



ESTABLISHING TEACHING SCHOOLS IN SOUTH AFRICA

Research conducted for the Department of Higher Education

Project leader: Sarah Gravett

Co-leader: Nadine Petersen

Team members: Sarita Ramsaroop, Gerda Bender, Kakoma Luneta, Pierre du Plessis, Coert Loock, Senoelo Nkhase, Dirk Postma and Gadija Petker.

January 2015



higher education
& training

Department:
Higher Education and Training
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Acknowledgements

This research study was conducted as part of the “Strengthening Foundation Phase Teacher Education Programme”, a component of the EU-SA Primary Education Policy Support Programme.

Appreciation to all the participants from schools, universities and Departments of Education who shared their views.

Sections 3 and 4 are based mainly on research conducted by Coert Look.

The contents of the report do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Department of Higher Education and Training or the European Union.

© University of Johannesburg

Copies may be ordered from the Department of Higher Education and Training, 123 Francis Baard St, Pretoria, 0001. Email: Nkoe.a@dhet.gov.za



Contents

ESTABLISHING TEACHING SCHOOLS IN SOUTH AFRICA	1
Section 1: Background, motivation and aims of the research	3
Section 2: Research articles.....	5
Integrating foundation phase teacher education with a “teaching school” at the University of Johannesburg.....	5
Bridging theory and practice in teacher education: teaching schools – a bridge too far?	30
Towards a governance and management model for teaching schools in South Africa.....	53
Section 3: Establishing an appropriate governance and management model for teaching schools in South Africa	79
Section 4: Norms and standards for teaching schools	127

ESTABLISHING TEACHING SCHOOLS IN SOUTH AFRICA

PREAMBLE

The report consists of four sections.

In **Section 1** the background, motivation and aims of the research are stated. Thereafter the research methods used are indicated.

Section 2 of the report consists of three research articles emanating from the research. These articles summarise the main strands of the research.

The first article presents challenges and successes experienced by the University of Johannesburg in establishing a teaching school. The main findings are that the teaching school has the potential to strengthen teacher education programmes. However, as the programme designers and university staff under-estimated the complexity of bringing together the world of the university and the world of the school classroom there were missed opportunities for using the teaching school experience optimally to help student-teachers develop the disposition and outlook of competent novice teachers. Aligning the understanding of academic staff and teaching school staff regarding the nature and scope of student-teacher learning in each setting, and their respective roles in getting the world of coursework to 'talk to' the world of schooling and vice versa, emerged as a big, but not insurmountable, challenge. For establishing teaching schools in South Africa at all teacher education institutions the research points to the difficulties that the current education legislative framework present for realising the purpose of teaching schools as put forward in the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa.

The second article presents the views of school-based personnel and the teacher education sector on the introduction of teaching schools within the South African teacher education system and how they think teaching schools could enhance the education of student-teachers. The inquiry showed that the participants were positive that teaching schools will enhance teacher education through serving as a bridge between the academic university-based preparation of student-teachers and the practice demands of the teaching profession. However, they had no clear notion of how such schools could add value to teacher preparation differentiated to schools in which student-teachers are placed for work integrated learning. The article contends that prior to establishing teaching schools much deliberation between all stakeholders is required about the purpose and means of integrating teaching schools in teacher education. How will the role of the teaching school differ from the role of the professional practice school? How will the experiences of student-teachers in these schools be planned to contribute differently but complementarily to the education of student-teachers? How should teacher education be planned with teaching schools in mind?

The third article explores possible models for the governance of teaching schools in South Africa, set in the current legal dispensation for the public and the independent schooling sector. The paper mainly addresses the powers and functions of public schools and school governing bodies as defined within the broader framework of The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996, The National Education Policy Act (Act 27 of 1996), and the Employment of Educators Act (Act 76 of 1998). The analysis of these statutes informed the proposal of four possible models for governance of teaching schools. The article recommends two models that fit the mandate of teaching schools as envisioned in the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025: 1) a model that provides for teaching schools as a school type at national (not provincial) level and 2) the independent school model.

Section 3 provides the detail of the article on possible governance and management models for teaching schools that would be appropriate for the South African context.

Section 4 presents possible norms and standards for teaching schools.

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND, MOTIVATION AND AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

The Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa states as activity 4.5: “Strengthening the teaching practice/school experience component of teacher education programmes through the development of Teaching Schools”.

Teaching schools (TSs) are described in the Framework as “teaching laboratories”, where students can engage in learning-from-practice, such as by observing best practice, participating in micro-teaching and taking subject methodology courses. TSs may also be used as centres for research into teaching and learning. Furthermore, staff at TSs will be developed as mentors for student teachers and will be able to teach methodology courses. It is stated in the Framework that TSs will be located close to each teacher education delivery site and will consist of one primary school and one secondary school per site. The Framework also states the need to develop national norms and standards for TSs.

Against this background the research focused on developing an understanding of the preconditions for establishing TSs, the nature of the relationship between higher education institutions and TSs, the status of these schools in terms of the education legislation framework, and how TSs could serve as “teaching laboratories”.

The aims of the research were to:

- a. develop norms and standards for TSs (presented in **section 4**);
- b. identify the challenges to be likely faced in establishing such schools, and to suggest ways in which the challenges can be addressed (presented in **sections 2 and 3**);
- c. determine the steps to be taken to establish such schools (presented in **section 3**);
- d. identify possible governance and management (including relationships, roles and responsibilities) models for such schools that would be appropriate for the South African context (presented in **sections 2 and 3**);

- e. Explore how the utilisation of the schools can be integrated into initial teacher education programmes and research programmes to benefit different stakeholders (presented in **section 2**).

The following research methods were employed:

- a. Review of relevant literature
- b. Case study of:
 - a school attached to the University of Johannesburg, that is currently functioning as a teaching/research school
 - a rural primary school (in Mpumalanga, close to the site where a new teacher education programme is implemented) to establish what would be required to transform this school into a teaching school
- c. Interviews with school principals and teachers of selected schools close to teacher education institutions
- d. Interviews with a sample of Deans of Education, as well as co-ordinators of the school experience component of initial teacher education programmes
- e. Interviews with a sample of managers responsible for managing student placement in teaching hospitals
- f. Interviews with a sample of teacher educators at all teacher education institutions
- g. Interviews with a sample of provincial DBE officials, and DHET officials
- h. Analysis of relevant education legislation

SECTION 2: RESEARCH ARTICLES

Integrating foundation phase teacher education with a “teaching school” at the University of Johannesburg

Authors: Sarah Gravett, Nadine Petersen and Gadija Petker

Published in “Education as Change”

To cite this article: Sarah Gravett, Nadine Petersen & Gadija Petker (2014)

Integrating foundation phase teacher education with a ‘teaching school’ at the

University of Johannesburg, Education as Change, 18:sup1, S107-S119, DOI:

10.1080/16823206.2013.877357

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2013.877357>

Abstract

Successful teacher education programmes underscore the integration of knowledge for teaching with knowledge of teaching, the ‘how’ of teaching. Such programmes necessitate an integrative programme design to counteract the schism between the ‘world of theory’ and ‘the world of practice’ and draw optimally on collaboration between teacher educators and teachers who supervise students in schools to achieve this. The paper reflects on participants’ experiences of a teacher education programme designed to integrate the university coursework curriculum with student-teachers involvement in a school established to serve as a practice learning site - a teaching school. Data comprised the views of faculty managers, university and teaching school staff and student-teachers involved in the Foundation Phase teacher education programme and the teaching school.

The main findings are that the teaching school has the potential to strengthen teacher education programmes. However, as the programme designers and university staff underestimated the complexity of bringing together the world of the university and the world of the school classroom there were many missed opportunities for using the teaching school experience optimally to help student-teachers develop the disposition and outlook of competent novice teachers. Teaching school staff were also not enabled to develop optimally as teacher educators.

Keywords: foundation phase teacher education, theory-practice divide, teaching school, practice learning site, practicum.

Introduction

Literature on successful teacher education highlights the importance of student-teachers learning knowledge *for* teaching and knowledge *of* teaching (Feiman-Nemser, 2008). Programmes that accomplish these aims successfully intertwine coursework and practical work. In this paper we report on research conducted on a teacher education programme which aimed to accomplish this, looking back at four years of implementation from the perspective of participants. The teacher education programme incorporated extended involvement of student-teachers in a school associated with the University of Johannesburg (UJ). The school was established as a blend of the ‘lab’ school idea and the ‘practice/teacher training’ school notion that comes from the Finnish Model (Neimi, 2011, 2013; Sahlberg, 2011; Lavonen, et al, 2010; Neimi & Lavonen, 2012). Internationally, such schools are referred to in different ways such as ‘teacher training schools’ or ‘practice schools’ (Sahlberg, 2011:36) in Finland, and also ‘lab schools’ in the USA (Clawson, 1999:7).

In the rest of this article the term “teaching school” is used to refer to the school. The term “teaching school” (TS) was coined after the promulgation of the “Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa” (2011), which

makes provision for the establishment of schools associated with universities to strengthen the teaching practice component of teacher education programmes and serve as education research sites. Based on the work the UJ has done at its school, the Department of Higher Education and Training, (DHET), supported by European Union Funding, tasked a research team from the Faculty of Education (FoE) to conduct research on the establishment of TSs in South Africa. The research reported on in this paper forms part of this project.

We first sketch the background to the study in which we describe the process of designing a teacher education programme which integrates a TS as integral to the programme, drawing on applicable literature. This review of the literature also informed the research. Thereafter we expand on the research design, data collection and analysis before presenting the findings and concluding with a discussion of the implications hereof for TSs and teacher education.

Designing a teacher education programme to integrate a teaching school: background and literature

In 2010 the FoE at the UJ founded a public school in Soweto, in partnership with the Gauteng Department of Education (GDE) through a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA). The objectives were multiple: serving the education needs of young children close to the UJ Soweto campus; developing a practice learning site for the education of teachers of young children, enabling longitudinal child development studies and research on children's performance in the school curriculum; and serving as a resource center/development hub for schools close to the Soweto campus. We simultaneously embarked on researching the development of a teacher education model incorporating the school as a practice learning site.

The establishment of the TS coincided with the design of a Foundation Phase teacher education programme at the UJ. The programme design was informed by a wide array of literature (Darling-Hammond & Macdonald, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Grossman, Compton, Igra, Ronfeld, Shavan, & Williamson, 2009; Kessels, & Korthagen, 2001; Korthagen,

2011; Kincheloe; Bursztyn, & Steinberg, 2004; Kosnik & Beck, 2009; Loughran, 2006; Shulman, 2004; Zeichner, 2003; Zeichner & Conklin; 2008). From the literature consulted, including case studies of successful teacher education programmes, we extracted guiding principles for designing the programme. These were: an integrative design; a united vision of the type of teacher the programme wishes to deliver; and a “learning to be” orientation towards the education of teachers. Each principle encompasses numerous “tasks of teacher learning” (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). However, in the discussion that follows we shall focus only on aspects relevant to the research.

Our design of the programme was also guided by a central organizing principle or “a pedagogical stance” rooted in knowledge of how children learn and develop (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p. 1018) as is evidenced in studies on powerful teacher education programmes (Darling-Hammond, 2006). The curriculum construction and the student-teachers’ involvement in the TS reflect the centrality of child study. First year BEd students study a curriculum geared for grade R children and they observe and provide assistance in the TS’s grade R classes. In the second year the focus is on grade 1 learners where student-teachers also begin to teach selected lessons and in their third year they are involved in the grade 2 classes. In the fourth year they integrate the various dimensions of their studies in the grade 3 class. We reasoned that student-teachers’ involvement with the same children over four years would support the development of “pedagogical learner knowledge” (MacKinnon, 1992 as cited in Darling-Hammond, 2006) of the foundation phase child.

We also saw the potential of the role that a teaching school could play in addressing the perceived “theory-practice divide” which seems to plague teacher education. We find Jerome Bruner’s (as cited in Brown & Duguid, 2000) distinction between “learning about” and “learning to be” a useful heuristic to guide thinking about the type of student-teacher development and learning that we claim resolves the perceived the “theory-practice dilemma”. Arguably, much of what is taught in higher education is conceptual, or “learning about” phenomena. With his “learning to be” notion Bruner points out that university learning should be understood in relation to the development of a social identity. “Learning to be” is about developing the demeanour, disposition, and outlook (“the eye”) of a

competent practitioner. We contend that we should indeed teach student-teachers conceptual knowledge of the field of education. However, if we want to avoid a theory-practice disjuncture, “learning to be” should be foregrounded, and “learning about” should be embedded in “learning to be.”

Our interpretation of Bruner’s “learning to be” resonates with the view of Kessels and Korthagen (2001) that a phronesis, or practical wisdom approach to teacher education resolves the theory-practice disjuncture. They do not argue that conceptual knowledge should be diminished in teacher education, but that the development of perception-based knowledge should be foregrounded. A phronesis approach focuses mainly on the development of practical reasoning. Kessels & Korthagen (2001, p. 27) explain that, “To choose and justify a particular course of action ... the ultimate appeal of phronesis is not to principles, rules, theorems, or any conceptual knowledge. Ultimately, the appeal is to perception.” Deciding on appropriate action for a particular situation, requires above all that one must be able to perceive and discern the relevant details. We always act in, and react to, situations as we see and experience them. Therefore effective actions require effective ways of seeing. Effective ways of seeing are not learned in abstraction but learned in practice through reflective experience. In agreement with Kessels and Korthagen (2001) a “learning to be orientation” implies that student-teachers mainly engage in a form of experiential learning emanating from “student concerns” or concrete experiences accompanied by guided reflection.

We concur with Korthagen (2011) that if students have not encountered concrete problems or concerns about teaching, it is highly unlikely that they will perceive the usefulness of the conceptual knowledge of education as field. Concrete experiences or student concerns should introduce “formal” conceptual knowledge (Kessels & Korthagen, 2001). Thus, we saw the TS playing a significant role in providing the site for student observations and concerns emanating from their involvement in the school. These could then serve as the basis for guided reflection in the coursework or “practical theorising” (McIntyre, 1995, p. 377-378) in which “theory-based ideas (are) used to guide practice and to theorise about good practice ...”

Research design

This study was conceptualised as a generic qualitative study, implying a focus on discovering and understanding “a phenomenon, a process, or the perspectives and worldviews of the people involved” (Merriam 2009:22). The focus in generic qualitative studies is on the identification of patterns and categories within data which are interpreted to explain phenomena. We were interested in investigating the various participants’ experiences of a teacher education programme incorporating a TS in order to develop a holistic picture of the central construct under investigation. We reasoned that academic staff could provide feedback on the link between the academic curriculum and the students’ experiences in the TS. TS staff could shed light on their own development in becoming teacher-educators and how they facilitated students’ learning in the TS. Lastly, student-teachers could provide insights into how the TS contributed (or not) to their learning and development. Our research was guided by the following main research question:

What are participants’ experiences of a FP teacher education programme that incorporates a teaching school?

Data collection

Various methods enabled us to collect data that allowed the participants to report on their experiences from their unique perspectives. Participants included the university management staff who had been involved in the establishment of the TS (n=3), a sample of TS staff (n=4), UJ academic staff (n=4) and teacher-students in their 2nd (n=40), 3rd (n=35) and 4th (n=22) years of study. First year students were excluded from the sample as data were collected early in the year. A doctoral student within the larger project conducted the interviews with TS staff and the students in order to prevent a conflict of interest, researcher bias and data contamination. In-depth individual semi-structured interviews (with a different open-ended interview protocol) were used for the interviews with the UJ staff. These interviews were conducted by the second author who had not been involved in teaching in the programme. Here both UJ and TS staff were prompted to reflect critically on their experiences of a teacher

education programme that incorporates a TS. For instance UJ staff were asked questions such as *“How did you envisage students’ linking the content they learnt at UJ with their experiences at the TS?”* TS staff on the other hand were asked questions such as *“What were your experiences of aligning your work as a teacher in the TS with your role of mentor/guide to student-teachers in your classroom?”* Focus group interviews were conducted with groups of approximately 8-15 students at a time, with at least two focus groups interviews being conducted with each cohort group. The focus group interviews for the student-teachers enabled us to gain insights into their reflections on their experience in the TS by open-ended questions such as *“Tell us about your learning experiences in the TS”*.

Data analysis

We divided the data into four sets to reflect the varied participant groupings. Each data set was analysed using procedures associated with content analysis following the guidelines suggested by Charmaz (2003) and Henning, Van Rensburg and Smit, (2004). It involved the following steps: coding the responses and then clustering these codes into categories. For instance from the codes initially obtained from the student data set, which included 2nd year student responses, those statements which were similar in meaning were grouped together and codes were allocated. Each data set generated between 100 and 150 codes; in naming these codes the analysers stayed as close to the meaning in participant responses as possible. Thereafter, similar codes were combined to form conceptual categories. The analysis of each data set followed along similar lines. The results from these four sets of analyses were then combined conceptually. The conceptual categories in turn were used to thematise the findings and are presented below.

Presentation of findings

Academic and TS staff and student-teachers' responses highlight a number of aspects of importance for a teacher education programme incorporating a TS.

The teaching school as a practice learning site for teacher education

The TS provided a useful practice learning site for the education of teachers of young children. Firstly, the twinning of the academic focus from the first year of study in the FP programme with students' placements in Grade R, and progressing to Grade 3 in the fourth year, enabled consistent opportunities for studying children's development. This was twofold: in terms of learners' developmental milestones and learning of the school curriculum and of teacher pedagogies and the knowledge base required for teaching in the FP. It aligned with how the FP curriculum and the role of student-teachers' placement in the TS was originally conceived by the Faculty Dean: *"the central construct of the students' focus was meant to be on the children in the school; their learning and developmentin my interactions with students they have indicated that this has been beneficial for their learning. My information from academic staff is similar. Staff in courses such as education studies report that students' prolonged exposure to the same children over time has increased their understanding of the often challenging cognitive theories of development that they are exposed to in class, they see the interplay of the theory from lectures with what is occurring in practice in the classroom"*.

This corresponds with data from TS staff: *"...students ... often tell me that they remember what a particular learner struggled with in Grade R and now that they can observe the same learner in Grade 3 they are able to see the difference in their development and behaviour ... the student has been with the child for four years"*.

Student-teachers' views seem to concur:

"I am making connections between the theoretical work we do in Education Studies and the practical implications of this in the classroom in Grade 2".

“ I am connecting what I have been taught and what I have read about teaching children how to read with how the teacher does it in the classroom”.

For the more senior student-teachers the benefit is most tangible as they have had prolonged exposure to the learners. For instance,

“I am now in my fourth year and I have seen how the children that I met when they first started in the school in Grade R have changed and developed”.

“I watch them [the children] in class and on the playground and I see how they have changed, how their language has developed ... which ones used to struggle with writing and no longer have that problem....it's exciting to watch this first-hand”.

Teaching school staff as teacher educators

As part of the vision for the TS, school teachers were expected incrementally to take on the role of teacher educators, working in tandem with UJ academic staff. Some TS staff recognize their role as guides and mentors to students and are aware of the partnership implied: *“....often the students look confused about an observation assignment that they get from a lecturer but once we talk about what it requires and I point them to the scenario in class when something happened that is relevant to their assignment, then you can see the excitement on the students' faces when they understand ... they have the opportunity of doing something theoretically and at the same time doing it practically when it is still fresh in their minds and not have to wait for maybe four months before they go to the school for their practicum. To me they are getting the best of both worlds... from the university lecturers the theoretical side of teaching and from the teachers and learners at the school they are getting the practical knowledge...”*

More generally, TS staff argue that their role in helping student-teachers' learn about general classroom practice is beneficial to student-teachers. They mention the value of student-teachers' early exposure to the classroom situation, enculturation into the practice of being

a teacher and experience of learning about young children, who have recently entered formal education. For instance, one Grade R teachers believes that the students-teachers' time in her classroom is beneficial as they are *"experiencing what it means to be a teacher from the very beginning of their studies They are exposed to my themes for the week and my daily lesson plans, how I arrange group activities and why, how to interact fairly with all the children"*. This example illustrates how the teacher sees her role in contributing to the students' learning of the very practical planning aspects involved in a teacher's task as well as the thinking behind what influences a teacher's pedagogical choices.

