Use of prior knowledge				√	
	Relevance to real life.				√	
Lesson Development	Effectiveness of method			√	√	√
	Teacher confidence and subject mastery		√	√	√	√
	Scope of content and lesson pacing		√	–'		
	Content sequencing/ coherence		√	√	√	
	Use of appropriate resources			√		
	Use of learner experiences			√		
	Achieving higher order skills			√		
	Linking lesson to related contexts			√		
	Clarity of explanations, instructions and communication	√	√	√	√	
	Drawing and using class feedback			√		
	Organisation of learners and classroom		√			
	Questions and questioning techniques		√			
	Didactic flexibility		√			√
	Effectiveness of group work strategies		√			
	Maintaining interest and attention	√	√			
	Learner involvement/cooperation	√				
	Interaction with learners	√				
	How learners are assessed		√			
	Catering for diversity and inclusivity		√		√	
	Chalkboard work					√
	Use of other learning media		√		√	√
	Concepts/terms explained.				√	
	Methods/strategies effectively implemented as planned				√	
	Assessment activities integrate well [evidence of task class or homework]				√	
	Effective learner participation: Responses reinforced, well managed.				√	
Conclusion	Actualisation of learning content					√
	Fractionalisation					√
	Achievement of outcomes					√
	Evaluation					√
	Was lesson concluded?		√			
	Integrates and consolidates lesson		√		√	
	Was feedback received from learners?		√			

- Teacher subject mastery and confidence (4)
- Clarity of explanations, instructions and communication (4)
- Effectiveness of method/approach used (3)
- Sequencing and coherence (3)
- Use of instructional media (3)

The remaining 20 indicators were specific to one or two institutions which renders the lesson development skills and competences privileged by different institutions to be the most diverse of all the categories.

Of the 7 indicators of a good conclusion that were derived from the institutions' assessment instruments, none was assessed in 3 or more of the institutions. In fact, only one (the integration and consolidation of the lesson) was assessed in two institutions with the other 6 indicators being unique to each individual institution. While the teacher education institutions agreed that an effective lesson comprised an introduction, lesson development and conclusion, there was great variance on what constituted each of these

stages of a lesson. One or five supervisors assessing the same lesson using the 5 different assessment tools would rate the success of the lesson differently on the basis of the different foci occasioned by the diverse assessment indicators for the different institutions. The same divergence was manifest in the classroom management aspects as Table 4 shows.

Classroom Management and Control

For classroom management and control, discipline and orderliness, classroom atmosphere, as well as time management were each assessed by 3 of the 5 institutions with the other 9 aspects of classroom management being exclusive to one or two institutions. Although classroom management has been deemed a significant aspect in minimizing learner failure and frustration (Demirdag 2015), it is not accorded much priority as the number of indicators and their spread over institutions indicate. Demirdag (2015) even asserted that most TE institutions "… do not train prospective teachers on classroom management skills and strategies." The classroom management and control indicators emphasized by the other universities apart from NMMU and Uniswa reflect a narrow definition of classroom management and control which is propeased towards the control aspect. Nie and Lau (2009) noted the ambivalence of research findings on the effectiveness of the control approach to classroom management with some research indicating that it undermines learner motivation and induces passivity which may be misconstrued for good behaviour. They argued more for the creation of conditions in which volition, choice and autonomy flourish. Proactive classroom management where routines are used to enforce self-control and self-determination were not assessed much. The trend of divergence rather than convergence in the learning indicators assessed was apparent in this category as in the preceding categories. Divergence was even reflected more in the next category of assessment indicators (Table 5).