This also seems to be borne out by student-teachers' views of their learning: *"From some of the teachers, I have learned about best practice in a school, about how to meet the CAPS requirements for teaching home language, mathematics and life skills and also how to translate that into a yearly planner and daily lesson plans"*. They too identify how they learn about the practical aspects associated with being a FP teacher such as *"learning how to translate the curriculum (CAPS) to a yearly schedule and weekly and daily lesson plan"* and to their pointers to their learning about the integrated nature of children's learning in the FP. So for example a student reports that being in the TS allows him to: *"experience the full complexity of what teaching involves – it is not a one-dimensional thing but it is multi-faceted ...for instance, if the child is struggling to write how does it affect their learning of other things in the classroom?"*

There are also indicators in the data of the benefits for the teachers of taking on a guiding and mentoring role for student-teachers. For instance a TS staff member said: *"when I have to explain to students what I do in the classroom and why I do it and when I look at what the lecturers ask the students to observe or do in my class, it offers me a chance to sit back and reflect on my own teaching... also the students tell me about the theories they are learning to explain what happens when a child learns, so I am also learning as though I am at university ... my knowledge about Grade R children is being deepened"*. Thus it seems as if TS staff is also becoming more reflexive as teachers and deepening their own understanding of how they practice their craft. To our minds this can be beneficial not only to the student-teachers the

TS staff guide, but is also ultimately to the benefit of the teachers in their own professional development and to the tasks they execute as teachers.

Student-teachers' exposure to teachers, who understand how to teach the school curriculum effectively, means that they are able to come to grips with the current school curriculum very early in their academic programme in a way that would not otherwise be possible. On the other hand it also presents a challenge for student-teacher learning when TS staff is not able to serve as appropriate models for students. Student-teachers are able to quickly observe when TS staff is unable to fulfil the task of teacher educator as evidenced by: *"... the teacher I observe doesn't seem to be applying or using the theory like I have never seen a child play there and the teacher just observes and the children are left on their own working at their desks I think that this limits the young children and their knowledge"*. Academic staff have to manage student-teachers' expectations that TS staff would all exemplify "best practice" and keep their focus on child development. Feedback from student-teachers indicate the difficulty of this: *"[at the TS]I am learning what not to do as a teacher such as relying too much on talk-and-chalk methods, or incorrectly teaching mathematical concepts"*.

On the other hand, the TS have a number of teachers who by their very example and expertise effortlessly take on the role of teacher educators. Student-teachers say: *"Teacher X is an excellent example of a FP teacher. She teaches and reinforces the concepts to the class in such a clear manner that there are few learners who don't understand. As a FP student I have learned innovative ways of teaching difficult maths concepts"*.

Challenges with integrating coursework with learning at the teaching school

The success of the TS as a practice learning site was prefaced on the basis of integrating the coursework curriculum with the work in the school and on a close cooperation between the TS staff and the academic staff. Asking participants to critically reflect on the first four years has highlighted the challenges of aligning the academic components of the FP programme with the students-teachers' time at the TS.

One of the biggest challenges for students has been the integration of conceptual knowledge in the coursework with their involvement at the TS. For instance student-teachers' comments clearly highlight their struggles: *"I'm not sure how to adapt the theoretical methods that I learn in my methodology to the classroom activities at FU."* Student-teachers' learning is also hampered when academic staff does not communicate sufficiently with TS staff. A student revealed: *"I am not always sure what the lecturer wants me to observe in the classroom and I find it difficult to connect what I do see with the theories we are learning about in class. Sometimes I am so lost". "The things I observe at the school relate to so many things we are learning about at the university in different classes I struggle to bring them together to make sense of them"*.

At the same time these comments also highlight the difficulties posed for TS staff; they report that they cannot effectively take on the role of teacher educators if they are not clear on academic staff expectations of them and student-teachers' involvement in the TS. An example of the lack of communication and integration is evident in a TS staff member's comment that the school curriculum is neglected. For instance, she indicated: *"I don't always see CAPS being drawn on optimally in UJ classes, we as the classroom teachers have a lot of experience working with CAPS but the UJ lecturers don't always have this knowledge so I don't see it featuring in the students' work"*. She also argued that the lecturers *"were often not clear on exactly what they want the students to 'get' from their observations and time at the TS"*.

Aligning the academic programme with the student-teachers' work in the TS is also challenging for academic staff. When the notion of the TS was mooted the Faculty Dean indicated that it would be *"...the UJ staffs responsibility to direct the students' attention to the children's learning and development. Thus, what kind of tasks do we set for students and how do we scaffold their learning in this respect"*? It also implied that academic staff would work closely with TS staff to design observation and learning tasks for directing and scaffolding students' learning about the development of young children. The results from this study indicate that this has not happened as intended.

Firstly, academic staff has admitted to struggling with this aspect of the TS and many had gone through a number of iterations to refine the nature and scope of student-teacher tasks. For instance one lecturer admits that academic staff had to be divested of the view “...that students will somehow ‘pick up’ the broad theories simply by being in the practical situation in the classroom so often”. She indicates that she also found it challenging to “design specific, structured tasks for students related to my academic content so that they could observe aspects in the TS and reflect on these afterwards in the lectures....”. In her own words: “designing tasks to take note of the interplay of theory and practice was particularly difficult ... and to structure smaller task that lead to a more comprehensive task was tough...it’s only now three years later that I have a better understanding of how these elements should come together”.

Some academic staff also neglected to share sufficient detail of the nature and scope of the student-teacher observation tasks and overall assessment tasks so many opportunities for TS staff to support student learning were lost. For instance one staff member at the TS indicated: “I do not have clarity from the lecturers on what the students should be learning from experience, so I end up doing my own thing with the students”. Another TS staff member added: “we haven’t spoken enough about how I see my role is as a mentor teacher and what the lecturer expects of me. This confuses me and the students. For instance I didn’t understand why the UJ uses such a detailed lesson plan guide ... the one I use as a class teacher is much less detailed and simpler ... but when I showed it to the students they said their lecturer wanted them to write all the detail in their lesson plans”. It is also evident in the following example from student-teachers: “I struggle to understand what the lecturers want me to do with all the components of my lesson planning at university while the teachers at the school don’t want all that detail...it confuses me”.

The problematic nature of the teaching school as an ordinary public school

One of the biggest stumbling blocks in enabling the TS to fulfil the aims for which it was created, has been its legal status as an ordinary public school. According to the UJ academic staff member who was instrumental in drawing up the MoA, the current education legislative framework only allows for the following types of public schools: ordinary public schools, public schools for learners with special education needs; or public schools that provide education with a specialized focus on talent (e.g. creative arts). He indicated that because the TS has no special status: *“it has been the source of many tensions since the school’s establishment and has required extensive negotiation and co-operation from university management, TS staff and the local Education Department structures to enable the school to remain focused on its educative obligations while developing its capacity to fulfil its role as a TS.”*

The teaching school initiators report that: *“initially the university had little say about which teachers were appointed in the school which made it difficult for planning the development of TS staff as teacher educators. Also, now, the university has little leeway to intervene if teachers are not fulfilling their roles as teacher educators adequately.”*

Another issue is the situation of the TS staff as GDE employees subject to specific rules and regulations. Thus, despite a MoA with the GDE outlining the need for latitude in terms of operational and reporting matters, the TS staff report feeling *“caught between UJ on the one hand and GDE on the other”*. Examples hereof are when TS staff has to forgo planned staff development opportunities from UJ specialists because department officials are on a school visit or because they have been summoned to a GDE workshop or meeting. As one teacher put it *“We serve two masters: UJ and the GDE and we sometimes do not know who to respond to, but because GDE is our employer we always have to listen to them.”*

Teacher autonomy in the face of GDE control and monitoring at district level is also alluded to by TS staff: *“we would like to experiment with integrating concepts that are spread all over*

the CAPS documents but we have no freedom to do so ... we thus have no way to test what works and what does not. How can we then help student-teachers learn better?" This also affects the arrangement of the timetable to accommodate reflection sessions with students. Up to now TS staff indicate their extreme frustration at the *"constraints in timetabling which prevents us from meeting with the students to talk about their observations and teaching."* In order for TS teachers to assist student-teachers with practical theorising – they require time 'in the moment' after a lesson or teaching and learning episode to engage with students about what they have observed or address questions students may have.

Discussion

The design of the FP teacher education programme that coincided with the establishment of the TS, stemmed from a vision for a particular type of FP teacher and from the role of the school in accomplishing this. The TS was envisioned to provide concrete experiences that would be interwoven with students' coursework, creating opportunities for organized and methodical interrogation, analysis and theorisation of practice. This was meant to alleviate the difficulty that student-teachers and teacher educators experience to make connections between the two distinct settings in which teacher education takes place – the university and the school, referred to by Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, (1995, p. 7) as the "two-worlds pitfall".

However, the findings point to the programme designers and university staff underestimating the complexity of the processes involved in bringing together these "two worlds" in the context of the newly-established TS. Bridging the divide between the school and university is multifaceted: It requires staff from both contexts to journey out of their own organizational and professional territories and to combine their respective skills, knowledge and expertise in new ways. It is what Anagnostopoulos, Smith and Basmadjian (2007) after the work of Engestrom (2003, p. 3), refer to as developing "horizontal expertise", in which "professionals from different domains enrich and expand their practices through working together to reorganize relations and coordinate their work". Thus, although the Faculty Dean

envisaged a collaborative process in which the UJ staff would take the lead and work with TS staff towards designing suitable concrete experiences for students in the process of “learning to be” a teacher, this did not occur adequately. The empirical data from both student-teachers and TS staff reflect notions associated with theory ‘belonging’ in the university classroom and the TS as a setting for applying or ‘putting such theory into practice’.

Also an active, on-going plan for collaboration and the development of horizontal expertise was needed for the creation of “boundary objects” (Anagnostopoulos, Smith & Basmadjian, 2007, p. 139), which could have served as reference points for the learning of student-teachers and the respective input of role-players within the shared space of the TS. From the data it appears as though academic staff worked with the assumption that university objects, such as the lesson plans templates, would easily make the transition to the teaching school context and maintain their integrity as tools for the facilitation of student-teacher learning. This was a serious misjudgement on the part of academic staff as it created confusion for not only the student-teachers but also for the teachers as novice teacher educators. It is clear that many more opportunities were needed for TS staff and academic staff to co-create a shared epistemological space in which the “stepwise, two-dimensional process of negotiation and hybridization” (Engestrom, 2003, p. 3) could be encouraged and in which the integration of theoretical constructs (“scientific concepts”) and everyday concepts could be explored. According to Lavonen (2013) Head of Teacher Education at the University of Helsinki, this aspect emerged as one of the key levers for the success of the teacher education programmes and teacher training schools in Finland.

The findings suggest that the TS indeed has the potential for providing a space for both university staff and school teachers to realise the ‘learning to be’ orientation of the programme. However, this potential was not fully achieved. The ‘learning to be orientation’ in our FP programme includes enabling student-teachers to discern the interplay between various elements that play a role in teaching of young children. This speaks to our earlier arguments that student-teacher involvement in the TS could contribute to the development of phronesis-type knowledge, the practical wisdom for action, developed through reflecting on experiencing of concrete situations (Kessels & Korthagen, 2001). However, our reading of

the empirical data points to a failure on the part of academic staff to deliberately use the TS for this purpose. It is not clear if and how student-teachers were helped through guided reflection to make explicit their perceptions and emerging personal theories in relation to learning episodes in the TS and the university classroom.

Another missed opportunity relates to not using the TS experience optimally to develop the disposition and outlook of a competent teacher. According to Feiman-Nemser (2001, p. 45) the study of teaching requires “skills of observation, interpretation, and analysis. The undergraduate teacher years are the best time to begin forming habits and skills necessary for the ongoing study of teaching in the company of colleagues. serious conversations about teaching are a valuable resource in developing and improving their practice”. Student-teachers’ involvement in the TS, provided an ideal context to develop these skills. However, expecting student-teachers to observe interactions in the TS without clear direction to either TS staff or student-teachers themselves is counter-productive and can actually lead to student-teachers “... getting into pitfalls or learning things that are inappropriate in any teaching situation and that will be reinforced by further unanalyzed experience on the job” (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985, p. 9). The findings point to a need for more explicit discussion and a shared understanding of all aspects of the students’ observations, tasks and roles in the TS. This would include academic staff taking the lead in initiating the development of shared tools such as guided reflection protocols for analysis of classroom practice. As a result of academic staff missing opportunities for sufficiently focussing observations in the TS, capitalizing on the experiences of student-teachers in the TS, and for collaborating more closely with TS staff, student-teachers’ ‘learning to be’ a teacher was curtailed.

One of the greatest values currently is that the way in which the programme is structured in relation to the student teachers’ involvement in the TS, enabled the possibility of student-teachers developing a deep understanding of child development. This has emerged not only from our research. Ragpot’s research (2013) also testifies to this. Ragpot offers a module on cognitive development of children in the early years. She found in her doctoral research that this very challenging theoretical work was made accessible through constant interaction with the same children over eighteen months. Student-teachers were able to bring their concrete

experiences in the TS and emanating concerns about child learning and conceptual development to the coursework in a successful way.

Most importantly, what this research has highlighted is that assuming that teachers will magically morph into teacher educators is fallacious. Experience as teachers alone does not equip TS staff to work as teacher educators. Feiman-Nemser & Buchman (1985, p. 64) rightly make the point that, “If classrooms are to become settings for learning to teach that go beyond adaptation and unreflective imitation, purposes of learning to teach cannot automatically be subordinated to the goal of pupil learning. Teachers also must see themselves as teacher educators willing to plan for the learning of a novice.” They also argue that becoming a teacher educator implies that the teacher must shift into another role. Teachers must be prepared for their roles as teacher educators. This implies a coherent programme for the development of TS staff to develop as teacher educators and that TS staff must avail themselves for development opportunities. The findings show that this aspect required additional input. This is confirmed by Myllyviita (2013), a Finnish training school teacher who argues that without on-going development opportunities and support it is unlikely that teachers will take on the role of teacher educators effectively.

Does the teaching school notion as envisaged in the “Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa” have the potential to enhance teacher education and to “strengthen the Work Integrated Learning (WIL) component of teacher education programmes” (DHET, p. 3)? Based on our research, the answer is yes. However, integrating a teaching school into a teacher education programme is complex and multi-dimensional. It implies that teacher education goes on simultaneously in two distinct settings. We concur with Feiman-Nemser & Buchman (1985) that connecting these two worlds is demanding. It is apparent from this study that clearer guidelines for on-going interaction in the triumvirate of student-teacher, academic staff and TS teacher were required. As both sets of staff were unclear about exactly how to maintain optimal cooperation and integration of their respective tasks as well as how to supervise student-teacher learning, the potential of the TS as practice learning site has not been fully realised. Ideally student-teachers’ learning in the coursework and TS school should work in tandem.

What was needed was a shared understanding between school staff and university staff on the issues student-teachers will study in the school, “*when they are to be studied, what activities are to be engaged in, what kinds of questions are to be asked, and what kinds of criteria are to be applied*” (McIntyre, 1995:371) without necessarily aiming for consensus.

Conclusion

In designing a teacher education programme which incorporates a teaching school our goals were in service of strengthening foundation phase teacher preparation. Informed by teacher education literature and case studies on teacher education we envisioned the academic programme working in tandem with the TS to create opportunities for student-teachers to move between the two sites in an organized and methodical interrogation, analysis and theorization of practice. Specifically, we envisioned that the TS would afford optimal opportunities for the realisation of a “learning to be” orientation through which the perceived theory-practice disjuncture could be bridged.

Our early experiences in this initiative illustrate that integrating the world of the university classroom and the school classroom as sites of learning is easier said than accomplished. Aligning the understanding of academic staff and TS staff regarding the nature and scope of student-teacher learning in each setting and their respective roles in getting the world of coursework to ‘talk to’ the world of schooling and vice versa has emerged as a big, but certainly not insurmountable, challenge. What we have come to realise is that just as the world of teaching is complex, integrating the world of the university classroom and the world of the TS classroom, is equally complicated.

For establishing teaching schools in South Africa at all teacher education institutions our research points to the difficulties that the current education legislative framework present for realising the purpose of teaching schools as put forward in the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa (2011). Without affording special status to TSs, thereby enabling closer collaboration between the university

and school with regard to school governance and teaching and mentoring practices in the school, it would be unfeasible for TSs to serve as 'teaching laboratories', where student teachers can engage in learning-from-practice, such as by observing best practice, participating in micro-teaching exercises and taking subject methodology courses.

REFERENCES

Anagnostopoulos, D, Smith, E.R., & Basmadjian, K.G. 2007. Bridging the university-school divide. Horizontal expertise and the 'two-worlds' pitfall. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(2), 138-152.

Barber, M. & Mourshed, M. (2007). How the world's best performing school system come out on top. Retrieved on 20 May 2010.

http://www.mckinsey.com/locations/ukireland/publications/pdf/Education_report.pdf

Brown, J.S., & Duguid, P. (2000). The social life of information. Boston: Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.

Bruner, JS 1990. *Acts of Meaning*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Bruner, J.S. 1996. *The culture of Education*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Charmaz, K. (2003). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln, (Eds). *Strategies for qualitative inquiry* (pp. 249 – 291), Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.

Clawson, M.A. (1999). Continuity between course content and Lab school practice. Outcomes of a self-study of the lab school at Syracuse University. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 20 (1), 7-17

Darling-Hammond, L. & Macdonald, M (2000). Where there is learning there is hope. The preparation of teachers at the Bank Street College of Education. In Darling-Hammond L.

(2000). *Studies of excellence in teacher education* (pp. 1-95). Washington: AACTE Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Baratz-Snowden, J. eds. (2005). *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom: Preparing the Highly Qualified Teachers Our Children Deserve*. San Francisco: John Wiley & sons. Kindle Edition.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education. Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Departments of Basic Education and Higher Education and Training (2011). *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa*.

Eisner, E.W. 2002. From episteme to phronesis to artistry in the study and improvement of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(2002), 375-385.

Engestrom, Y. 2003, March. The Horizontal dimension of expansive learning: Weaving a texture of cognitive trails in the terrain of health care in Helsinki. Paper presented at the International Symposium New Challenges to Research on Learning, Helsinki, Finland.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchman, M. (1985). Pitfalls of Experience in Teacher Preparation. *Teachers College Record* Volume 87(1), 1985, p. 53-65 <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number: 677, Date Accessed: 9/15/2012 6:36:39 AM

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2008). Teacher learning. How do teachers learn to teach? In Cochran-Smith, M., Feiman-Nemser, S., McIntyre D.J., & Demers, K.E. (2008). *Handbook of research on teacher education. Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 697-705). New York: Routledge.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice. Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teacher College Record*, 103(6), December 2001, pp. 1013-1055 <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number: 10824, Date Accessed: 9/15/2012 6:15:08 AM.

Gravett, S. 2012. Crossing the “theory-practice divide”: Learning to Be(come) a teacher. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*. 2(2), 1-14.

Grossman, P.; Compton, C; Igra, D; Ronfeldt M; Shavan, E & Williamson, PW. 2009. Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teacher College Record*, Volume 111, Number 9, pp. 2055-2100.

Henning, E., Van Rensburg, W.A., & Smit, B. (2004). *Finding your way in qualitative research*. Pretoria: Van Schaiks.

Lavonen, J. (2013). Seminar on teaching schools in Finland. University of Johannesburg, November, 2013. (Lavonen is Head of Department: Teacher Education. University of Helsinki)

Kansanen, P. (2003). Teacher education in Finland: Current models and new developments. In B. Moon, L. Vlăsceanu, & C. Barrows (Eds.), *Institutional approaches to teacher education within higher education in Europe: Current models and new developments* (pp. 85-108).

Kessels, J. & Korthagen, F.A.J. (2001). The Relation between Theory and Practice: Back to the Classics. In Korthagen, F.A.J (Eds.). *Linking Practice and Theory. The Pedagogy of Realistic Teacher Education*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum. Kindle edition.

Kincheloe, JL; Bursztyn, A & Steinberg, SR eds. 2004. *Teaching teachers. Building a quality school of urban education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Korthagen, F.A.J. (2011). Making teacher education relevant for practice: the pedagogy of realistic teacher education. *Orbis scholae*, 2011, 5(2), pp. 31-50.