Table 4: Classroom management and control

Category	*Indicators*	*NMMU*	*RU*	*UNISWA*	*UFH*	*WSU*
Classroom Management and Control	Classroom atmosphere	√	√		√	
	Discipline and orderliness of class			√	√	√
	Individual attention			√		
	Control of the learning process			√		
	Use of clear instruction			√		
	Teaching Strategies	√				
	Flexibility	√				
	Learner involvement	√				√
	Language usage	√				
	Questioning techniques	√				√
	Use of Resources	√	√			
	Time management	√			√	√

Table 5: Post-lesson reflections

Category	*Indicators*	*NMMU*	*RU*	*UNISWA*	*UFH*	*WSU*
Reflections	Informative marking		√			
	Analysis of lesson using appropriate learning indicators		√	√	√	
	Teacher's self-evaluation	√	√			
	Design of appropriate remediation		√			
	Frequency of assessments given to class			√		
	Achievements: what worked well in lesson planning and delivery and why.	√		√		
	Challenges: identifies challenges in planning and presenting the lesson.		√		√	
	Commitment to improving own performance and lifelong learning.		√		√	
	Execution of learnings based on previous lessons/ actions reflections.				√	

Post-teaching Reflections

There was very little that was assessed after the lesson just as before the lesson (both in terms of the number of indicators and the institutions assessing the indicators) which implied that the lesson ended with the lesson conclusion. Of the 9 post-lesson reflection indicators, only lesson analysis was common in 3 of the institutions with 7 other indicators being assessed in 2 institutions and the last being exclusive to one institution. The value of post-lesson critical reflection, which develops teachers into lifelong learners who are autonomous and self-directed, was not given much priority. The lesson analysis indicator assessed by the three institutions lacked specificity of what indicators guided the assessment to ensure the analysis did not degenerate to a mere recount of lesson events (Heeralal 2014). In terms of the lack of convergence, record keeping was the worst of all the categories (Table 6).

Record Keeping

The category with the least indicators (7) and manifest in just two institutions was that of record keeping. It was apparent that the keeping of records about learners and their circumstances as well as their progress was generally not a priority among teacher education institutions. This was unfortunate considering that it is from judicious record keeping that the teacher can ascertain his or her progress, that of the learners, as well as their personal circumstances which would enable the design of instructional approaches consonant with the learners' needs.

DISCUSSION

The discussion first summarises the TP supervision indicators privileged by the majority (3+ out of 5) of the institutions, the component of the supervision in which each indicator was assessed, the nature of the indicator (input, process or output) and the domain at which the

Table 6: Record keeping

Category	*Indicators*	*NMMU*	*RU*	*UNISWA*	*UFH*	*WSU*
Record Keeping	Class lists		√	√		
	Record of work done		√	√		
	Assessment record			√		
	Samples of tests and marking schemes			√		
	Detailed information on selected learners' all round development		√			
	Self-evaluation rubric		√			
	Improvements made during TP		√			

Table 7: Summary of indicators prioritised across institutions

Indicator	*Universities (out of 5)*	*Supervision component*	*Nature of indicator*	*Domain*
Statement of objectives	5	Pre-teaching	input	cognitive
Teacher professionalism andaffective	5	Teacher personal quality	input	cognitive
Adherence to prescribed formats	4	Pre-teaching	input	cognitive
Teacher confidence and subject mastery andaffective	4	Lesson development	input	cognitive
Clarity of explanations, instructions and communication	4	Lesson development	process	cognitive
Logical lesson presentation	3	Pre-teaching	input	cognitive
Dress code and grooming	3	Teacher personal quality	input	affective
Captivating introduction	3	Lesson development	process	cognitive
Logical lesson presentation	3	Lesson development	process	cognitive
Use of instructional media	3	Lesson development	process	cognitive
Classroom atmosphere	3	Classroom management	context	affective
Discipline and orderliness	3	Classroom management	context	affective
Time management	3	Classroom management	process	cognitive
Lesson analysis	3	Post-lesson reflections	output	cognitive

indicator was assessed. The domain was established from the framing of sub-indicators constituting each indicator in the different institutions' assessment tools. To Goe et al.'s (2008) input, process and output indicators, the discussion adds context indicators. Table 7 presents this information.

Of the 14 privileged indicators, there were only 2 assessed in all the 5 institutions, 3 in 4 of the institutions and 9 in 3 of the institutions. The majority of what the study regards as indicators prioritised across teacher education institutions were manifest in only 3 of the 5 institutions which evinces lack of consensus among teacher educators on the non-negotiable skills competences and dispositions students should have by the end of their TP period. It would appear that of the criteria the indicators should satisfy as identified by Goe et al. (2008: 13- 14), the quality of practicality in terms of measurability actuated the determination of the indicators than the other factors such as comprehensiveness, utility, generality, reliability and credibility.

Input assessment indicators (6/14) dominated the process (5/14), context (2/14) and output (1/14) indicators showing the preference TE institutions accorded to what the teacher brought into the learning process ahead of the nature of the process, context and outcome. An effective teacher would, in that case, be defined as one who is and knows more than one who does. According to Richards (2013) process relates to how the teaching is conducted, the methodology and output refers what learners are capable of doing because of the instruction received. Both input and process largely focus on the teacher while output focuses on the learner. That there was a dearth of output indicators on the indicators that were assessed by at least 3 of the institutions manifests a preoccupation, on the part of teacher education, on the teacher through the teacher and not on the teacher through what learners can demonstrate. Rusznyak and Bertram (2015: 34) distinguished foregrounded teacher education programs knowledge bases as they foreground namely, general pedagogic knowledge, specialized content and pedagogic knowledge, and contextual knowledge for teaching. Bertram and Christiansen (2012) saw propositional knowledge, practical knowledge, and personal knowledge all coming together to impact professional practice. By having institutions focusing on specific knowledge bases at the exclusion of others, there is greater likelihood of half-baked products exiting the TE system. According to Rusznyak and Bertram (2015: 37), in South Africa, the Minimum Requirements for Teacher Education Qualifications (MRTEQ) (2011) identified the critical challenge of education in the country as that of teachers' "poor content and conceptual knowledge" explains the greater focus on the input dimensions of teaching, particularly the knowledge base.

The checklist approach, where the complex art of teaching is reduced to its constituent parts, is problematic in that the whole may be more than the aggregation of its components. The checklist may be satisfied at the expense of considering how the teacher brings all the important elements to bear on the practice of teaching. The effectiveness of the teacher could well be measured on the teaching artifacts they produce and what they say and do in the classroom without much regard for what effect that has on learners' learning. Learners' learning would in that case, not be an index to instructional effectiveness. Ong'ondo and Jwan (2009) observed that prior to the seventies teacher education's preoccupation was with the process-product designs which assessed teaching effectiveness on the basis of outcomes where focus was on the effects of teacher actions on learners' learning. That input and process were privileged across institutions but not the output is a departure from this pre-seventies ideal. We find the lack of output indicators in the assessment instruments contradictory with their unanimous focus on the assessment of statement of objectives in the pre-teaching stage, which itself should naturally lead to the assessment of learner behaviour as an indicator of objectives attainment. There has been a shift in thinking over the years, to the recognition of the central role teacher cognition, represented in their thoughts, beliefs and attitudes play in their instructional choices and the shaping of classroom dynamics and events (Borg 2006). Such thinking is not reflected in the learning indicators that were privileged across diverse teacher education institutions in the present study.

In terms of the component of supervision from which the indicators were selected, lesson development had the greatest share of indicators (5/14) where there was some consensus among the TE institutions on their evaluative relevance with very little consensus among pre-lesson, post-lesson, classroom management, personal qualities categories and none on record keeping. The greater degree of conformity on the lesson development indicators could have

been occasioned by the fact that the category had the most number of indicators across all the institutions.