Loughran, J. 2006. *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education. Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. New York: Routledge.

Marton, F. & Trigwell, K. 2000. Variato est mater studiorum, *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19(3), 381-395.

McIntyre, D. 1995. Initial teacher education and practical theorising: A response to Paul Hirst. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, XXXXIII(4), 365-383.

Myllyviita, A. (2013). Seminar on teaching schools in Finland. University of Johannesburg, November, 2013. (Myllyviita is a teacher and teacher educator at Viikki Training School, University of Helsinki and Project Coordinator of training school teachers' in-service ICT training).

Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ragpot, L. (2013). *Student Learning in a Course on Cognitive Development in Childhood*. Unpublished D Ed Thesis.

Shulman, L.S. edited by Wilson, S.M. (2004), *The wisdom of practice: essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spence, S. 2007. Phronesis and the student teacher. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 41(3),

311-322.

Zeichner, K. 2003. The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit,

Zeichner, K. and H.G. Conklin. 2008. Teacher education programs as sites for teacher preparation. In *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts*, eds. M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre and K.E. Demers, 269-289. New York: Routledge.

Bridging theory and practice in teacher education: teaching schools – a bridge too far?

Sarah Gravett and Sarita Ramsaroop

Published in *Perspectives in Education* 2015: 33(1)

Abstract

The study reported on in this article stems from the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa (2011). This framework proposes the establishment of teaching schools to strengthen teacher education. This article reports on a qualitative inquiry into the views of school-based personnel and the teacher education sector on the implementation of teaching schools as sites for teacher education and whether they think teaching schools could enhance the education of student-teachers. The inquiry showed that the participants were positive that teaching schools will enhance teacher education through serving as a bridge between the academic university-based preparation of student-teachers and the practice demands of the teaching profession. However, they had no clear notion of how such schools could add value to teacher preparation differentiated to schools in which student-teachers are placed for work integrated learning. We contend that prior to establishing teaching schools much deliberation between all stakeholders is required about the purpose and means of integrating teaching schools in teacher education. If not, teaching schools serving to bridge the gap between education of student-teachers at universities and the demands that novice teachers face once they enter the teaching profession may remain an elusive ideal.

Background and focus of the inquiry

The study on which this article is reporting stems from a document developed by the national departments in South Africa. The Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher

Education and Development in South Africa¹ endeavours to strengthen “the teaching practice/school experience component of teacher education programmes through the development of Teaching Schools and Professional Practice Schools” (Department of Basic Education & Higher Education and Training, 2011:17). This Framework describes *Teaching schools* as “teaching laboratories”, where students engage in learning-from-practice, for example, by observing best practice and participating in micro-teaching activities. Teaching schools can also serve as centres for research into strengthening teacher education. The Framework proposes that teaching schools are intended to be in close proximity to teacher education institutions to enable student-teachers to regularly gain access to authentic classroom sites. Furthermore, the Framework proposes that teachers at teaching schools will be developed as mentors for student-teachers and will be able to teach methodology courses within the formal teacher education curriculum. Professional practice schools, on the other hand, are viewed as schools where students go for work integrated learning (WIL). The Framework proposes that teaching schools and professional practice schools will play differentiated, complementary roles in the education of teachers. Students will engage with a specific school community over time at the former, and will learn to practice their craft in different schools in the latter.

Before the dissemination of the Framework document in 2011, the Faculty of Education at the University of Johannesburg (UJ) in partnership with the Gauteng Department of Education founded a public school on its Soweto campus in 2010. Some of the objectives for establishing the school were to develop an integrated practice site for the pre-service education of teachers. It was also established as a site for longitudinal child development studies and research on children’s performance in the school curriculum. Based on the work UJ had already done at its school, the Department of Higher Education and Training, supported by European Union funding, commissioned researchers from the education faculty to conduct research on establishing teaching schools in South Africa. The unit of analysis (Mouton, 1996) was specific role players in teacher education (described in the “methods” section of this article). The inquiry was guided by this research question: “What are the views of school

¹ Hereafter we will refer to it as the *Framework*

teachers, school management teams and the teacher education sector on the proposed establishment of teaching schools at South African teacher education institutions?”

This article reports on *one component* of this research: the views of certain stakeholders on the introduction of these schools in South Africa and whether they think teaching schools could enhance the education of student-teachers for the teaching profession.

In the rest of the article we will discuss some of the literature on the role of schools in other teacher education systems. We then briefly present the inquiry and discuss the findings in depth, drawing the conclusion that participants, while generally supportive of the endeavour, had no clear notion of how such schools could add value to teacher preparation, probably because they had not encountered them in practice as yet.

Collaboration between schools and universities in teacher education

Collaboration between schools and teacher education institutions in the preparation of teachers is prevalent in education systems. The model that is widely used is to place `student-teachers at selected schools for the practicum component of the teacher education programme. However, the extent to which schools become partners differs from country to country and also within countries. We discuss the systems of three countries where schools play a prominent role in the education of teachers.

In the US, many teacher education institutions have partnered with school districts to create professional development schools, aimed at providing quality education for pre-service teachers (Mule, 2006). The delivery of teacher education programmes is the function of both university lecturers and senior teachers in these schools. The focus is on producing professional teachers who “learn from teaching rather than who has finished learning how to teach” (Darling-Hammond, 2008:94).

Recently England has pursued a school-based model of initial teacher education, seemingly to minimise university involvement, driven by the political conviction that the school is the most effective place for learning how to teach (Mcnamara, Murray & Jones, 2014). In 2010 the Secretary of State for Education in England, announced the intention to shift teacher education and continuing professional development of teachers from universities to schools, led by the newly established teaching schools (Whitehead, 2011). The vision is to establish 500 teaching school alliances by 2014-15. A teaching school alliance comprises 25, or more schools, strategic partners, such as higher education institutions, and other interested organisations (Matthews & Berwick, 2013). Teaching schools are tasked with identifying, demonstrating and sharing best practice within each alliance.

The shift to school-led teacher education is even more pronounced in the School Direct Initiative (Mcnamara, Murray & Jones, 2014). This is a market-driven model where schools recruit and train pre-service teachers with a view of providing them with employment. Schools in this model are expected to train pre-service teachers in areas of professional development and subject knowledge. Training is conducted in collaboration with a service provider of choice, which could be a university.

Finland's teacher education model is based on a full partnership between universities and teacher training schools, also referred to as normal schools or practice schools. Sahlberg (2012:12) describes Finnish teacher education as a "spiral sequence of theoretical knowledge, practical training and research-oriented enquiry for teaching". The bulk of student-teachers' practice teaching takes place in training schools, (Kansanen, 2014). Even though these schools are governed by universities, they follow the same curriculum as other public schools. Research-based thinking integrates theoretical and practice-based aspects during teacher education studies (Kansanen, 2014). This is achieved by aligning teaching practice sessions in training schools with theoretical studies that directly relate to the focus of that practice period (Kansanen, 2014). In so doing, pre-service teachers practice teaching and practitioner research simultaneously (Kansanen, 2014). In addition to being placed in training schools, student-teachers are placed in a network of selected field schools for practice teaching (Sahlberg, 2012).

With student-teachers' first practice experience occurring at training schools, observation of and involvement in best practice is ensured. This is made possible by appointing staff at these schools that meet higher professional requirements than ordinary municipal schools, with proven competence in teaching skills, supervision, teacher professional development and assessment strategies (Sahlberg, 2012). Teaching school teachers not only guide and mentor student-teachers (Kansanen, 2014), they also conduct research in collaboration with the university to contribute to the development of teacher education (Sahlberg, 2012). These roles require mentor teachers to continuously improve their expertise in their field. Mentor teachers are required to complete courses in pedagogics and to undergo continuous supervisor training (Jussila & Saari, 2000).

Research methods

Merriam (2009:22) terms a qualitative study that does not fit any specific design genre as a "generic qualitative inquiry". The research we conducted falls into this combination of qualitative methods, utilised for the purpose of inquiring into the views of a variety of role players, pertaining to teaching schools and whether such schools could enhance teacher education. These role players included school-based personnel and the teacher education sector. In so doing, rich descriptions of the "perceptions, assumptions, prejudgments, presuppositions" (van Manen, 1977, in Miles & Huberman, 1994:10), regarding the establishment of teaching schools, could be elicited, allowing the researchers to build a "complex, holistic picture" (Creswell, 1998:15) of the participants' views.

A combination of purposive and convenient sampling was used to select "desirable participants" (Henning, Van Rensburg & Smit, 2004: 71). Six teacher education institutions (universities and universities of technology) were selected to participate in the research. The main criterion for selecting the sample was to aim for maximum variation. Therefore, rural and urban teacher education institutions were included. Another criterion for inclusion was that the institutions had to offer both primary and secondary school initial teacher education.

At these institutions, heads of teacher education (in some cases deans) were requested to participate. They invited teacher educators (n=59). The teacher education institutions also identified one or two schools (n=10) in close proximity to the institution. Principals (n=10) of the selected schools invited teachers (n=168) in their schools and school management teams (n=32) to form part of the inquiry.

Prior to data collection an information session was held on teaching schools as presented in the Framework. The information as stated in the Framework was presented.

Three methods of data-collection were used. Semi-structured (open-ended) questionnaires, requiring written responses, were used in the case of school teachers, school management teams and teacher educators. On completion of the questionnaires, these participants reconvened and were asked to raise issues that emanated from completing the questionnaire. The purpose of this was to ascertain what the most pertinent issues were from the perspective of participants. This was video recorded. This also served as a reliability measure of the inquiry and was a form of 'member checking' (Merriam, 2009).

Semi-structured interviews, using an interview schedule were conducted with principals and heads of teacher education. Questions that were asked were similar to the questions used in the questionnaires, but allowed for more detailed responses and also for more in-depth probing. The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

The data were analysed using qualitative content analysis, as described by Henning et al (2004: chapter 6). We firstly read through all the data to familiarize ourselves with it. In this process "big" ideas from the data were noted. Thereafter we divided the data into five sets to reflect the participant groupings. Each data set was analysed by using open coding, that is, through identifying units of meaning and labelling these. This was followed by categorising, which implied that related codes were grouped and named. The categories from the different sets of data were combined conceptually into; (1) across data-set categories and (2) themes (with sub-themes), resulting in final "thematic patterns" (Henning et al, 2004: 106).

Findings: participants are positive, yet uninformed

The overarching theme derived from the data is: “Teaching schools will enhance teacher education through serving as a *bridge* between the academic university-based preparation of student-teachers and the practice demands of the teaching profession.” The belief that there is a “gap” between the education of student-teachers at universities and the realities that novice teachers face once they enter the teaching profession is inherent to this finding. Sub-themes relate to teaching schools bridging the gap.

Bridging the gap through student-teachers observing a good practice example of school life

University and school-based participant groups viewed teaching schools as sites for student-teachers to observe best teaching practice, assuming that this would be what they would encounter. Teachers mentioned that schools would “familiarize students with teaching and good teaching practice” by giving “student-teachers longer time in teaching schools to be exposed to different challenges that are practically happening”. Deans and school principals concurred that teaching schools can contribute to improving student-teachers' pedagogical craft and their curriculum content knowledge. By observing different grades they would develop their pedagogical content knowledge.

School-based participants, including school managers and teachers, agreed that novice teachers who enter the profession lack work-based knowledge and skills derived from apprenticeship experiences. They said that through regular observation and on-site experience, in a school they have come to know well, student-teachers would/could develop an understanding of the way a school functions. This could contribute to developing student-teachers holistically as they “get more exposed to reality when you are a teacher with an administrative load and who has the pressure to get the best possible results from learners who also come from houses where there are numerous problems”. According to teacher educators and teachers, student-teachers will be “groomed as professionals” by observing teachers who are good role models and who embody the different roles and expectations of a teacher: student-teachers “develop a teacher identity.”

Bridging the gap through student-teachers experiencing the “real practice of what is happening in schools”

School-based participants were of the view that there is a “gap between what universities offer to students and the real practice of what is happening in schools”. Teachers ‘accused’ universities of imparting “inligting wat nie van toepassing is op wat werklik in die onderwys gebeur nie” (information that is not relevant to what really happens in schools), resulting in students who “stap met baie boeke kennis en weinig praktiese ondervinding” (walk with lots of book knowledge, but little practical experience). The school management teams also mentioned that university lecturers are often not in touch with school practice and don’t always know what is relevant: “dosente is te lank uit die praktyk en weet nie aldag wat relevant is nie”.

The notion that teacher education is often too theoretical was mentioned by all participant groups. A dean admitted; “we focus very much on the theory, and we don’t really focus on what is actually changing and happening in the classroom ... schools have changed; the dynamics of the school population have changed and that requires a complete different way ... to approach things”.

Generally, the participants said that the disjuncture between school and university expectations results in concerns about the quality of teachers emerging from universities. The concerns from teachers include “students who start their teaching careers struggling with curriculum content”. School principals added that student-teachers “do not know how to do preparation that is valuable to teaching”. All role players were confident that teaching schools could serve to “bridge the gap between theory and practice” with teachers indicating that teaching schools could provide opportunities to “implement theory in practice” by “establishing a link between the theory done at university to practice done at schools” thereby making learning “real and relevant”. Teachers added that teaching schools can “fill up the gap between university curriculum and school curriculum”.

Teachers mentioned that student-teachers placed in teaching schools would be exposed to “realistic and relevant practical classroom experiences” and would “observe different approaches to resolving authentic issues,” which may “allay their fears in the teaching profession”. Such experiences might allow student-teachers to “identify the authenticity of the theoretical material that the student-teachers are using given the current system which leaves a gap between the provision of solutions in terms of practical issues like discipline, poor parental involvement as a result of illiteracy, [and] poor background”.

A dean expressed a similar notion: if “they have just been trained in the university they are trained in the academic sense, but by *joining forces with schools* as teaching schools I think they would get a more professional flavour of teacher training, as medical doctors are getting”.

Some teachers also proposed that the time student-teachers spend on practical experience be increased with more time spent at school, resulting in “more practical than theory” and that “practice should be direct and not after theory” as “this does away with forgetting what has been taught”. Such an approach will fill the “gap between what the universities offer students and the real practice of what is happening in schools” and “form a link between university and schools”.

Bridging the gap through a collaborative relationship

For teaching schools to be used optimally a collaborative relationship between the different role players has to be fostered. All parties agreed that university teacher educators and mentor teachers have to be equally committed and need to view the role of the other as equal. A dean that “teachers have knowledge and practical experience far more than anyone else can wish for.....I think it will be an equal relationship”. Teachers said that “teaching school staff come with practical experience while university teaching education staff come up with methodology and the two will help the student-teacher in totality. It will be a collaboration of experience and methodology” and “we should be seen as equals”.

Towards achieving an equal partnership, continuous communication about course content and the student-teachers' progress and development is needed. Regular consultations between teaching school teachers and teacher educators can result in a "marriage between theory and practice".

Bridging the gap: a bridge too far?

It is important to note that most of the research participants do not have any experience of teaching schools. They do not know such schools empirically. Thus, their responses are based on their conceptions of a construct. We expected that participants' responses would be speculative, which was generally not the case. We found this surprising, but realized that participants' responses reflected their views on current practices related to school practicum and how these could benefit from placing students in a controlled school environment, which they assume a teaching school would be. Even though the research aimed to elicit the participants' views on a new type of school that will work in tandem with universities in the education of student teachers, their responses reflected their views of the current practice of placing students in schools for WIL. Participants did not talk about teaching schools playing a fundamentally different role in the education of student teachers than schools currently do. Undoubtedly, before establishing teaching schools in South Africa much deliberation is required in the teacher education sector about the purpose of integrating teaching schools in teacher education. How will the role of the teaching school differ from the role of the professional practice school? How will the experiences of student-teachers in these schools be planned to contribute differently but complementarily to the education of student-teachers? How should teacher education be planned with teaching schools in mind? These are important considerations which the participants were not able to fully grasp yet because of the novelty of the construct.

Participants were silent on whether the integration of teaching schools into teacher education would impact teacher education curricula and models. This implies that teaching schools run

the risk of becoming add-ons. We argue that none of the proposed benefits of the teaching school, as a “bridge,” will be realized unless teacher education programmes are developed with the teaching school as integral to the programme design.

The notion that there is a “gap” between the education of student-teachers at universities and the demands of teaching is prominent in the data. Teachers and teacher educators say that they contribute different kinds of knowledge to the education of student-teachers. These are typified as theoretical knowledge versus practical knowledge, suggesting knowledge types remain largely distinct. Binary ways of thinking about knowledge and about the theory-practice dichotomy is a perennial issue in teacher education (McNarama, Jones & Murray, 2014). In addition, possible approaches to bridging the dichotomy abound in the teacher education literature (Korthagen, 2011).

Participants in this research propose that teaching schools could bridge the gap. For some the potential lies in teaching schools enabling student-teachers to spend time in a model school environment, which will result in teachers who are better prepared for the complexities of teaching. This view informs teacher education reforms in some countries where school-based teacher education is introduced to overcome the fierce criticism that teacher education is not sufficiently relevant to practice. An example of this is the push in England to moving teacher education away from higher education into schools. The Secretary of State for Education announced in 2010 that initial teacher education should be mainly school based. He views teaching as “a craft which is best learnt as an apprentice observing a master craftsman or woman” (McNarama, Murray & Jones, 2014).

But, will more observation time in a school, even a model school, equate with enhanced preparation for the teaching profession? We think not.

We concur that observing exemplary practice is powerful. Student-teachers observing expert teachers at work can learn much about pedagogical skills related to teaching strategies and

classroom management. But, as the study of Orland-Barak & Leshem (2009) shows, student-teachers often attribute little learning value to the observation in schools. Their observations remain on a concrete, perceptual level, which prevents them from making connections at a conceptual level. Without scaffolding student-teachers struggle 'to see beyond'. Observation tasks must be designed purposefully for student-teachers so that they will elicit dialogue that will help student-teachers to "distinguish the learning potential intrinsic in the multidimensional, simultaneous, immediate and unpredictable teaching reality" (Orland-Barak & Leshem, 2009:33).

We agree with Derry that placing individuals in a rich environment does not ensure learning. Derry points out that the "learning environment must be designed and [learning] cannot rely on the spontaneous response to an environment which is not constructed according to, or involves, some clearly worked out conceptual framework" (2008: 60–61).

We argue that teaching schools and universities should intentionally co-design the teaching school as a "learning place" (Conway, Murphy and Rutherford, 2014) for student-teachers. Furthermore, we agree with Shulman (2004) that experience does not necessarily lead to "wisdom of practice". Learning through experience requires reflection on experience. The ultimate goal of educating teachers is to teach them to act with understanding (Feiman-Nemser & Buchman, 1985). Student-teachers encountering "doing" in the teaching school need help in seeing how understanding clarifies and shapes ways of doing. In teaching schools this means that student-teachers should be guided by knowledgeable mentors "to structure or restructure an experience, a problem, or existing knowledge or insights" (Korthagen, 2001: 58) to enhance understanding.

Another reason why the involvement of student-teachers in the teaching school will not necessarily address the "gap" is that the incorporation of a teaching school results in the education of student-teachers occurring simultaneously at two sites. A disjuncture between coursework learning and teaching school learning, if not mediated, could actually serve to broaden the gap that the teaching school is supposed to bridge. A way to counteract this is to plan for the conceptual connectedness of university learning and teaching school learning in

terms of, inter alia, a shared understanding of learners and learning, the role of the teacher, and the mission of schooling. A shared vision between the university and teaching school, as complementary teacher education sites, about the kind of teacher the programme envisages is key (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Zeichner and Conklin (2008:272), who studied exemplary teacher education programmes in the United States, highlight the centrality of a uniting vision in such programmes:

The case studies suggest that it is the guiding ideas of a program that are likely to have the most influence on what prospective teachers learn and suggest that the more coherent a program is with regard to the ideas about teaching and learning and schooling that underlie it, the more powerful the influence is likely to be. The cases as a group suggest that program impact is strengthened by a clear and common vision of teaching and learning that permeates all coursework and field experiences.

This implies that a close working relationship between university teachers and teaching school mentors is vital. The research conducted by Gravett, Petersen & Petker (2014) in the teaching school linked to the UJ also attests to this. They argue that student-teachers' coursework and teaching school learning should work in tandem. A discursive understanding is needed between school teachers and university teachers of the issues and questions student-teachers will examine in the school, "*when* they are to be studied, what *activities* are to be engaged in, *what kinds of questions* are to be asked, and *what kinds of criteria* are to be applied (McIntyre, 1995:371). A discursive understanding implies dialogue, but does not assume full convergence of views between what student-teachers encounter at the teaching school and in their coursework.

Some research participants view teaching schools as sites for implementing theory in practice, thereby bridging the "gap". For others, the teaching school provides an authentic environment to "test" theoretical material student-teachers encounter at the university. For the latter, the teaching school serves as a site of "applying received knowledge" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999: 257) to practical situations through implementing, translating, using,

adapting and/or putting into practice what they learn in coursework. This “theory-into-practice” view is well-entrenched in teacher education (Korthagen, 2011).

The problem with this view is that theoretical knowledge and practice knowledge remain separate, the theory-practice binary is reaffirmed. Thus, we doubt whether a teaching school could bridge the gap if this view is implicit to the approach of a teacher education programme. So, what are alternative conceptualisations and what would the role of a teaching school be in them?

Kessels & Korthagen (2001) contend that a phronesis, or practical wisdom approach to teacher education, resolves the theory-practice disjuncture. Phronesis focuses mainly on the development of practical reasoning or perception-based knowledge. We are of the view that teacher education incorporating a teaching school sits comfortably with our conceptualisation of the phronesis approach (Gravett, 2012). In essence, phronesis that incorporates a teaching school, would imply that student-teachers mainly engage in a form of experiential learning stimulated by “concerns” encountered at the teaching school. Reflection, guided by teaching school and university teachers, serve to structure the teaching school experience. This is done through clarification, classification, the extraction of core ideas and principles, making of tentative generalisations through extrapolation and the incorporation of conceptual knowledge. Personal theorising forms the foundation for moving to “formal” conceptual knowledge.

Cochran-Smith & Lytle (1999) also dispute the theory-into-practice relationship. They do this through their “knowledge *of* practice” conception of teacher learning and the concomitant “inquiry as stance” construct for understanding teacher learning. They note that the term practice is often equated with that which is practical –“to refer to doing, acting, carrying out, and/or performing the work of the profession” (1999:290). From the perspective of inquiry as stance, however, “neither the activity of teaching nor inquiry about teaching are captured by the notion that practice is practical. Rather, teaching and thus teacher learning are centrally about forming and re-forming frameworks for understanding practice” (1999:290).

We argue that teacher education programmes should be designed so that both the university and teaching school serve as sites for the “intentional investigation of practice” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999:250). At these sites questions that function as “lenses for seeing and making sense of practice” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999:292) should be considered, at the university more broadly and at the teaching school within the context of school life. Questions such as the following could be used to guide student-teachers to challenge their own assumptions and to identify and question salient issues of practice: Who am I as a developing teacher? What are my assumptions about learners? What sense are learners making of what is going on in the classroom? How do the views, frameworks and research of others inform or challenge my own understandings? What are the underlying assumptions of the materials, texts, tests and curriculum frameworks with which I engage? What am I trying to accomplish here and why? How do my thinking and actions connect to larger education issues and agendas? How do my experiences in the programme contribute to my own developing educational theory?

We also find the concept of “third space” (McNamara, Jones & Murray, 2014) enlightening when thinking about the role teaching schools could play as a bridge to resolve the theory-practice dilemma. According to Zeichner (2010) third spaces “involve a rejection of binaries such as practitioner and academic knowledge and theory and practice and involve the integration of what are often seen as competing discourses in new ways—an either/or perspective is transformed into a both/also point of view”. Kozleski (2011:257) describes the power of being together in third space as meaning “that we suspend assumptions about being right and take the time to consider and explore the unfamiliar, question, and above all, listen to one another and possibly, silence the shrill critic within us all”.

Even though some research participants suggest that theoretical knowledge belongs to the realm of the university, third space thinking does not locate theoretical knowledge with the university and practice knowledge with the teaching school. To us, third space thinking means that staff from both the teaching school and university “journey out of their own

organizational and professional territories and ... combine their respective skills, knowledge and expertise in new ways" (Gravett et al, 2014: S115).

Teaching school teachers must be able to move comfortably between the world of school practice and of educational ideas so as to introduce applicable conceptual knowledge when mentoring student-teachers. This is done at training schools in Finland. Teachers at these schools underwent teacher education that is research-based, implying "systematic integration of scientific educational knowledge, didactics (or pedagogical content knowledge), and practice in a manner that enables teachers to enhance their pedagogical thinking, evidence-based decision making, and engagement in the scientific community of educators" (Sahlberg, 2012:7). In Finland all teachers are educated in this way. This is not the case in South Africa. However, we argue that teaching school teachers will have to be involved in this type of development to prepare them for their role as mentors.

Conversely, it is also crucial that university teachers incorporate student-teachers' experiences at the teaching school in coursework. We concur with Korthagen (2011) that if student-teachers have not encountered concrete problems or concerns about teaching, it is highly unlikely that they will perceive the usefulness of the conceptual knowledge of education as field. Dialogue about what student-teachers observe and experience in the teaching school could serve as powerful springboards for introducing related conceptual knowledge in the coursework component of the programme.

Third space thinking brings binary discourses together. This does not mean that there is no difference between the role of the university and the teaching school in teacher education. The university and teaching school contribute in different, but complementary ways to the education of student-teachers. Hirst (1990 in McIntyre, 1995) contends that mentor teachers possess authoritative situational knowledge specific to the school context. McIntyre (1995:372) adds that experienced teachers have accumulated over the years "a vast body of professional knowledge highly relevant to initial teacher education". Furlong et al. (2008:41) argue that a key function of the university is "theorising the epistemological and pedagogical

underpinnings” of the teaching profession. In the absence of such theorising the “complexity and contestability of professional knowledge is no longer seen to be at the heart of what partnership is about. Professional knowledge becomes simplified, flattened, it is essentially about contemporary practice in schools”.

Synchronising the complementary roles of teaching schools and universities requires the equal valuing of theory-based and experience-based knowledge (Koppich, 2000). Researchers at universities working closely with schools in initial teacher education indicate that breaking the hierarchical chain between teacher educators and school mentors is possible through university lecturers respecting the professional commitment, research ability and the capacity of teachers to create knowledge (Whitehead, 2011).

Conclusion

This inquiry showed that the participants were positive that teaching schools as envisaged in the Framework will enhance teacher education through serving as a bridge between the academic university-based preparation of student-teachers and the practice demands of the teaching profession. However, they had no clear notion of how such schools could add value to teacher preparation, complementary to schools in which student-teachers are placed for work integrated learning. We contend that prior to establishing teaching schools in South Africa much deliberation involving all stakeholders is required about the purpose of integrating teaching schools in teacher education. If not, teaching schools serving to bridge the gap between the education of student-teachers at universities and the demands that novice teachers face once they enter the teaching profession may remain an elusive ideal – a bridge too far.

Acknowledgements: The research was supported by the Department of Higher Education and Training with a European Union Grant. Data-collection for the broader project was done by a

team consisting of: Sarita Ramsaroop, Nadine Petersen, Gerda Bender, Kakoma Luneta, Pierre du Plessis, Coert Loock, Senoelo Nkhase and Dirk Postma.

REFERENCES

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. L. 1999. Relationships of Knowledge and Practice: Teacher Learning in Communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24: 249– 305.

Conway, P. F., Murphy, R. & Rutherford, V. 2014. 'Learningplace' Practices and Pre-service Teacher Education in Ireland: Knowledge Generation, Partnerships and Pedagogy. In McNamara, O., Murray, J., & Jones, M. (Eds). *Workplace Learning in Teacher Education. International Practice and Policy*. Springer, London, UK. Pages 221-242.

Creswell, J.W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design. Choosing among Five Traditions*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Darling-Hammond, L. 2008. Teacher Learning that Supports Student Learning. In Presseisen, B.Z. (Ed). *Teaching for Intelligence*. Corwin Press, Thousand Oaks, California.

Department of Basic Education and Higher Education and Training. 2011. Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa. Pretoria. South Africa.

Derry, J. 2008. Abstract rationality in education: from Vygotsky to Brandom. *Studies in the Philosophy of Education*, 27: 49– 62.

Feiman-Nemser, S. 2001. From Preparation to Practice: Designing a Continuum to Strengthen and Sustain Teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103 (6): 1013-1055.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchman, M. 1985. Pitfalls of Experience in Teacher Preparation. *Teachers College Record* Volume 87(1): 53-65.

Furlong, J., McNamara, O., Campbell, A., Howson, J. & Lewis, S. 2008. Partnership, Policy and Politics: Initial Teacher Education in England under New Labour. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 14(4): 307-318.

Gravett, S. 2012. Crossing the “Theory-Practice Divide”: Learning to Be(come) a Teacher. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*. 2(2): 1-14.

Gravett, S., Petersen, N. & Petker, G. 2014. Integrating foundation phase teacher education with a ‘teaching school’ at the University of Johannesburg. *Education as Change: Journal of Curriculum research*. 18(1): S107-S119.

Henning, E., Van Rensburg, W.A. & Smit, B. 2004. *Finding Your Way in Qualitative Research*. Pretoria: Van Schaiks.

Jussila, J. & Saari, S. 2000. Teacher Education as a Future Moulding Factor, International Evaluation of Teacher Education in Finnish Universities. Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council, Helsinki, Finland.

Kansanen, P. 2014. Teaching as a Master’s Level Profession in Finland: Theoretical Reflections and Practical Solutions. In McNamara, O., Murray, J., & Jones, M. (Eds). *Workplace Learning in Teacher Education*. International Practice and Policy. Springer, London, UK. Pages 279-292.

Kessels, J. & Korthagen, F.A.J. 2001. The Relation between Theory and Practice: Back to the Classics. In Korthagen, F.A.J (Eds.). *Linking Practice and Theory. The Pedagogy of Realistic Teacher Education*. Taylor & Francis, New Jersey, London. Pages 20-31.

Koppich, J.E. 2000. Trinity University: Preparing Teachers for Tomorrow’s Schools. In Darling-Hammond, L (Ed.). *Studies of Excellence in Teacher Education*. AACTE Publications, USA. Pages 1-48.

Korthagen, F.A.J. 2001. Linking Practice and Theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, April 2001.

Korthagen, F.A.J. 2011. Making Teacher Education Relevant for Practice: The Pedagogy of Realistic Teacher Education. *Orbis Scholae*, 5(2): 31-50.

Kozleski, E. 2011. Dialectical practices in education: Creating third space in the education of teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 34(3): 250– 259.

Matthews, P. & Berwick, G. 2013. Teaching Schools: First among Equals? Nottingham, National College for Teaching and Leadership.

McIntyre, D. 1995. Initial Teacher Education as Practical Theorising: A Response to Paul Hirst. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 43 (4): 365-383.

McNamara, O., Jones, M. & Murray, J. 2014. Framing Workplace Learning. In McNamara, O., Murray, J., & Jones, M. (Eds). *Workplace Learning in Teacher Education. International Practice and Policy*. Springer, London, UK. Pages 1-28.

McNamara, O., Murray, J. & Jones, M. 2014. Workplace Learning in Pre-service Teacher Education: An English Case Study. In McNamara, O., Murray, J., & Jones, M. (Eds). *Workplace Learning in Teacher Education. International Practice and Policy*. Springer, London, UK. Pages 183-206.

Merriam, S.B. 2009. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mouton, J. 1996. *Understanding social research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Miles, B.M. & Huberman, A.M. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Sage Publication, California, USA.

Mule, L. 2006. Preservice Teachers' Inquiry in a Professional Development School Context: Implications for the Practicum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22: 205-218.

Orland-Barak, L. & Lesham, S. 2009. Observation in learning to teach: forms of "seeing". *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 36(3): 21-37.

Sahlberg, P. 2012. The Most Wanted. Teachers and Teacher Education in Finland. In Darling-Hammond, L., & Lieberman, A. (Eds.). *Teacher Education around the World. Changing Policies and Practices*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon. Pages 1-21.

Shulman, L. 2004. The Wisdom of Practice. Essays on Teaching, Learning and Learning to Teach. (Edited by Wilson, SM). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Whitehead, J. 2011. Teacher Education in England: The changing landscape and key drivers behind the reforms. In Murray, J & Wishart, J (Eds). *Teacher Education: The changing landscape across the UK*. ESCalate, Bristol, UK, Pages 27-35.

Zeichner, K. 2010. Rethinking the Connections Between Campus Courses and Field Experiences in College- and University-Based Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2) 89–99.

Zeichner, K. & H.G. Conklin. 2008. Teacher Education Programs as Sites for Teacher Preparation. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D.J. McIntyre and K.E. Demers (eds),

Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts, 269-289. New York: Routledge.

Towards a governance and management model for teaching schools in South Africa

Coert Loock and Sarah Gravett; University of Johannesburg

Published in the South African Journal of Childhood Education, 2014 4(3): 174-191.

Article can be accessed at:

<http://www.uj.ac.za/EN/Faculties/edu/CentresandInstitutes/CEPR/SouthAfricanJournalofChildhoodEducation/Pages/Onlineissues.aspx>

Abstract

This article reports on a project that was aimed at establishing a model for the governance of teaching schools in South Africa, set in the current legal dispensation for the public and the independent schooling sector. The paper mainly addresses the powers and functions of public schools and school governing bodies as defined within the broader framework of The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996, The National Education Policy Act (Act 27 of 1996), and the Employment of Educators Act (Act 76 of 1998). The analysis of these statutes informed the proposal of four possible models for governance of teaching schools. The article recommends two models that fit the mandate of teaching schools as envisioned in the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025: 1) a model that provides for teaching schools as a school type at national (not provincial) level and 2) the independent school model.

Background

This article emanates from the Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa². In this Framework the development of teaching schools in South Africa is envisaged to strengthen “the teaching practice/school experience component of teacher education programmes through the development of Teaching Schools and Professional Practice Schools” (Department of Basic Education & Department of Higher Education and Training, 2011:17). The Framework describes teaching schools as “teaching laboratories”, where student teachers engage in learning-from-practice by, for example, observing best practice and participating in micro-teaching activities. Teaching schools can also serve as centres for research of teacher education. Furthermore, the Framework proposes that teachers at teaching schools will be developed as mentors for student teachers and will be able to teach subject methodology (pedagogy for specific learning areas) courses at the teacher education institution.

Prior to the promulgation of the Framework the Faculty of Education at the University of Johannesburg, through a memorandum of agreement with the Gauteng Department of Education, founded a public primary school on its Soweto campus in 2010. The main objective for establishing the school was to develop an integrated practice site for the pre-service education of teachers, similar to what the Framework proposes with regards to teaching schools. Based on the work the University of Johannesburg (UJ) had already done at its school, the Department of Higher Education and Training (supported by European Union funding) commissioned researchers from UJ to conduct research on teaching schools for South African teacher education. This article reports on one component of this research, namely an appropriate management/governance model for teaching schools.

We briefly discuss a selection of the literature about the participation of schools in teacher education. We refer, specifically, to the teacher training school system in Finland, because this system is similar to the schools that the Framework envisages. Thereafter we propose

² Hereafter we will refer to it as the Framework

various models for the organisation, governance and funding of teaching schools in South Africa, some of which could be accommodated within the current legislative framework and others that will require legislative change.

The method we used to arrive at the different models was to conduct an in-depth survey and analysis of the laws and regulations as well as related materials that govern schools in South Africa, such as the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996, the Education Law and Policy Handbook (2003), compiled for the Education Labour Relations Council and published by a local publisher of law books; regulations promulgated by the Department of Education and Culture (1999), the Constitution of South Africa (1996), the National Educational Policy Act, 27 of 1996 and the Employment of Educators Act (76 of 1998). We also drew extensively on our experience in founding the school in Soweto, as well as more recently, the gradual conversion of an existing public primary school in Siyabuswa to eventually serve as a teaching school³. While we were compiling the commissioned research report, we had several conversations with education department officials (provincial, Department of Basic Education and Department of Higher Education and Training) to soundboard the emerging models.

Schools as sites of teacher education

The collaboration of schools and teacher education institutions in the pre-service education of teachers is customary worldwide. However, the nature of the collaboration differs from country to country and also within countries. Butink and Wouda (2001) as cited by Maandag, Deinum, Hofman and Buitink (2007) describe five models of collaboration between schools and teacher education institutions in relation to the education of student teachers. These are: school as workplace (work placement model); school with a central supervisor (co-ordinator model); trainer in the school as a trainer of professional teachers (partner model); trainer in the school as a leader of a training team in the school (network model) and training by the school (training school model). Depending on how teaching schools will be integrated into

³ The University of Johannesburg Faculty of Education offers a foundation phase teacher education programme in Siyabuswa, which will be taken over by the University of Mpumalanga in 2017.

the curriculum design of teacher education programmes in South Africa, the teaching school collaboration model will fall within the category of a *partner* or *network* model, or a hybrid of the two.

Based on the description in Maandag et al (2007) the Finnish model of university training schools, also referred to as university practice schools or teacher training schools (Kansanen, 2014, Sahlberg, 2012), falls within the broad classification of a partner/network model. These schools are governed by universities (Kansanen, 2014) and the funding of the schools comes from the Ministry of Culture and Education (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2011). The schools follow the same curriculum and practice as normal municipal schools, but have higher professional requirements for teachers. Proven competency in teaching skills, supervision and mentoring and assessment strategies are required (Sahlberg, 2012; Kansanen, 2014). Once appointed, mentor teachers are expected to complete courses in university pedagogics and to undergo continuous supervisor training (Jussila & Saari, 2000). Teachers thus have to learn how to be a teacher educator.

Teaching practice is integrated into all levels of the teacher education programme (Niemi & Jakku-Sihvonen, 2011) and research-based thinking integrates theoretical and practice-based aspects of the education programme (Kansanen, 2014). This is achieved by aligning teaching practice periods with theoretical studies that correlate with the focus of that practice period (Kansanen, 2014). Teacher educators also visit the training schools and collaboratively supervise students with the school mentors (Kansanen, 2014). Thus, there is a close partnership between teacher educators at universities and training school teachers, based on mutual recognition of the expertise and experience of the other party (Raiker, 2011). Training schools are generally situated close to universities. This further promotes a close working relationship between these schools and universities (Raiker, 2011). In some universities the initial practice periods take place at training schools where student teachers encounter best practice and later they are also placed at other schools (municipal field schools) for practice teaching (Sahlberg, 2012).

In addition to mentoring and guiding student teachers, training school teachers are also expected to engage in research in collaboration with the university so as to contribute to the development of teacher education (Sahlberg, 2012).

The first South African teaching school was designed with some of the characteristics of Finnish schools in mind. Also, similar to Finnish teacher training schools, South African teaching schools will be located close to universities. And similar to the Finnish model, it is proposed that the school teachers will function as mentors to student teachers, teach subject pedagogy courses and that the schools will be used as sites for research to improve practice.

The legal framework for school governance in South Africa

In this section we discuss the South African Schools Act,⁴ which sets out the legal framework for both public and independent schools in South Africa. However, our focus will be on public schools, assuming for the sake of the argument that teaching schools will be public schools.

The South African Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996)

Two important principles laid down in the Schools Act, and which are pertinent for the establishing of teaching schools, are: different entities are assigned responsibilities for governance and professional management of schools; and the fundamental interest of parents in the education of their children is acknowledged by affording them majority representation in public school governing bodies.

The Schools Act makes provision for three different types of public schools, namely ordinary public schools, public schools for learners with special education needs, and public schools

⁴ Herein referred to as the Schools Act

that provide education with a specialised focus on talent, including sport, performing arts or creative arts.

Governance of public schools

In terms of section 16(1) of the Schools Act, the governance of each public school vests in its school governing body. Although the concept of “governance” may be interpreted as policy-making, the Schools Act makes it clear that the governing body is no mere policy-making body. The school governing body also deals with management functions such as administration and control of property, opening and maintaining a bank account, purchasing equipment and learning materials, and so forth. In essence, the governing body of a public school has original functions related to the overall oversight, governance and management of the school as a juristic person.

The status of public schools as a juristic person

A “juristic person” is a concept recognized by law as the subject of rights and duties, to give to bodies/societal ties the same, or similar, legal powers or competencies as those ascribed to natural/adult persons. The legal powers include powers such as owning assets, or incurring liabilities, concluding contracts and suing, or being sued.