Much of the effective teaching indicators as captured by the universities' TP assessment instruments assume a direct and positive correlation between teacher attributes and learners' learning. If the teacher knows, is and can; then that translates to learners' learning. Darling-Hammond's (2012) distinction between teacher quality and teaching quality is instructive. While teacher quality is a description of what the teacher brings to the teaching and learning context in terms of their traits, skills, knowledge, among others, teaching quality denotes the nature of instruction that allows diverse learners to learn. While teaching quality depends largely on teacher quality, teacher quality does not necessarily translate into teaching quality. As Darling-Hammond (2012:4) puts it, "[S]trong teacher quality may heighten the probability of effective teaching, but does not guarantee it." How teacher quality is brought to bear on the learners' learning within the specific instructional context defines teaching quality. If effective teaching is that which brings about effective learning, then there is more merit in focusing student teacher assessment more on teaching quality than infer teaching quality from teacher quality.

The cognitive domain was privileged most across institutions (9/14) with the affective domain manifest in 3/14 indicators and the combination of the two domains reflected in 2/14 indicators. The priority accorded the cognitive dimension meant that TE institutions saw teaching as primarily a cognitive enterprise which necessitated assessment of cognitive skills among the students. Krull and Leijen's (2015) call for measurable and quantifiable indicators of teaching explain the little focus on the affective variables which are not easy to determine with certainty.

The psychomotor domain was conspicuously absent, not only in the indicators privileged by most institutions, but also in the individual institutions' assessment tools. Shulman (2009) distinguished between assessment of teaching and assessment for teaching and there was a manifest measurement of the former than the latter.

A significant number of what universities consider indicators of effective teaching look like personal attributes and that raises the question whether good teachers are born or are made and the extent to which the TE institutions can convert one who is not naturally endowed with such attributes into an effective teacher.

Generally, the unit of assessment in the universities' TP instruments was the teacher and not the learners. This raises questions whether the two are mutually exclusive. A focus on both would bridge the chasm between teaching and learning. The focus on the teacher could be because of the purpose TP assessment is made to serve. Tucker and Stronge (2005) and Santiago and Benavides (2009) saw TP assessment as largely serving the performance improvement function and the accountability purpose. While the former seeks to ensure the teacher's reflection on own practice to better enhance it (formative in nature), the latter seeks to evaluate one's competence against set criteria for the purpose of credentials or other incentives (summative in nature). Where the accountability function overrides the performance improvement function, then the teacher, who is accountable and who should be certified as competent at the end of the whole assessment process necessarily has to be the focus of TP assessment. Learners' learning is thus, only extrapolated from the teacher's teaching (Tucker and Stronge 2005). Santiago and Benavides (2009) conceded the challenge of combining the improvement and accountability functions of assessment in a unitary assessment process.

Arguing for the inclusion in teacher evaluation models of teacher responsibilities less directly related to the teaching function, Santiago and Benavides (2009: 14) posited that "[T]he work of a teacher involves considerably more than the pedagogical activities associated with student learning."

CONCLUSION

The need to engender objectivity in the assessment means that only indicators related to routinized and visible aspects of practice merited inclusion in the assessment instruments as Table 7 indicated. Because these are assessed, the students construe them to be the essence of sound teaching practice to the exclusion of the non-observable aspects. Teaching is reduced to technicist external teacher behaviours and classroom procedures. This reduces teaching to nothing more than technical or instrumental knowledge. There is need to devise ways of testing the less visible manifestations of teacher effectiveness.