Public schools are juristic persons created by legislation, in other words creatures of statute. In the case of public schools, the school governing body is the organ acting on behalf of the juristic person. This means that this particular juristic person’s capacity to act as a legal entity is limited to those rights, functions and obligations set out in the statute creating it (Schools Act). Sections 15 and 16(1) limit the powers of schools and their organs (governing bodies) to those functions authorised by the Schools Act itself.

It should be noted that a juristic person cannot function or exist within another juristic person such as a higher education institution. This aspect needs to be considered if public schools are linked to teacher education institutions⁵ for the purpose of teacher education.

A teaching school, as public school, should function within the current policy framework as contemplated in section 12(3) of the Schools Act. This implies that the school governing body would be responsible for the governance of the school in accordance with the functions, obligations and rights as prescribed by the Act. Section 20 stipulates that the governing body develops its own constitution, the code of conduct for learners, the admission policy, language, religious observance and all other policies of the school. It should be noted that Section 20 schools are mainly no-fees schools. In addition, a school governing body may apply for additional functions, such as the right to maintain and improve the school buildings and property; the right to determine the extra-curricular activities and curriculum policy; the right to purchase text books, educational materials and equipment; to pay for the services of the school and the right to levy school fees and exercise any other functions consistent with the Schools Act and any applicable provincial law.

School funding and financial management

The *National Norms and Standards for School Funding for Ordinary Public Schools*, states that a school may carry out its own procurement and may deal directly with suppliers and contractors for the relevant budgeted items in accordance with standard procurement procedures, the financial directions issued in terms of section 37 of the Schools Act, and paragraph 116 of the Norms and Standards. This does not mean that the school governing body may not take advice from other stakeholders such as the principal, educators or sponsoring body, which could be teacher education institutions in the case of teaching schools. Good governance principles and the provisions of sections 16(2) and 20(1) (a) of the Schools Act would indeed require of the school governing body to take such advice.

⁵ In South Africa teacher education takes place at universities and some universities of technology. The term teacher education institution is used to refer to these higher education institutions.

In the case of a public school for learners with special education needs, or a public school for learners with “focused talent”, procurement will take place in accordance with section 37 of the Schools Act and standard procurement procedures, as no norms and standards have been promulgated for these schools.

The function of determining the curriculum policy of the school and extra-mural activities is also allocated solely to the school governing body and cannot be executed as a joint function with another role player such as a higher education institution. The head of department of the provincial department of education can however impose a condition to the allocation of section 21 functions to the effect that the school governing body should *consult certain stakeholders* in the execution of this or any other section 21 function.

In the legal/policy context sketched thus far, a teaching school can function as an ordinary public school, a public school for learners with special education needs, or a school with a specialised focus. The governance and management of the school are determined by the normal legal framework provided for in the Schools Act.

Having probed the existing legal framework and the stipulations of the South African Schools Act related to public schools, the next sections will describe possible governance and management models for teaching schools in South Africa.

Four governance and management models for South African teaching schools

The term “teaching school” is currently not used to describe a school type in the legislative framework. It is therefore necessary to investigate various options or “models” that can be introduced to make provision for teaching schools. Some of these can be accommodated within the current framework of the South African Schools Act, if not fully, then with

amendments, while one of them requires the promulgation of new legislation by an Act of parliament.

Model 1: A public school with a teaching school project

In this model a teaching school *becomes* a “project school”. This means that a teaching school will be a public school with a “teaching school project for teacher education” and named accordingly, for example: “*School X Teaching School Project*”. The school governing body will have to negotiate and conclude a formal agreement with a higher education institution, to which the provincial department may either be a party or may be informed of the project.

All of the provisions as set out in the agreement must be consistent with the constitution of the school as well as the Schools Act. The Schools Act does not make provision for a deviation from the provisions of section 23, regarding the composition of the school governing body of an ordinary public school. There is therefore no leeway for representatives of the higher education institution to be elected or appointed to the school governing body as members with voting rights. Such representatives may be co-opted onto the school governing body, but without voting rights. This is different in the case of public schools for learners with special needs where representation of members of the “sponsoring body” (Section 24(e) of the South African Schools Act) may be allowed as members with voting rights, subject to notice by the Member of the Executive Council (MEC) and by notice in the Provincial Gazette. The MEC will determine the number of representatives (section 24(2)).

The following aspects are important when considering this option:

Governance

If this option is followed the school governing body has to establish a “teaching school project committee” as a sub-committee of the school governing body. It is possible for the higher education institution to have representation on such a committee by virtue of Section 30(1)(b) of the Schools Act, which states that persons who are not elected members of the

school governing body may be appointed to serve on a project committee of the school governing body on the grounds of their expertise. As a matter of law and good practice, decisions of the committee are subject to proper oversight by the school governing body.

Appointments of teachers

Section 6(3)(a) of the Employment of Educators Act determines that any appointment, promotion or transfer to any post on the educator establishment of a public school must be made on the recommendation of the governing body of the public school. With regard to teaching schools the teachers who participate in the “project”, linked to the higher education institution, do so on behalf of the school and not on behalf of the higher education institution.

The higher education institution could pay a stipend for such teachers into the school fund to remunerate them for their work as mentors and the school governing body must then pay the teachers. A teacher who actively participates in the teacher education programme at the teaching school on behalf of the higher education institution and receives remuneration for such participation needs to obtain permission from the provincial head of department if he/she is employed by the provincial department of education. The school governing body may also obtain permission from the head of department to remunerate teachers for additional work performed in which case the provincial department will be responsible for payment. Such application for permission must be done in terms of section 38A of the Schools Act.

Professional management of the school.

The principal is responsible for the professional management of the school. The school governing body may appoint a “project manager” to oversee the teaching school project.

Infrastructure management

All the movable assets of the school belong to the school. If the higher education institution leases classrooms for the purpose of teacher education, the approval of the MEC, as

contemplated in section 36(4) (a) (i), needs to be obtained. If the higher education institution provides items such as projectors and screens, acquired for teacher education purposes, the school governing body, through means of the committee referred to above and the higher education institution must decide on the ownership of such movable assets. The question that arises is whether the above assets may be seen as donations or whether ownership of these assets would fall back to the higher education institution once the project comes to an end. If the items remain the property of the higher education institution the institution must appoint a person to be in control of the property, preferably the project manager or an educator involved in the project.

Financial management

Section 37(1) of the Schools Act (Norms and standards for school funding (ss116)), requires that a school should only have one bank account. If a school should receive money from a higher education institution for the teaching school project, the amount received will have to be reflected as such. A separate ledger account may be kept for such payments received from the higher education institution, and for expenditure incurred for that particular purpose. The school governing body and the higher education institution must have a clear agreement regarding the funding of the project. The teaching school project must not place an additional burden, financial or other, on the parents of the school.

We are of the view that his model can be considered as an option, but it poses major challenges for the establishment of effective teaching schools. Some of these challenges are related to the existing school governance structures, appropriate funding, appropriate infrastructure, appointment of suitable teachers and the ability to create an enabling environment, which is conducive to teacher education. In this model the higher education institution has little power to influence teaching and teaching school related activities at the school and a true partnership between the school and the higher education institution is not possible. This presents a major obstacle for a teaching school to fulfil its mandate as contemplated in the Framework.

Model 2: Declaring a separate category (type) of school (an amendment to the South African Schools Act)

The second option is that the Department of Basic Education amends the Schools Act to make provision for teaching schools as a separate public school type, as per section 12(3) of the Schools Act. This would mean that the Minister of Basic Education would have to create a unique governance structure for teaching schools, with separate norms and standards for school funding.

Because the Framework proposes that teaching school teachers will serve as mentors for student teachers there will be implications for conditions of service of teachers. They will be expected to fulfil this role in teaching schools adequately, being required to mentor student teachers and to collaborate closely with teacher education institutions. This will mean that teachers will work with student teachers during school hours and also after school hours. They will also be required to participate in development programmes conducted by the higher education institution in order to develop their capacity to function efficiently as mentors of student teachers. These requirements have implications for the post establishment ratio and remuneration of teachers at teaching schools.

In South Africa all teachers are employed subject to the provisions of the Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998. In accordance with the Act, the Minister of Basic Education shall determine the salaries and other conditions of service of educators. Different salaries and conditions of service may be determined in respect of different ranks and grades of teachers, teachers appointed at or outside educational institutions, or teachers appointed in different sectors of education. The implication is that if section 12(3) of the schools Act should be amended to provide for a different category of school, additional remuneration could be considered by the Minister of Basic Education. If section 12(3) is not amended, section 38A (2) of the Schools Act does make provision for the governing body to apply to the provincial department of education as employer for approval to pay a state employee any payment contemplated in terms of the Employment of Educators Act (Act 76 of 1998 or the Public Service Act, 1994 (Proclamation 103 of 1994)).

It should be noted that declaring a different category of school cannot serve as a waiver to any of the stipulations contemplated by the Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996) in terms of the “original” functions of school governing bodies of public schools. These include: 1) the recommendation of educators and non-educators to the head of the department for appointment; and 2) the establishment of posts and the employment of educators and non-educators additional to the establishment determined by the Member of the Executive Council. The Employment of Educators Act (EEA) 76 of 1998 (ss. 6A-7) deals with the appointment of educators and the filling of posts. Subject to sections (4) and (5), no transfer to any post on the teacher post establishment of a school shall be made unless the recommendation of the school governing body has been obtained and the democratic principles of equality and equity have been complied with (s 7(1)).

Governance implications of model 2

- a) Though this model requires the amendment of the Schools Act to make provision for a teaching school as a separate category of school, the school will continue to function as part of the provincial dispensation.
- b) Because a different category of school is declared, the school is managed as a school with a special status.
- c) Although the composition of the school governing body makes provision for representation by members of the sponsoring body (the higher education institution), the school governing body still exercises its “original functions”.
- d) Due to the nature of the school, the need for the governing body to establish a separate project committee (Model 1) falls away.
- e) Because the school is a juristic person, any form of agreement or memorandum of agreement must be contracted between the higher education institution and the school governing body, as is the case in Model 1.

School funding and financial management implications

In the case of a public school for learners with special education needs or a public school with a “focused talent”, the procurement will take place in accordance with section 37 of the Schools Act and standard procurement procedures, as no norms and standards have been promulgated for these schools. As indicated in Model 1, section 37(1) of the Schools Act, states that a governing body of a school must open and maintain one banking account. The same rules and regulations are applicable for Model 2.

We are of the view that this model is a viable option. An amendment to section 12(3) of the Act creates an opportunity to declare a different category of school, with the possibility to apply for an appropriate post establishment, funding and staff remuneration structure. The disadvantage of this model is that the higher education will still have limited legal capacity to ensure that the schools fulfil the mandate as stated in the Framework. As in the case of Model 1 an equal partnership between the school and the higher education institution is not possible.

Model 3: An independent (private) school

Hofmeyer and Lee (1999:1) define private schools to include

... all formal schools that are not public and may be founded, owned, managed and financed by actors other than the state, even in cases where the state provides most of the funding and considerable control over these schools.

Closer investigation reveals that there exists a myriad of state-aided schools owned by, for example, religious bodies, farmers, mining and forestry. Because they are state-aided, these schools are governed by Section 14 of the South African Schools Act.

Chapter 5 (s 45) of the South African Schools Act indicates that: *Subject to the Act and any applicable provincial law, any person may, at his/her own cost, establish and maintain an*

independent school. The registration of such schools can currently only be executed by the Head of Department (meaning at provincial level).

Funding and payment of subsidies to independent schools

According to Section 48 of the Act, the Minister of Basic Education may, by notice in the Government Gazette, determine norms and standards for the granting of subsidies to independent schools, after consultation with the Council of Education Ministers and the Financial and Fiscal Commission and with the concurrence with the Minister of Finance, and may from the funds appropriated by the provincial legislature for that purpose, grant subsidy to an independent school.

Only non-profit independent schools receive subsidies from the state, which are never more than sixty percent of the equivalent cost of government schooling, even when the school is located in a disadvantaged and impoverished area. However, Section 50 (5 s50 ss(2)) allows the Minister to determine different requirements in respect of different independent schools, as stipulated under 5 (S 50 ss 1 a-b). It is therefore possible for the Minister to determine different requirements for teaching schools linked to a specific set of norms and standards for such schools. Of specific interest is sub-section 1 (c) relating to the criteria of eligibility, conditions and manner of payment of any subsidy to an independent school. The funding needs of teaching schools may not be sufficiently covered by these criteria and conditions. The Ministry of Basic Education, in terms of the norms and standards for school funding, bases its subsidy policy for the independent school sector on fiscal arguments and social grounds. Section 62 of Notice 2362, noted above, defines the fiscal argument in the Act as follows: *"...the right of reputable, registered independent schools to exist is protected by the Constitution, and the payment of subsidies to them is not precluded."*

The subsidy levels of independent schools are related to the current provincial fee levels on a five-point progressive scale. Eligible schools charging the lowest fees qualify for the highest level of subsidy, while schools charging the highest fees (in excess of 2.5 times the provincial average cost per learner in an ordinary public school), are considered to serve a highly affluent

clientele, and no subsidy is paid from public funds. The Ministry of Basic Education, may after due consultation, amend or revise these norms.

Before funding is approved, each independent school (as a juristic person) will have to meet the conditions of eligibility as stipulated by the provincial department. It must include indicators of sound management, proper admissions, attendance registers and an ability to manage public funds effectively.

Establishing teaching schools for the purpose of teacher education linked to universities, and declaring them as independent, state-aided schools as determined by Section 14 of the South African Schools Act seems to be a viable option, with some constraints and challenges that can be overcome, and without major changes to existing legislation.

Implications of this model for the establishment of teaching schools

- a) The independent model implies that teaching schools become “contract schools”, meaning that the higher education institution will not only register the teaching school as an independent school under its “ownership”, but also enter into an agreement with the provincial department of education.
- b) We contend, that although “independent”, these schools should be required to follow the public school curriculum (with the leeway to experiment with curriculum). The majority of student teachers will be employed by public schools and should therefore be familiar with the public school curriculum.
- c) Freed from bureaucratic requirements and processes, the model allows teaching schools to become teaching laboratories characterised by exemplary schooling practices needed for good teacher education.
- d) An appropriate school governance model/structure will have to be established, personifying the juristic personality of the school.
- e) The appointment of “fit for purpose” teachers at the school becomes the responsibility of the “owner”. This enables the school governance structure to appoint

relevantly qualified expert teachers and the conditions of service of teaching schools teachers will include both their teaching and mentoring roles.

- f) The national norms for subsidising independent schools in accordance with the criteria linked to eligibility, conditions and any other matter (5 s50 (1) (c –d)), which must or may be prescribed in terms of the Act opens up an avenue for the Department of Basic Education to allocate a higher subsidy to teaching schools to enable them to fulfil their teacher education mandate in addition to their schooling mandate.
- g) The issue of transferring the buildings and infra-structure of existing public schools to the “owners” (HEIs) can easily be resolved – the transfer of property and staff to the School Boards of the ex-Model C Schools is an example of such a process.
- h) The transfer of staff from a public school to a private or independent school, with its own conditions of service and remuneration package, will be the most difficult aspect of this model (that is, if an existing public school is transformed to a teaching school).

Teaching schools will be more expensive than ordinary independent schools. In addition to normal education-related needs of schools, teaching schools will require appropriate infrastructure and a favourable learner-teacher ratio to enable teachers to fulfil their mentoring roles along with their teaching roles. Furthermore, a special salary dispensation will have to be implemented for this model. Teachers in these schools must not only be exemplary expert teachers, but they take up the additional role of student teacher mentor, thus a dual role. We are also of the view that teaching schools should be low fee schools so as to be accessible to children from the surrounding community and/or children from disadvantaged communities. Teaching schools should not become elitist schools that can be afforded by affluent parents only.

The discussion of this model so far signals that teaching schools will have to be subsidised at a level substantially higher than low fee independent schools. Alternatively, teaching schools could be subsidised similarly to low fee independent schools, supplemented by a ring-fenced grant to higher education institutions similar to the funding provided to higher education institutions involved in health care training linked to teaching hospitals and health care clinics (clinical grant).

We are of the view that the independent school model could be implemented without much difficulty, after a process of consultation within the ranks of the Council of Education Ministers and the Financial and Fiscal Commission, in concurrence with the Minister of Finance as well as with teacher education institutions.

Model 4: Teaching schools as institutions of the Department of Basic Education

Teacher education is a national and not a provincial responsibility. Teaching schools will be associated with higher education institutions offering teacher education. Consequently, a model to provide for teaching schools as a school type that functions at the national level of governance and administration under the jurisdiction of the Department of Basic Education could be considered. This implies that teaching schools will then become a separated school dispensation regulated and centrally administered by this department.

Such an arrangement should be in accordance with the National Education Policy Act 27 of 1996 (NEPA), subject to the provisions of Act 100 of 1997 (s. 11(a) and Act 48 of 1997 (s. 4)). The NEPA stipulates that subject to the provisions of subsections (1) to (3), the responsible Minister (Department of Basic Education) shall determine national policy for the planning, provision, financing, co-ordination, management, governance, programmes, monitoring, evaluation and well-being of the education system in accordance with sub-section: *(g) the organisation, management, governance, funding, establishment and registration of education institutions ((Sub-s. (4) Amended by s. 11(b) of Act 100 of 1997.)*

The Council of Education Ministers (CEM)

It is noted that any contemplated policy changes in respect of education in schools shall be determined by the relevant Minister after consultation with the Council of Education Ministers, as well as all parties in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) established by Section 40 of the Labour Relations Act, 1995 (Act 68 of 1995). Such a matter shall then be introduced in Parliament, or in the case of regulations, published in the Government Gazette.

The interpretation, scope and administration of such a policy should be clearly defined. The Minister must, in consultation with the Council of Education Ministers and other consultative bodies (all the parties in the ELRC established by section 6 of the Education Labour Relations Act (Act 146 of 1993)), establish a special education policy dispensation for teaching schools linked to teacher education institutions in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and with due consideration to, and compliance with, ss. 1-3 of the NEPA.

Funding and financial administration

The funding model for teaching schools has to be in line with the Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999) to ensure transparency, accountability and sound management of revenue, expenditure, assets and liabilities. A higher education institution is listed as a constitutional institution in Schedule 1 of the Act and the legal framework delineated in the Act relating to public entities. Strategic prioritisation (such as teaching schools linked to teacher education institutions) and re-prioritisation of medium-term baseline allocations over the strategic period of three years will have to be encapsulated into the budget process.

The same type of funding could be provided to teaching schools as the ring-fenced funding provided to the higher education institutions linked to teaching hospitals or health care training clinics for training of health care practitioners (clinical grants). This would imply that the Department of Basic Education provides basic funding for the schools, similar to the funding applicable to public schools. In addition, a suitable ring-fenced amount is made available to the higher education institution to fund the teaching school component, e.g. for additional remuneration of teachers and the costing of teacher development. This type of funding will be managed in accordance with the Public Finance Management Act mentioned above. The budget will have to be presented to the Department of Basic Education (in collaboration with the Department of Higher Education and Training) in either line-item format or programme-output presentation. The latter will be more useful to the teacher education institutions and the Department of Basic Education, as it will indicate the extent to which the allocation of resources actually reflects teacher education priorities in relation to planning and execution.

We are of the view that this is a viable model for teaching schools. However, the promulgation of a new legal dispensation for the establishment of teaching schools, together with the related development of a new regulatory framework and provisioning at a national basis, overseen by the Department of Basic Education, maybe a long and tedious process.

Conclusion: the viability of the proposed models

The conclusion we draw from the analysis and the conceptualisation of the four models is that, pragmatically speaking, one model is currently more feasible than the others. Although Models 1 and 2 can accommodate the establishment of teaching schools, we argue that neither of these two models are appropriate for the optimum organisation, governance and funding of teaching schools in South Africa, as contemplated in the Framework.

Gravett, Petersen and Petker (2014) report on some of the major stumbling blocks related to an ordinary public school functioning as a teaching school. The challenge of the school not having *special status* is raised as follows by a UJ staff member who was instrumental in drawing up the memorandum of agreement with the provincial department of education:

... it has been the source of many tensions since the school's establishment and has required extensive negotiation and co-operation from university management, teaching school staff and the local education department structures to enable the school to remain focused on its educative obligations while developing its capacity to fulfil its role as a teaching school (S114).