What was quite evident from all the categories in which the assessment indicators were content analysed was that there was more divergence than convergence in the actual assessment indicators across institutions. Only the broad categories of lesson planning, lesson development, classroom management and so forth had some measure of uniformity but there was marked diversity in institutional interpretation of what constituted good lesson planning, effective lesson delivery, effective classroom management and so forth. That there is no consensus over what should be assessed on teaching practice makes the determination of the aspects privileged by different teacher education institutions all the more needful. The concept of a good or effective teacher, though used often, cannot be defined with precision.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While institutional autonomy needs to be respected in teacher education institutions, there is need for some measure of convergence on some non-negotiable indicators of sound teaching practice which is research informed. The robust research needed for a determination of non-negotiable specific indicators of effective teaching practice need to be preceded by consensus on the perspective from which effective teaching should be measured (the teacher's, the subject matter, the learner's and so forth) and what that effective teaching would look like. Such considerations point to there being no quick fix to the challenges of determining what constitutes effective teaching practice. The onus, however, devolves on every institution to develop a framework for teacher performance profiled against a teacher evaluation instrument. It should however, be borne in mind that the complexity of teaching renders the use of a single indicator to measure it impossible.

REFERENCES

Bertram C, Christiansen I 2012. Editorial, special issue on teacher knowledge and learning: Perspectives and reflections. *Journal of Education*, 56: 1-16.

Borg S 2006. *Teacher Cognition and Language Education: Research and Practice*. London: Continuum.

Cohen L, Manion L, Morrison K 2007. *Research Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.

Danielson C 2013. The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument. From <http://www.loccsd.ca/~div15/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2013-framework-for-teaching-evaluation-instrument.pdf> (Retrieved on 20 June 2016).

Darling-Hammond L 2012. *Creating a Comprehensive System for Evaluating and Supporting Effective Teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.

Demirdag S 2015. Classroom management and students' self-esteem: Creating positive classrooms. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(2): 191-197.

Goe L, Bell C, Little O 2008. *Approaches to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: A Research Synthesis*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

Heeralal PJH 2014. Mentoring needs of pre-service teachers during teaching practice. A case study at a South African university. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(1): 511-515.

Kiggundu E, Nayimuli S 2009. Teaching practice: A make or break phase for student teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, 29: 345-358.

Ko J, Sammons P, Bakkum L 2013. *Effective Teaching: A Review of Research and Evidence*. Berkshire: CfBT Education Trust.

Krull E, Leijen Ä 2015 Perspectives for defining student teacher performance-based teaching skills indicators to provide formative feedback through learning analytics. *Creative Education*, 6: 914-926.

Layne L 2012. Defining effective teaching. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 23(1): 43-68.

Nie Y, Lau S 2009. Complementary roles of care and behavioral control in classroom management: The self-determination theory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 34: 185-194.

Ong'ondo CO, Jwan JO 2009. Research on student teacher learning, collaboration and supervision: A literature review. *Educational Research and Review*, 4(11): 515-524.

Pretorius SG 2012. The implications of teacher effectiveness requirements for initial teacher education reform. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(3): 310-317.

Reed Y 2014. *Initial Teacher Education Research Project: Report on English courses for Intermediate Phase Student Teachers at Five Universities*. Johannesburg: JET Education Services.

Richards JC 2013. Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal*, 44(1): 5-33.

Rusznyak L, Bertram C 2015. Knowledge and judgement for assessing student teaching: A cross-institutional analysis of teaching practicum assessment instruments. *Journal of Education*, 60: 31-61.

Santiago P, Benavides F 2009. Teacher Evaluation: A Conceptual Framework and Examples of Country Practices. *Paper Presented at the OECD-Mexico Workshop towards a Teacher Evaluation Framework*, 12 August, Mexico.

Shulman L 2009. Assessment of teaching or assessment for teaching? In: DH Gitomer (Ed.): *Measurement Issues and Assessment for Teaching Quality*. Washington, DC: Sage Publications.

Tucker PD, Stronge JH 2005. *Linking Teacher Evaluation and Student Learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Varlas L 2009. Highly Effective Teachers: Defining, Rewarding, Supporting, and Expanding Their Roles. Infobrief. From <http://www.ascd.org/publications/newsletters/policy-priorities/vol15/issue3/full/Highly-Effective-Teachers@-Defining,-Rewarding,-Supporting,-and-Expanding-Their-Roles.aspx> (Retrieved on 21 June 2016).

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