Another challenge they mention is the lack of sufficient leeway to appoint teachers who fit the profile needed for their teaching school responsibilities and the inability of the university to intervene if teachers do not fulfil their roles as mentors adequately. Gravett et al (2014) also highlight the fact that teaching school staff as employees of the provincial department of education feel obliged to adhere to the rules, regulations and reporting requirements of the

department first and foremost, regardless of what the needs of the school as a teacher education site may require. Despite a memorandum of agreement, providing for latitude regarding some operational matters and experimentation with the curriculum, teaching school staff often felt “caught between University of Johannesburg on the one hand and Gauteng Department of Education on the other” (S114). A teacher observed:

We serve two masters: University of Johannesburg and the Gauteng Department of Education and we sometimes do not know who to respond to, but because the Gauteng Department of Education is our employer we always have to listen to them (S114).

Typical public school timetabling, not allowing for timeslots during the school day for teachers to interact with student teachers, also proved to be an obstacle. Teaching school staff express frustration at the “constraints in timetabling which prevents us from meeting with the students to talk about their observations and teaching”. Gravett et al (2014: S114) argue that mentoring requires “time ‘in the moment’ after a lesson or teaching and learning episode to engage with students about what they have observed or address questions students may have”.

These authors are positive that teaching schools do have the potential to add considerable value to teacher education. However, integrating a teaching school into a teacher education programme is complex and multi-dimensional. They maintain that affording special status to teaching schools would be a precondition for success of these schools. They conclude that the special status of teaching schools should be such as to enable close collaboration between the teacher education institution and the school with regard to school governance and teaching and mentoring practices in the school.

Though the school in Soweto is a public school, it was a new school, founded as a teaching school on the university campus. It began with two Grade R-classes only, which allowed for gradual development of the school. Thus, despite the challenges highlighted by Gravett et al

(2014), the Faculty of Education's sphere of influence in developing the school has been substantial. On the other hand, our experience in converting an existing school in Siyabuswa into a teaching school has been a completely different experience. There have been many complications in working with an established public school within the current legal/policy framework. It is also very hard to work in an environment that is strongly unionised. Despite a memorandum of agreement with and goodwill from the provincial department of education and the school management team, our sphere of influence as teacher education institution has been limited, which has hampered progress. We have no bona fide power to influence the management and teaching practices in the school. We can support and advise, but we cannot direct. Though teachers in the school may not be modelling "best practice" to student teachers, we cannot oblige them to participate in development programmes and to change their practice. In addition, the teachers cannot be obliged to take up additional responsibilities required of teaching school teachers and we cannot intervene if they do not execute tasks associated with the teaching school teacher role.

Our experience has also taught us that a teaching school system will not be viable in the long run without a sound financial model supporting it. For example, the University of Johannesburg Faculty of Education had to raise substantial donor funding to support the stipends that are paid to the teaching school teachers and to fund the development of the teachers in the schools in Soweto and Siyabuswa. This is not sustainable. We maintain that universities will not support the integration of these schools into teacher education without the assurance that the schools will be funded adequately.

We regard both the independent school model and the model providing for teaching schools as a school type at national level of educational governance as viable. However, the latter model may be too technical in nature due to major legislative changes required and an act of parliament to be promulgated to provide for a special education dispensation, not provided for by the South African Schools Act.

We would argue that the independent (private) school model is appropriate for establishing teaching schools within the current legislative framework and that it is, furthermore, viable within a short time-frame. This model has the advantage of minimal legislative adjustments and it fits the current legislative framework best. The current legislative framework for independent schools allows enough flexibility for the establishment and governance of teaching schools. The challenges are mainly technical and are related to a feasible and an appropriate funding model to ensure long term viability of teaching schools.

This article presented different options that could be considered for a governance, management and financial model for teaching schools in South Africa. We argued that an appropriate model would enable close collaboration between the higher education institution and the school as equal partners with regard to school governance and teaching and mentoring practices in the school. The model should also allow for the appointment of “fit for purpose” teachers and should be financially viable. We recommend two models as meeting these requirements best: a model that provides for teaching schools as a school type at national level and the independent school model. The latter model has the advantage of minimal legislative adjustments and it could be implemented within a short timeframe.

REFERENCES

Abedian I., Strachan.B & Ajam T. 2001. Transformation in action: Budgeting for health service delivery. University of Cape Town Press.

Curro-Holdings, Spark Schools and Nova Schools.

<https://www.curro.co.za/home/parent/aurora-fees.aspx>; <https://za.news.yahoo.com/low-fee-private-schools-increase-sa-062400063.html>.

Department of Education and Culture. 1999. Notice regarding the registration and payment of subsidies to independent schools. Notice No 287 Of 1999, 28 October 1999: Kwazulu-Natal Department of Education and Culture.

Davies, E.H. 1999. Administration of the education system and school governance. Interuniversity Center for Education law and Educator Policy (CELP). Pretoria. Paarl Print.

Federation of Governing Bodies of South African Schools (FEDSAS). 2011. School's law and governance. Juta & Co Ltd. Western Cape. Rustica press.

Gravett, S., Petersen, N. & Petker, G. 2014. Integrating foundation phase teacher education with a "teaching school" at the University of Johannesburg. *Education as Change*, 18:sup1, S107-S119.

Gravett, S. 2012. Crossing the "theory-practice divide": Learning to be(come) a teacher. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*. 2(2), 1-14.

Hofmeyer J. & Lee S. 1999. The new face of private schooling. <https://www.hsrcpress.ac.za/downloadpdf.php?file=files/PDF/1937/.html>

Joubert, R. and Bray, E. Eds. 2007. Public school governance in South Africa. Interuniversity Center for Education law and Educator Policy (CELP). Pretoria. Paarl Print.

Juta & Co, Ltd. 2003. Education law and policy handbook. The national laws, policies, codes and agreements relating to school governance and employment of educators in South Africa. Compiled for the Education Labour Relations Council. Juta & Co Ltd. Western Cape. Rustica press.

Kansanen, P. 2014. Level Profession in Finland: Theoretical Reflections and Practical Solutions. In O McNamara, Murray, J., & Jones, M. (Eds). *Workplace Learning in Teacher Education. International Practice and Policy*. Springer, New York.

Maandag, D.W., Deinum J.F., Hofman, W.H. & Buitink, J. 2007. *Teacher education in schools: an international comparison*. European Journal of Teacher Education, 3 (2), pp. 151-173.

Muller M. 2006. Healthcare Service Management. Cape Town: Juta & Co Ltd.

Niemi, H. & Jakku-Sihoven, R. 2011. Teacher education in Finland. In M.W. Zuljan, & Vogrinc, J. (Eds), *European dimensions of teacher education – similarities and differences*. Ljubljana: The National Education Institute and Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana. 338 p., ISBN 978-961-253-058-7, pp. 33-51).

Raiker A. 2011. Finnish University Training Schools: principles and pedagogy. University of Bedfordshire. United Kingdom.

Sahlberg P. 2012. The most wanted. Teachers and teacher education in Finland. In L. Darling-Hammond, & Lieberman, A. Eds. *Teacher Education around the world. Changing policies and practices*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon. Pages 1-21.

South Africa. 1996. The Constitution of South Africa. 1996. Pretoria. Government printers.

South Africa. 1996. The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996. The Schools Act. Pretoria. Government printers.

South Africa. 1996. The National Education Policy Act 27 of 1996. Pretoria. Government printers.

South Africa. 1998. Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998.

SECTION 3: ESTABLISHING AN APPROPRIATE GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT MODEL FOR TEACHING SCHOOLS IN SOUTH AFRICA

1. PREAMBLE

This section of the report proposes a systemic model for the organisation, governance and funding of teaching schools (TSs) in South Africa, as envisaged in the *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025*. To achieve this, the researchers recognise that schools and school governance structures operate within a specific legal framework and in terms of national and departmental policies. The establishment of TSs therefore requires an investigation into the legal imperatives and organisational demands in the public school sector, as well as the way TSs would impact on the higher education sector.

The research aim of developing a systemic model was achieved through an in-depth survey and analysis of the relevant laws and regulations as well as other related materials that govern schools in South Africa. Various interviews were also conducted, including with the Federation of Governing Bodies of South African Schools (FEDSAS); members of the Interuniversity Centre for Education Law and Education policy (CELP) and individuals in the Department of Higher Education and Training as well as the Department for Basic Education; Gauteng Department of Education and the Mpumalanga Department of Education.

Various governance models for TSs are presented and possible risks and challenges associated with each as well as the advantages and disadvantages to be considered in each case are discussed.

2. NATIONAL LAWS, POLICIES AND CODES RELATING TO SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND EMPLOYMENT OF EDUCATORS IN SOUTH AFRICA

In order to develop an appropriate governance and management model for TSs in South Africa, within a national policy framework which will serve the purpose and interests of all stakeholders involved, the following Acts need to be considered:

2.1 The South African Schools Act 84 Of 1996 (The Schools Act – Assented to: 6 November 1996)

As amended by:

Education Laws Amendment Act 100 of 1997

Education Laws Amendment Act 48 of 1999

Education Laws Amendment Act 53 of 2000

Education Laws Amendment Act 57 of 2001

Education Laws Amendment Act 50 of 2002

Education Laws Amendment Act 1 of 2004

Education Laws Amendment Act 24 of 2005

Education Laws Amendment Act 31 of 2007

Basic Education Laws Amendment Act 15 of 2011

Purpose of the Act: To provide for a uniform system for the organisation, governance and funding of schools; to amend and repeal certain laws relating to schools; and to provide for matters connected therewith.

2.2 The National Education Policy Act 27 of 1996 (Assented to: 16 April 1996)

As amended by:

Education Laws Amendment Act 100 of 1997

Education Laws Amendment Act 48 of 1999

Education Laws Amendment Act 31 of 2007

Basic Education Laws Amendment Act 15 of 2011

Purpose of the Act: To provide for the determination of national policy for education; to amend the National Policy for General Education Affairs Act 1984, so as to substitute certain definitions; to provide afresh for the determination of policy on salaries and conditions of employment of educators and to provide for matters connected therewith.

2.3 Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998 (Assented To: 30 September 1998)

As amended by:

Education Laws Amendment Act 48 of 1996

South African Council for Educators Act 31 of 2000

Education Laws Amendment Act 53 of 2000

Education Laws Amendment Act 57 of 2001

Education Laws Amendment Act 50 of 2002

Education Laws Amendment Act 1 of 2004

Education Laws Amendment Act 1 of 2004

Education Laws Amendment Act 24 of 2005

Further Education and Training Colleges Act 16 of 2006

Basic Education Laws Amendment Act 15 of 2011

Purpose of the Act: To provide for the employment of educators by the state, for the regulation of the conditions of service, discipline, retirement and discharge of educators, and for matters connected therewith as well as regulations and related materials and policies in terms of the Acts mentioned above.

The development of an appropriate governance and management model for TSs will, in accordance with the current legislative education framework or by establishing a new national policy framework, provide a teacher education system linked to higher or teacher education institutions (HEIs/TEIs), that will provide teacher education of progressively higher quality which will contribute to the well-being of the education community and uphold the rights of all involved.

Whereas it is necessary to set uniform norms and standards for teaching schools, once these are implemented, the governance and management model recommended in this document will require the acceptance of all stakeholders and related organs of State.

3. THE STATUS OF TEACHING SCHOOLS WITHIN THE CURRENT LEGAL CONTEXT FOR EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

A teaching school (TS) is understood to be a public school linked to a HEI/TEI, with the brief to assist with teacher education and with education-related research programmes. In this document the legal framework within which public schools function as well as the question of how the proposed TSs may fit into this framework will be discussed.

3.1 The South African Schools Act 84 of 1996

The Act sets out the legal framework for both public and independent schools in South Africa. Whenever the term “school” is used in this document, it refers to a public school.

Some of the important principles laid down in the Schools Act are as follows:

- There is a distinction between governance and professional management
- Different entities are assigned responsibilities for governance and professional management

- The Schools Act acknowledges the fundamental interest of parents in the education of their children by affording them majority representation in public school governing bodies.

In terms of the provisions of section 15 of the Schools Act, each public school is a juristic person. “Juristic person” is a concept recognized by law as the subject of rights and duties, to give to bodies/societal ties the same or similar legal powers or competencies as those ascribed to natural/adult persons.

The legal powers include powers such as:

- a) Owning assets, or incurring liabilities
- b) Concluding contracts
- c) Suing, or being sued

In the case of public schools, the governing body is the organ acting on behalf of the juristic person. Public schools are juristic persons created by legislation, i.e. creatures of statute. This means that this particular juristic person’s capacity to act as a legal entity is limited to those rights, functions and obligations set out in the statute creating it (Schools Act). Sections 15 and 16(1) limit the powers of schools and their organs (governing bodies) to those functions authorised by the Schools Act itself.

In terms of the Schools Act⁶, there are three different types of public schools, namely:

- Ordinary public schools
- Public schools for learners with special education needs, and
- Public schools that provide education with a specialised focus on talent, including sport, performing arts or creative arts.

⁶ Section 12(3).

The above distinction is important as it is closely related to the establishment of TSs, as proposed in *The Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025*. This Framework defines TSs as “teaching laboratories”, where student teachers may engage in learning-from-practice, such as by observing best practice, participating in micro-teaching exercises and taking subject methodology courses. It immediately becomes clear that certain provisions of the SASA (Act 84 of 1996) relating to school management and governance require closer consideration.

3.1.1 Governance of public schools

In terms of section 16(1) of the Schools Act, the governance of each public school vests in its governing body. Although the concept of “governance” may indicate mere policy-making functions, the Schools Act states explicitly that the governing body is no mere policy-making body. The governing body is indeed afforded policy-making functions, but the Schools Act contains several provisions that could under normal circumstances be referred to as management functions. These include aspects such as administration and control of property, opening and maintaining a bank account, purchasing equipment and learning materials, etc. In essence, the governing body of a public school therefore has original functions related to the overall oversight, governance and management of the school.

Other functions that the Schools Act assigns to a governing body include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a) Determining the admission policy of a school
- b) Determining the language policy of a school
- c) Adopting a code of conduct
- d) Recommending to the Head of Department, educators and non-educators for appointment

- e) Establishing posts and the employment of educators and non-educators additional to the establishment determined by the Members of the Executive Council.

In terms of section 30 of the Schools Act, a governing body may establish committees and appoint persons who are not members of the governing body to such committees on grounds of expertise, as long as a member of the governing body chairs the committee.

The following sections of the Act should be noted:

- section 20(1)(a) of the Schools Act, which states that the governing body of a school must promote the best interest of the school and strive to ensure its development through the provision of quality education for all learners at the school, and together with this,
- section 36(1), which states that a governing body must take all reasonable measures within its means to supplement the resources provided by the state in order to improve the quality of the education provided by the school to all learners at the school.

3.1.2 The status of public schools as a juristic person

A “juristic person” is a concept recognized by law as the subject of rights and duties, to give to bodies/societal ties the same or similar legal powers or competencies as those ascribed to natural/adult persons.

The legal powers include powers such as:

- a) Owning assets, or incurring liabilities
- b) Concluding contracts
- c) Suing, or being sued

Public schools are juristic persons created by legislation, i.e. creatures of statute. This means that this particular juristic person’s capacity to act as a legal entity is limited to those rights,

functions and obligations set out in the statute creating it (Schools Act). Sections 15 and 16(1) limit the powers of schools and their governing bodies to those functions authorised by the Schools Act itself.

It should be noted that a juristic person cannot function or exist within another juristic person such as a higher education institution. This aspect is important and needs to be considered when public schools are linked to HEIs/TEIs for the purposes of teacher education. A teaching school registered as a public school should function within the current policy framework as contemplated in section 12(3) of the Schools Act. This implies that the School Governing Body (SGB) is responsible for the governance of the school in accordance with the functions, obligations and rights as prescribed by the Act, and not by the provincial Head of Department (HoD), subject to the allocation of functions to the SGB by the HoD, in accordance with the provisions of section 21 of the Schools Act. The HoD has no authority to prescribe or delegate functions to any governing body, other than those provided for in section 21. This also means that the SGB develops its constitution, the code of conduct for learners, the admission policy, language, religious observance and all other policies of the school. This development does not take place in consultation with the provincial education department (PED) and/or the HEI/TEI unless provided for as such in legislation.

Exceptions are those functions referred to in section 21 of the Schools Act that may indeed be allocated by the PED. With regard to the section 21 functions, the SGBs of TSs may perform these functions if allocated to them in terms of section 21 of the Schools Act.

3.1.3 Public schools on private property

In the case of a school being situated on private property, section 14 of the Schools Act determines that a public school may only be provided for on private property in terms of an agreement between the Members of the Executive Council (MEC) and the owner of the private property, in this case the HEI/TEI. This agreement must be consistent with the Schools Act, and must provide for the following:

- (a) The provision of education and the performance of the normal functions of a public school
- (b) Governance of the school, including the relationship between the governing body of the school and the owner
- (c) Access to the property on which the school stands by all interested parties
- (d) Security of occupation and use of the property by the school
- (e) Maintenance and improvement of the school buildings and the property on which the school stands and the supply of necessary services
- (f) Protection of the owner's rights in respect of the property occupied, affected or used by the school.

As mentioned, the content of the agreement must be consistent with the Act, which implies that the governing body will have the same powers, functions and rights as a public school not situated on private property.

3.1.4 School funding and financial management

The *National Norms and Standards for School Funding for Ordinary Public Schools* states clearly that a school may carry out its own procurement and may deal directly with suppliers and contractors for the relevant budgeted items in accordance with standard procurement procedures; the financial directions issued in terms of section 37 of the Schools Act, and paragraph 116 of the Norms and Standards. The SGB may, however, take advice from other stakeholders such as the principal, educators or sponsoring body, which could be an HEI/TEI.

In the case of a public school for learners with special education needs or a public school for learners with a “focused talent”, procurement will take place in accordance with section 37

of the Schools Act and standard procurement procedures, as no norms and standards have been promulgated for these schools.

In the context described, a TS can currently only function as an ordinary public school, a public school for learners with special education needs, or a school with a specialised focus. The governance and management of the school will be determined by the normal legal framework provided for in the Schools Act.

In the case of a public school for learners with special education needs or a public school for learners with a “focused talent”, procurement will take place in accordance with section 37 of the Schools Act and standard procurement procedures, as no norms and standards have been promulgated for these schools.

3.2 Application of the Act

Chapter 2(2) of the Act state that the Member of the Executive Council (MEC) and the HoD must exercise any power conferred upon them by or under the Act, after taking full account of the applicable policy as stated in the National Education Policy Act (Act 27 of 1996).

4. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT MODELS FOR A TEACHING SCHOOL WITHIN THE CURRENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK

An appropriate governance and management model for TSs as defined by the *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025* will be contemplated, considering the current legal and policy frameworks as discussed.

It is especially important to note that there is no provision made for the term “teaching school” as a school type in the existing legislative framework. However, there are a few options available under the SASA (Act 84 of 1996), which will be discussed below.

4.1 Model 1: A public school with a teaching school project

The approach adopted in Model 1 is that a TS becomes a so-called “project school”, which means that a TS will be a public school with a “teaching school project for teacher education” and named accordingly, for example: Teaching “*School X – Teaching School Project*”. The project will be implemented in the public school within the governance of the school as set out above. The SGB should then negotiate and conclude a formal agreement with an HEI/TEI, to which the provincial department may either be a party or may be informed of the project.

This agreement must contain detail regarding the following aspects:

- a) The financial contribution on behalf of the HEI, or by the HEI
- b) The governance of the school as well as the purpose and nature of the project
- c) The duration of the agreement
- d) The parties involved
- e) Subsidiary projects and logistics
- f) Ownership of movable property provided to the school by the HEI.

All of the provisions as set out in the agreement must be consistent with the constitution of the school as well as the Schools Act. The Schools Act does not make provision for a deviation from the provisions of section 23, regarding the composition of the SGB of an ordinary public school. There is therefore no way in which representatives of the HEI/TEI (or the Department of Basic Education) may be elected or appointed to the SGB as members with voting rights. Such representatives may be co-opted onto the SGB, but without voting rights. This differs from public schools for learners with special needs where representation of members of the

“sponsoring body” (Section 24(e) of the SASA) may be allowed, subject to notice by the Member of the Executive Council (MEC) and by notice in the Provincial Gazette. The MEC will determine the number of representatives (section 24(2)).

In terms of section 18 of the Schools Act, the SGB of a school must adopt a constitution. Such a constitution may make provision for co-opting representatives of expertise (in this case, the HEI/TEI). However, the constitution may not confer voting powers on such co-opted members. The aspects discussed below are important when considering this option.

4.1.1 Governance

Section 30 of the Schools Act makes provision for the establishment of committees of the governing body. These committees are established to assist the governing body as a whole, to perform its duties. Section 30(1)(b) states that persons who are not members of the governing body may be appointed to such a committee on grounds of expertise, but a member of the SGB must chair the committee. If this option is followed, it will be advisable for the SGB to establish a sub-committee for the teaching school project. A representative or representatives of the HEI/TEI must be appointed to this committee. The committee will decide on issues such as the governance of assets, the management of assets, the recommendation and appointment of teachers, and the appropriate training schedule. As a matter of law and good practice, decisions of the committee will be subject to proper oversight by the SGB.

4.1.2 Appointment of teachers

Section 6(3)(a) of the Employment of Educators Act⁷ determines that any appointment, promotion or transfer to any post on the educator establishment of a public school may only be made on the recommendation of the governing body of the public school. Therefore, most

⁷ Act 76 of 1998.

of the teachers at the school are appointed on recommendation of the SGB.⁸ A teacher who actively participates in the student education programme at the TS on behalf of the HEI/TEI needs to obtain permission from the provincial HoD if he/she is employed by the Department of Education of Basic Education.⁹ The SGB must also obtain permission from the HoD to remunerate a state employee for additional work performed by such an employee. Such application for permission must be done in terms of section 38A of the Schools Act. The HEI/TEI may not appoint additional teachers. However, the SGB may, in terms of section 20(4), do so. If the HEI/TEI identifies a need for additional educators, it may approach the SGB in this regard.

Student teachers involved in the school may not be in control of a class on their own. In terms of the South African Council of Educators Act¹⁰, only a person registered at the Council may be appointed as a teacher and be in control of a class. A student may, however, be registered provisionally with SACE, provided that he/she will meet all the requirements for registration within a reasonable time.

4.1.3 Professional management of the school

In terms of the Personnel Administration Measures (PAM),¹¹ the school principal is responsible for the professional management of a public school.¹² The role of the principal is limited to the management of that for which the professionals (teachers) are responsible, which entails primarily curricular matters. The main task of the teachers is to take care of the process of learning and teaching at the school. That is what they were trained for. “Professional management” therefore simply means “the management of classroom

⁸ The only two exceptions are when a new school is established. In such a case the HOD will either make an appointment, transfer or promotion in terms of section 6(3)(m) or may, without recommendation, transfer an educator temporarily for a stated period in terms of section 8(5). Such an educator will however return to his/her post at the end of the period.

⁹ See section 33 of the Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998, which determines that no educator shall without permission of the employer perform, or undertake to perform, remunerative work outside the educator’s official duty.

¹⁰ Act 31 of 2000.

¹¹ G.N. 222 of 1999 published in *Government Gazette* No. 19767 dated 18 Feb 1999.

¹² See also section 16(3) of the Schools Act.

instruction". The PAM further determines that the principal is responsible for the following managerial tasks¹³:

- (a) Provide professional leadership within the school
- (b) Guide, supervise and offer professional advice on the work and performance of all staff in the school and, where necessary, discuss and write or countersign reports on teaching, support, non-teaching and other staff
- (c) Ensure that workloads are equitably distributed among the staff
- (d) Be responsible for the development of school-based, school-focused and externally directed staff training programmes, and assist teachers, particularly new and inexperienced teachers, to develop and achieve educational objectives in accordance with the needs of the school.

It is important to note that the school principal is therefore "in charge" of all the personnel at the school, including the student teachers involved in the project. The SGB may appoint a "project manager" to oversee the teachers who train the students and to manage the related logistics. Such a project manager may either be a teacher or a delegate from the HEI/TEI, funded by the HEI/TEI. The "project manager" must report back to the teaching project committee, and ultimately to the SGB. The SGB remains responsible for determining the extra-mural curriculum of the school and the choice of subject options, provided that the SGB has been allocated this function in terms of section 21(1)(b). The SGB must however discuss this with the HEI/TEI as a partner in terms of the agreement envisaged above or in terms of conditions that the HoD may have imposed on the SGB at the time of allocation of this function, as discussed previously.

4.1.4 Infrastructure management

All the movable assets of the school belong to the school.¹⁴

¹³ Chapter A 4.2(e)(ii).

¹⁴ See sections 37(5) and 52(3) of the Schools Act.

- Section 20(1)(g) of the Schools Act clearly states that the governing body controls and administers the school's property, which includes movable assets. The HEI/TEI uses the school's property for the project, and this must be to the benefit of the school.
- If the HEI/TEI leases classrooms for the purpose of training, the approval of the MEC, as contemplated in section 36(4)(a)(i), needs to be obtained.
- If the HEI/TEI provides items such as projectors and screens acquired for student training, the SGB, by means of the committee referred to in (a) above and the HEI/TEI must decide on the ownership of such movable assets.
- The question that arises is whether the above assets may be seen as donations or whether ownership of these assets would revert to the HEI/TEI once the project comes to an end. If the items remain the property of the HEI/TEI, the institution must appoint a person to be in control of the property, preferably the project manager or an educator involved in the project.

Consideration must also be given to the provisions of section 37(4) in terms of which the governing body of a public school is obliged to adhere to the conditions under which property may be donated to the school. This provision recognises the fact that the HEI/TEI may indeed impose conditions on property made available to the school, such as that the property must be returned to the HEI/TEI at the end of a specified period or the end of the project, that the school shall not become owner of the property despite being in possession thereof, etc.

4.1.5 Financial management

Section 37(1) of the Schools Act states that the governing body of a school may open and maintain only one banking account. If a school should receive money from an HEI/TEI for the teaching school project, the school will still have only one banking account and the monies received from the HEI/TEI for the project will have to be reflected as such. A separate ledger account may be kept for such payments received from the HEI, and for expenditure incurred for that particular purpose. The SGB and the HEI/TEI must have a clear agreement regarding the funding of the project. The TS project must not place an additional burden, financial or other, on the parents of the school. The TS project committee must prepare a budget for the

project, which must eventually be included in the overall budget of the school for approval by parents, as envisaged in Sections 38 and 39 of the Schools Act.

4.1.6 Liability

Section 60 of the Schools Act states as follows:

“(1) (a) Subject to paragraph (b), the State is liable for any delictual or contractual damage or loss caused as a result of any act or omission in connection with any school activity conducted by a public school, and for which such public school would have been liable but for the provisions of this section.

(Para. (A) substituted by s. 14 of Act 15 of 2011).

(b) Where a public school has taken out insurance and the school activity is an eventuality covered by the insurance policy, the liability of the State is limited to the extent that the damage or loss has not been compensated in terms of the policy.”

The TS project will qualify as an educational activity and will fall under the protection of section 60. The parties must however come to an agreement regarding the insurance of the moveable assets. The owner must insure the assets.

4.1.7 Reporting and disputes

The SGB and the HEI/TEI may for the sake of transparency and accountability agree on regular reporting on the progress of the project. This may be done quarterly, or as frequently as the parties may desire. This function would typically be undertaken by the TS project committee of the SGB, and may be specifically agreed on in the envisaged agreement between the SGB and the HEI.

Conflict resolution structures and mediation processes must also be provided for in the envisaged agreement in order to resolve potential conflicts between the SGB and the HEI, between supervisors and student teachers, and between a learner and a student teacher.

The SGB must act in the best interest of the school and the learners for the total duration of the “project” and the quality of the education provided by the school must never be compromised. The SGB and the HEI/TEI must work together as partners, be open and honest with each other and involve each other when making decisions regarding the teaching school project.

4.1.8 Implications

Governance

- a) Seeing that a different category of school has not been declared for teaching schools, the school is managed as an ordinary public school in which the SGB exercises its “original functions” in accordance with Act 16(1) as discussed in 2.2 of this document. The school is a juristic person, therefore any form of agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) must be contracted between the HEI/TEI and the SGB.
- b) Section 30 of the Schools Act allows the SGB of an ordinary public school to establish a committee structure for the SGB. This option allows the SGB to set up a TS project committee as a committee of the SGB. The Act requires that such a committee be chaired by a member of the SGB.
- c) Nothing prevents the HEI/TEI from appointing a project manager for student education practice and research, once the SGB has agreed to a “TS project”.
- d) Nothing prevents the SGB and HEI/TEI from establishing a joint advisory committee, with the understanding that such a committee is not a creature of statute.

School funding and financial management

- a) School funding and financial management should be conducted in accordance with section 37 of the Schools Act, and paragraph 116 of the Norms and Standards for school funding. Section 37(1) determines that a school may have only one bank account. If the

sponsoring body donates funds for the project, it must be included in the full budget and approved by the parents during the annual financial meeting.

- b) Additional remuneration for teachers involved in the project may be applied for under section 38A of the Act.

Curriculum

The functions of determining the curriculum and extra-mural activities are allocated to the SGB of a Section 21 school. These may not be executed as joint functions with the HEI. However, provision is made in section 21(3) whereby the PED may impose a condition to the allocation of a section 21 function, usually to the effect that the SGB should consult certain stakeholders (in this case the HEI/TEI).

4.1.9 Risk analysis

- a) Although Model 1 as proposed above, can certainly accommodate the concept of a TS linked to a HEI/TEI, this model poses certain challenges to participating HEIs/TEIs. These challenges are linked mainly to the existing school governance structures, appropriate funding, appropriate infra-structure and the ability to create an enabling environment conducive to teacher education in a TS.
- b) Voting rights are limited to the “TS project committee”, chaired by a member of the SGB.
- c) The post establishment ratio for an ordinary public school does not support an enabling environment for teacher education and research in the school.
- d) The HEI/TEI has no say or legal input as far as the quality of teachers involved in the project is concerned. This may put the project at risk, and may not serve the purpose articulated in the *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025*.
- e) If the school is dysfunctional and does not meet the infra-structure and resourcing standards required by the Act, it may result in reputational damage to the HEI/TEI and to the quality of teacher it produces.
- f) It will be difficult for the HEI/TEI to formally regulate the interaction between student teachers and school teachers as mentors, which would be a pre-requisite for a TS to be successfully involved in teacher education.

g) The main risk, however, emerges from the discussion in 3.2 of this document. As contemplated in 3.2, the *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025* defines teaching schools as spaces where student teachers may engage in learning-from-practice, such as by observing best practice, participating in micro-teaching exercises and taking subject methodology courses. This core requirement for a school to be regarded as a TS has to be introduced, organised, funded, managed and monitored by a sub-committee (“project committee”) of the SGB, while the HEI/TEI has very limited input regarding the effectiveness thereof.

As indicated above this model may be considered, but poses major challenges for the establishment of effective TSs. These challenges are linked mainly to the existing school governance structures, appropriate funding, appropriate infra-structure, and the ability to create an enabling environment conducive to teacher education in a TS. MG Repetition

4.2 Model 2: Declaring a different category (type) of school (an amendment to the South African schools act)

The second option is to request the Department of Basic Education (DBE) to amend the Schools Act (SASA) to make provision for TSs as a separate category, as envisaged in section 12(3) of the Schools Act. This would mean that the Minister of Basic Education would have to create a unique governance structure for TSs, with separate norms and standards for school funding. Currently the Act does not provide for such a school category. It seems imperative for this option that section 12(3) of the Act should be amended, with far-reaching implications.

As indicated above, the *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025* defines TSs as spaces where student teachers may engage in learning-from-practice, such as by observing best practice, participating in micro-teaching exercises and taking subject methodology courses. If school teachers are to be

expected to serve as teacher educators in TSs, it will have implications relating to the current conditions of service of such teaching staff.

4.2.1 Implications for conditions of service and the teacher-learner ratio

The establishment of public TSs for the purpose of teacher education requires interaction between student teachers and the HEIs/TEIs, as well as full involvement of classroom teachers in the school. This will require teachers to work with student teachers during and after school hours. They will also be required to make themselves available for developmental programmes conducted by the HEI/TEI in order for them to develop the capacity to function efficiently as teacher educators and as mentors of student teachers. These requirements have implications for the post establishment ratios and remuneration of teachers at TSs.

All teachers are employed subject to the provisions of the Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998.

(S. 2 amended by s. 58(3) of Act 16 of 2006 and substituted by s. 16 of Act 15 of 2011)

In accordance with the Act, the Minister of Basic Education shall determine the salaries and other conditions of service of educators. Different salaries and conditions of service may be determined in respect of different ranks and grades of educators; educators appointed at or outside educational institutions; or educators appointed in different sectors of education.

The implication is that if section 12(3) of the schools Act should indeed be amended to provide for a different category of school, additional remuneration could be considered by the relevant Minister of Basic Education. If section 12(3) is not amended Section 38A (2) of the Schools Act does make provision for the governing body to apply to the employer (PED) for approval to pay a state employee any payment contemplated in terms of the Employment of Educators Act (*Act 76 of 1998 or the Public Service Act, 1994 (Proclamation 103 of 1994)*).

It should be noted that declaring a different category of school cannot serve as a waiver to any of the stipulations contemplated by the Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996) in terms of the “original” functions of school governing bodies of public schools. These include:

- a) The recommendation of educators and non-educators to the Head of the Department for appointment
- b) The establishment of posts and the employment of educators and non-educators additional to the establishment determined by the MEC.

The Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998 (ss. 6A-7) deals with the appointment of educators and the filling of posts. Section 7(1) indicates that under this Act, due regard shall be given to equality, equity and the other democratic values and principles contemplated in section 159(1) of the Constitution. It should also be noted that, subject

to sections (4) and (5), no transfer to any post on the teacher post establishment of a school shall be made unless the recommendation of the governing body of the public school has been obtained.

(Sub-s. (2) amended by s. 16(a) of Act 48 of 1999 and substituted by s. 58 (3) of Act 16 of 2006).

This model requires of the Department of Basic Education to amend the Schools Act to make provision for a TS as a separate category of school, as defined in section 12(3) of the Schools Act. For this option, the Minister will have to declare a different governance structure for TSs with separate Norms and Standards.

This model does not differ much from the first model discussed above in terms of its structure, with the exception that the HEI/TEI as a “sponsoring body” will be afforded the same rights to representation on the SGB as those of sponsoring bodies for public schools for learners with special education needs or with a specialised focus.

4.2.3 Other implications

Implications for school governance

- a) As a different category of school is declared, the school is managed as a school with a special status.
- b) Although the composition of the SGB makes provision for representation by members of the sponsoring body, the SGB still exercises its “original functions”.
- c) Due to the nature of the school, the need for the governing body to establish a separate project committee falls away.
- d) As the school is a juristic person, any form of Agreement or MOU must be contracted between the HEI/TEI and the SGB, as is the case in Model 1.

Implications for school funding and financial management

- a) As in the case of a public school for learners with special education needs or a public school with a “focused talent”, the procurement will take place in accordance with section 37 of the Schools Act and standard procurement procedures, as no norms and standards have been promulgated for these schools.
- b) As indicated in Model 1, section 37(1) of the Schools Act states that a governing body of a school must open and maintain one banking account. The funding received from the HEI/TEI for the TS must be reflected as such. A separate ledger account may be kept for such payments received from the HEI/TEI or donors, as well as expenditure incurred for that particular purpose.

4.2.4 Risks

Both the above models make it difficult to create uniform national standards for the organisation, governance, funding and management of TSs. What is needed is a specific national policy or an amendment to current policy to ensure that the aims and objectives of the *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025* may be successfully implemented.

4.2.5 Conclusion

Although an amendment to section 12(3) of the Act creates an opportunity to declare a different category of school, with the possibility to apply for an appropriate post establishment, funding and staff remuneration structure, the HEIs/TEIs will still have only limited legal capacity to ensure effective teacher education at these schools. A major stumbling block is the lack of an appropriate systemic structure that would provide HEIs/TEIs with a mandate to ensure the appointment of a staff complement at TSs who may be mentors, researchers and role models. The so-called “fit for purpose” principle should apply, and teachers at the identified schools should be granted the opportunity to “opt out” if they so wish.

An option could be to strengthen the position of HEIs/ TEIs within a more appropriate management and governance structure. Unfortunately this cannot be done at provincial level, as any provincial legislature enacted by the Executive Member of Council (MEC) and a Head of Department (HoD) has to be in accordance with the Constitution and the South African Schools Act, taking full account of the applicable policy determined in terms of the National Education Policy Act, 1996 (Act 27 of 1996).

(Sub-s. (2). Added to by s. 1 of Act 50 of 2002 and sub-s. (3). Amended by s. 2 of Act 100 of 1997).

4.3. Model 3: The independent (private) school model

Kiteav (1999) in Hofmeyer and Lee¹⁵, define private schools as follows: “private schools includes all formal schools that are not public and may be founded, owned, managed and financed by actors other than the state, even in cases where the state provides most of the funding and considerable control over these schools”.

Hofmeyer and Lee further contend that by contrast, the current definition of private (also read: independent) schools in South Africa is more narrow and does not include certain types of non-public education, especially what is referred to as “public schools on private property”. Closer investigation reveals that there is a myriad of state-aided schools owned by religious bodies, farmers, mining and forestry, of which the vast majority used to be Catholic schools. Because they are state-aided, these schools are governed by Section 14 of the SASA.

4.3.1 Establishment and governance of independent schools

Chapter 5 (s 45) of the SASA indicates that: *Subject to the Act and any applicable provincial law, any person may, at his/her own cost, establish and maintain an independent school.* The registration of such schools can currently only be done by the Head of Department (at provincial level). The Act stipulates that the HoD must register an independent school once he/she is satisfied that:

- a) The standards to be maintained by such a school will not be inferior to the standards in comparable public schools
- b) The admission policy of the school does not discriminate on the grounds of race.

(5 S 47 ss (1) (a-c) and ss (2) deal with the conditions of withdrawal of registration).

Most provinces have developed a regulatory framework to govern this sector more closely. The Manual for Independent Schools, compiled by the Department of Education and Culture (KwaZulu-Natal, 2006, as well as the Notice served by the MEC)¹⁶, serves as good examples of a typical provincial regulatory framework to establish, support and govern the independent school sector.

¹⁶ Notice No 287 of 1999, 28 October 1999: KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education and Culture. South African Schools Act, 1996 (Act No 84 of 1996). Notice regarding the registration and payment of subsidies to independent schools.

4.3.2 Subsidies to independent schools

According to Section 48 of the Act, the Minister of Basic Education may, by notice in the Government Gazette, determine norms and standards for the granting of subsidies to independent schools, after consultation with the Council of Education Ministers and the Financial and Fiscal Commission and with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance, and may out of the funds appropriated by the provincial legislature for that purpose, grant subsidy to an independent school. (*S 48 ss 1-2; ss 3-5 deal with the conditions for termination and the right of appeal against termination or reduction of subsidies*).

It should be noted that only non-profit independent schools receive state subsidies, and that these are never more than sixty percent of the equivalent cost of government schooling, even when the school is located in a disadvantaged and impoverished area. It is interesting to note that Section 50 (*S 50 ss(2)*) allows the Minister to determine different requirements in respect of different independent schools, as stipulated under 5 (*S 50 ss 1 a-b*).

Of specific interest is sub-section 1(c) relating to the criteria of eligibility, conditions and manner of payment of any subsidy to an independent school. The reason for this is that the Minister of Basic Education, in terms of the norms and standards for school funding, bases its subsidy policy for the independent school sector on fiscal arguments and social grounds. (*Section 35 of the South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996 and ss 3(4)(g) of the National Education Policy Act Notice 2362 of 1998. Notice 2362 of 1998 S (61 – 64)*).

Section 62 of Notice 2362, noted above, defines the fiscal argument in the Act as follows: “... *the right of reputable, registered independent schools to exist is protected by the Constitution, and the payment of subsidies to them is not precluded.*”

Section 62 concludes that such independent schools perform a service to their learners that would otherwise have to be performed by the provincial education departments. Public subsidies to such schools cost the state considerably less per learner than if the same learners enrolled in public schools. It is therefore cost-efficient for the state to provide a subsidy.

Allocation table for independent school subsidies¹⁷

Fee level	Subsidy level
1. Up to 0.5 times (50%) the provincial average public cost per learner in ordinary public schools during the previous fiscal year	Subsidy equal to 60% of the provincial average public cost per learner in ordinary public schools
2. Higher than 0.5 and up to 1.0 times the provincial average public cost per learner in ordinary public schools during the previous fiscal year	Subsidy equal to 40% of the provincial average public cost per learner in ordinary public schools
3. Higher than 1.0 and up to 1.5 times the provincial average public cost per learner in ordinary public schools during the previous fiscal year	Subsidy equal to 25% of the provincial average public cost per learner in ordinary public schools
4. Higher than 1.5 and up to 2.5 times the provincial average public cost per learner in ordinary public schools during the previous fiscal year	Subsidy equal to 15% of the provincial average public cost per learner in ordinary public schools
5. Higher than 2.5 times the provincial average public cost per learner in	No subsidy

¹⁷ Norms and standards for School Funding. Section 3(4)(g) of the National Education Policy Act of 1996.

ordinary public schools during the previous fiscal year	
---	--

Note: The Minister of Basic Education may after due consultation, amend or revise the above norms.

Before funding is approved, each independent school (as a juristic person) will have to meet the conditions of eligibility as stipulated by the provincial department. It must include indicators of sound management, proper admissions, attendance registers and an ability to manage public funds effectively. (Note: The juristic personality vests in the Board of Directors or other similar school governance structure.)

4.3.3 Implications of this model for the establishment of TSs

- a) Establishing TSs for the purpose of student teacher education linked to universities, as discussed in this document, and declaring them as independent, state-aided schools as determined by Section 14 of the SASA, seems to be a viable option, with some constraints and challenges that may be overcome, and without major changes to existing legislation.
- b) In the context of this document, the independent school (also read “private school”) model implies that TSs become “contract schools”, meaning that the HEI/TEI will not only register the TS as an independent school under its “ownership”, but also enter into an agreement with the provincial department of education.
- c) Although “independent”, these schools would be required to follow the public school curriculum. The aim of TSs is to produce teachers for this sector.
- d) Freed from the normal red tape and bureaucratic processes, the model allows HEIs to innovate and raise the standards for schooling to the extent that they become the

desired role model schools and teaching laboratories needed for good teacher education.

- e) A different school governance model will need to be established, where the HEI/TEI takes ownership of the school and the school will be governed by a Board of Directors or similar structure that will personify the juristic personality of the school.
- f) The appointment of “fit for purpose” teachers at the school becomes the responsibility of the “owner”, which enables the HEI/TEI (Board of Directors) to ensure relevantly qualified teachers who can also become student mentors.
- g) The national norms for subsidising independent schools in accordance with the criteria linked to eligibility, conditions and any other matter (5 s50 (1) (c –d), which must or may be prescribed in terms of the Act, opens an avenue for the DHET to negotiate an improved and generally acceptable subsidy formulae for HEIs who become “owners” of TSs within the public schooling domain.
- h) The subsidy formulae discussed above will probably be inadequate. A survey of the fees linked to a non-subsidised private school indicated that fees vary between R45 571.00 (Foundation Phase), R50 422.00 (Intermediate Phase) and R60 483.00 (Grade 10 -12), at the time of writing this report.
- i) It is important for the TS Board of Directors or governance structure to be democratically elected by the stakeholders who have a vested interest in teacher education, such as the HEI, the DHET and the DBE.

TSs as a type of independent school are likely to be more expensive than public schools, and should be subsidised at a 100% level (60% as indicated above, will be totally insufficient for these low fee independent schools). In order to ensure the continued existence of the Independent Model for TSs, a fee-structure should be established that is lower than those profit-making independent schools quoted above, but high enough to ensure that the purpose of teacher education in TSs is not compromised.

Teacher salaries remain the main challenge and a special salary dispensation will have to be implemented for this model. Research has indicated that high-quality and well-qualified teachers can absorb 85% to 90% of the budget. Linked to the budget and the consequent subsidy requirements will be the funding of infra-structure requirements, upgrading of existing schools and extension of existing facilities for education-related needs, such as early childhood development, skills training and education materials and services.

4.3.4 Risk Analysis

- a) The issue of transferring the buildings and infra-structure of existing schools to the “owners” (HEIs) can easily be resolved. The transfer of property and staff to the School Boards of the ex-Model C Schools is an example of such a process.
- b) The transfer of staff from a public school to a private or independent school, with its own conditions of service and remuneration package, will prove to be the most difficult aspect of this model.

This model could be implemented almost immediately, after a process of consultation within the ranks of the Council of Education Ministers and the Financial and Fiscal Commission, with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance.

4.3.5 Implementation the independent (private) school model.

PHASE	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBILITY
1	Present the outcome of the research and its recommendations to all government structures and the HEIs/TEIs.	DHET

2	Engage and consult with the HEDCOM about the practicalities and possible implementation of TSs as part of the independent schooling sector.	DHET; DBE
3	Engage the Council of Education Ministers and the Financial and Fiscal Commission, with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance, with regard to an enhanced and sector-specific subsidy dispensation.	DHET; DBE
4	Engage and consult with the ELRC regarding the transfer and/or redeployment of educators.	DBE
5	Engage with PDEs and Public Works on the transfer of existing schools to the independent TS owners or HEIs.	DBE
6	Engage with the SGBs of existing schools, including the local feeder community, and inform them of the conversion of the school to an independent TS, and of the implications thereof for the parents and the local community.	DBE; HEIs/TEIs
7	Facilitate the drafting and signing of uniform and formal agreements between HEIs and PDEs regarding registration, subsidy, support and maintenance. PDEs establish and formalise a sector-specific regulatory framework (Section 49 (1)).	DBE; PEDs; HEIs/TEIs
8	Register TSs as independent public schools.	DBE
9	The MECs formally announce the expansion of the independent school sector with the establishment of TSs linked to specific HEIs by notice in the Provincial Gazette, and declare them as public schools (Section 49 (1) (2)).	MECs; HoDs; HEIs; TEIs
10	The MEC grants the approved subsidy (as recommended during phase 2 above) to the owner (HEI).	MEC; HEIs/TEIs
11	Commence with the transfer of all resources, and elect a Board of Directors.	DBE; HEIs/TEIs

12	Draft a Constitution for the Board of Directors and clearly stipulate the Board's roles, responsibilities, accountability and reporting structures.	DBE; HEIs/TEIs; PEDs
----	---	----------------------

4.4 Model 4: Amending current legislation to provide for teaching schools at a national level by the department of basic education

Contemplating the restrictions posed by the Schools Act on HEIs, and with due regard to the application of the Act by the nine provincial departments, it may be necessary to consider determining applicable policy for TSs to be established on a national basis.

Such an arrangement should be in accordance with the National Education Policy Act 27 of 1996 (NEPA), subject to the provisions of Act 100 of 1997 (s. 11(a) and Act 48 of 1997 (s. 4)). This implies that TSs will then become a separated school dispensation regulated and centrally administered by the Department of Basic Education. The NEPA stipulates that subject to the provisions of subsections (1) to (3), the responsible Minister (Department of Basic Education) shall then determine national policy for the planning, provision, financing, co-ordination, management, governance, programmes, monitoring, evaluation and well-being of the Teaching School as an education system in accordance with sub-section *(g) the organisation, management, governance, funding, establishment and registration of education institutions ((Sub-s. (4) Amended by s. 11(b) of Act 100 of 1997).*

4.4.1 The Council of Education Ministers (CEM)

It is noted that any policy changes in respect of education in educational institutions shall be determined by the relevant Minister after consultation with the Council of Education Ministers, as well as all parties in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) established by Section 40 of the Labour Relations Act, 1995 (Act 68 of 1995). Such a matter shall then be introduced to Parliament, or in the case of regulations, published in the Government Gazette.

The interpretation, scope and administration of such a policy should be clearly defined. The Minister will then, in consultation with the Council of Education Ministers and others, establish a special education policy dispensation for TSs linked to HEIs, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and with due consideration to, and compliance with, ss. 1-3 of the NEPA.

4.4.2 Funding and financial administration

The funding model for TSs is to be in line with the Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999) to ensure transparency, accountability and sound management of revenue, expenditure, assets and liabilities. A higher education institution is listed as a constitutional institution in Schedule 1 of the Act and the legal framework delineated in the Act relating to public entities. Strategic prioritisation (such as TSs linked to HEIs) and re-prioritisation of medium-term baseline allocations over the strategic period of three years will have to be encapsulated into the budget process.

A possibility that may be considered is to provide the same type of funding to TSs as the funding provided to the health care sector where HEIs are linked to Teaching Hospitals or Health Care Training Clinics. This would imply providing ring-fenced funding to HEIs to establish and manage TSs. This fund would be managed in accordance with the Public Finance Management Act mentioned above. The budget would have to be presented to the DBE in either line-item format or programme-output presentation. The latter would be more useful to the HEIs and the DBE, as it would indicate the extent to which the allocation of resources actually reflected teacher education priorities in relation to planning and execution. The new policy would have to provide a framework for the Minister of Basic Education to determine and enact the policy for TSs. However, specific clauses of the SASA related to public schooling and support would remain applicable, as the teaching schools would need continued sectorial support from the provincial departments of education, through their various structures.

The conversion of a normal public school to a teaching school would probably require a one-year period or longer to consider and promulgate the recommended changes to policy and to involve the role players at the various governance levels as indicated above.

4.4.3 Implementation of the model: a phased approach

The conversion of a normal public school to a teaching school would require some time to consider and promulgate the recommended changes to policy, and to involve the role players at the various governance levels as indicated above, hence a phased approach is recommended. The phase-in approach should probably include the following:

PHASE	ACTIVITY	ROLE PLAYERS
1	Developing a new policy dispensation for teacher education and teaching schools in South Africa at the appropriate level by considering the current roles and obligations imposed by the Constitution, the NEPA and the SASA.	DHET; DBE; ELRC; Fiscus (Financial and Fiscal Commission); other organs of state identified by the two Ministers concerned.
2	Performing all the processes involved in declaring the new model for teacher education linked to TSs as an Act of Parliament.	DHET; DBE and the CEM
3	Promulgation of the new policy.	DHET; DBE and the CEM
4	Formulating the supporting structures and interrelational activities at the macro and meso levels (see schematic outlay above). These will typically include: roles and responsibilities relating to funding and monitoring; infra-structure development and maintenance; curriculum and school support; HR and labour issues (including the “fit for	DHET; DBE; CEM and the EDF (HEIs/TEIs) as well as (HEDCOM) and the ELRC

	purpose” principle and possible redeployment options).	
5	HEIs/TEIs Identifying appropriate schools to be transformed to TSs and formally engaging with the relevant PEDs and SGBs. This process of engagement is important and should be initiated via the submission of a formal “declaration of intent”.	DBE; HEIs/TEIs; PEDs and SGBs of existing schools
6	Transfer of ownership of TSs to the DBE or designated structure and termination of the SGB as a school governance structure (read with step 7 below).	DBE; HEI; PED; SGB
7	Establishment/election of the new Teaching School Board to substitute the SGB as per the new policy promulgated.	DBE; HEI/TEI; PEDs; SGB; Stakeholders
8	Audit of assets and stocks at the TS and preparation of performance-based budget discussed above. Submission of budget to DBE or designated structure.	DBE; PEDs
9	Drafting a business plan and programme for teacher education at the TS.	HEI; DBE; PED; TS School Board
10	Providing existing teachers and school management team (SMT) members (including the principal) with options for redeployment through the designated structures.	HEI/TEI (recommends); TESB (actions); PED (redeploy)
11	Advertising for and appointment of suitably qualified and skilled personnel. Transfer of existing personnel to the DBE if designated as employer (Steps 1, 2 and 4 will determine the process and need).	DBE; PDEs; TSBs; Unions

12	Initiate an induction process for school teachers and academics involved in TSs, including skills development, organisational and communication structures and mentoring skills.	HEI/TEI; TS Board
----	--	-------------------

5. SUMMARY: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF EACH MODEL

5.1 Implications of model 1 as an option for TSs: public school with a teaching school project

ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
1. GOVERNANCE	
<p>1.1 Sections 30 and 30 (1) (b) of the SASA provides for the possibility to register a Teaching School (TS) as a “project” of the SGB.</p> <p>Note: No implications for the provisions of the SASA</p>	<p>1.1 Seeing that a different category of school has not been declared for teaching schools, the school is managed as an ordinary public school in which the SGB exercises its “original functions” in accordance with Act 16(1) as discussed above.</p> <p>1.2 The school is a juristic person, therefore any form of agreement or Memorandum of Understanding/ Agreement must be contracted between the HEI/TEI and the SGB.</p> <p>1.3 The problem of limited voting rights for the members of the HEI/TEI serving</p>

	<p>on the “Project Committee” presents a major stumbling block for the effective establishment of the TS concept.</p> <p>1.4 Limited voting rights by the SGB-members representing the HEI/TEI as a “sponsoring body” in accordance with Section 24 (e).</p>
2. STAFFING	
<p>2.1 In terms of section 38A of the Schools Act, the SGB may, in terms of section 20(4), appoint additional educators.</p>	<p>2.1 The post establishment ratio for an ordinary public school does not support an enabling environment for teacher education and research in the school</p> <p>2.2 A teacher needs to obtain permission from the provincial HoD if he/she is employed by the Department of Education of Basic Education to actively participate in the teacher education programme at the TS on behalf of the HEI/TEI.</p> <p>2.3 The HEI/TEI may not appoint additional teachers at a public school.</p> <p>2.4 The HEI/TEI has no say or legal input as far as the quality of teachers involved in the project is concerned.</p>
3. SCHOOL AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	

<p>3.1 In terms of the Personnel Administration Measures (PAM), the role of the principal is limited to the management of that for which the professionals (teachers) are responsible, which entails primarily curricular matters.</p> <p>3.2 Section 20(1) (g) of the Schools Act clearly states that the governing body controls and administers the school's property, movable assets included.</p>	<p>3.1 The task of the educators is mainly to take care of the process of learning and teaching at the school. The task of the educators (the "professionals") in the school is thus to provide classroom instruction. "Professional management" therefore simply means "the management of classroom instruction".</p> <p>3.2 If the HEI/TEI uses classrooms for the purpose of training, the approval of the MEC, as contemplated in section 36(4) (a) (i), needs to be obtained.</p> <p>3.3 It would be difficult for the HEI/TEI to formally regulate the interaction between student teachers and school teachers as mentors.</p> <p>3.3 The schools and the institutions involved are set up for failure if the core requirements for a school to be regarded as a TS have to be introduced, organised, funded, managed and monitored by a sub-committee ("project committee") of the SGB, while the HEI/TEI has very limited input regarding the effectiveness thereof..</p>
--	--

	3.4 If the school is dysfunctional and not meeting the infra-structure and resourcing standards required by the Act, it may result in reputational damage to the HEI/TEI, and to the quality of teacher it produces.
--	--

5.2 Implications for model 2 as an option for TSs: Declaring a separate category (type) of school – amending the schools act (SASA)

ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
1. GOVERNANCE	
1.1 The Department of Basic Education (Minister) can amend Section 12(3) of the SASA, to make provision for a TS as a separate category of school.	1.1 Although the composition of the SGB makes provision for representation by members of the sponsoring body, the SGB will still exercise its “original functions.
1.2 The Minister can declare a different provincial governance structure for TSs, including separate Norms and Standards for school funding.	1.2 The school remains a juristic person, therefore any form of Agreement must be contracted between the HEI/TEI and the SGB, as
1.3 As a different category of school is declared, the school will be managed as a school with a special status.	is the case in Model 1.
2. SCHOOL AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	

<p>2.1 An amendment to section 12(3) of the Act creates an opportunity to declare a different category of school, with the possibility to apply for an appropriate post establishment, funding and staff remuneration structure.</p>	<p>2.1 The HEIs/TEIs will still have only limited legal capacity to ensure effective teacher education at these schools, as the school curriculum and management as well as classroom instruction will still be regulated by the current policies.</p>
<p>3. STAFFING</p>	
<p>3.1 If section 12(3) of the Schools Act is amended to provide for a different category of school, additional remuneration could be considered by the Minister of Basic Education. Teachers may be remunerated appropriately for additional duties as mentors and researchers (Section 38A of the SASA).</p>	<p>3.1 Declaring a different category of school may not serve as a waiver to any of the stipulations in by the Schools Act (Act 84 of 1996) in terms of the “original” functions of SGBs of public schools. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The recommendation to the Head of the Department of educators and non-educators for appointment - The establishment of posts and the employment of educators and non-educators additional to the establishment determined by the MEC. <p>3.2 A major stumbling block is the lack of an appropriate systemic structure that would provide HEIs with a mandate to ensure the appointment of a staff complement at the TS who may be mentors, researchers and role models. The so-</p>

	called “goodness of fit” principle will fall by the wayside.
--	--

5.3 Implications of model 3 as an option for TSs: the independent (private) school model

ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
1. GOVERNANCE AND OWNERSHIP	
<p>1.1 The Sector is closely regulated by the State.</p> <p>1.2 A different school governance model may be established, in which the HEI/TEI takes ownership of the school and the school is governed by a Board of Directors or similar structure that personifies the juristic personality of the school.</p> <p>1.3 Before funding is approved, each independent school (as a juristic person) will have to meet the conditions of eligibility as stipulated by the provincial department. These must include indicators of sound management, proper admissions, attendance registers and an ability to manage public funds effectively.</p>	

<p>1.4 Freed from the normal bureaucratic processes, the model allows HEIs to innovate and raise the standards for schooling to the extent that they become the desired role model schools and teaching laboratories needed for good teacher education.</p> <p>1.5 The issue of transferring the buildings and infra-structure of existing schools to the “owners” (HEIs) can easily be resolved. The transfer of property and staff to the School Boards of the ex-Model C Schools is an example of such a process.</p>	
<p>2. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT</p>	
<p>2.1 According to Section 48 of the Act, the Minister of Basic Education may, by notice in the Government Gazette, determine norms and standards for the granting of subsidies to independent schools.</p> <p>2.2, The right of existence of reputable, registered independent schools is protected by the Constitution, and the payment of subsidies to such schools is not precluded (Section 62 of Notice 2362).</p> <p>2.3 The national norms for subsidy to independent schools in accordance with the criteria linked to eligibility, conditions and any other matter (5 s50 (1) (c-d), which must or may be prescribed in terms of the Act, opens</p>	<p>2.1 The Minister of Basic Education currently has the responsibility to ensure a balance between the total cost of independent school subsidies and the overall provincial budgetary position of the Department. This may lead to a reduction in the allocation of subsidy to independent schools.</p> <p>2.2 TSs as a type of independent school is likely to be more expensive than public schools.</p> <p>2.3 Teacher salaries remain the main challenge and a special salary</p>

<p>an avenue for the DHET to negotiate an improved and generally acceptable subsidy formula for HEIs/TEIs that become “owners” of TSs within the public schooling domain.</p> <p>2.4 The model does not differ significantly from the Teaching Hospital concept, as the funding will be encapsulated in the consideration of educational grants by the Council of Education Ministers and the Financial and Fiscal Commission, with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance.</p>	<p>dispensation will have to be implemented for this model.</p> <p>2.4 Research has indicated that high-quality and well-qualified teachers can absorb 85% to 90% of the budget.</p> <p>2.5 Linked to the budget and the consequent subsidy requirements will be the funding of infra-structure requirements, upgrading of existing schools and extension of existing facilities for education-related needs, such as early childhood development, skills training and education materials and services.</p>
3. STAFFING	
<p>3.1 The appointment of “fit for purpose” teachers at the school becomes the responsibility of the “owner”, which enables the HEI/TEI (Board of Directors) to ensure relevantly qualified teachers.</p>	<p>3.1 The transfer of staff from a public school to a private or independent school with its own conditions of service and remuneration package, will prove to be the most difficult aspect of this model.</p>

5.4 Implications of model 4 as an option for TSs: amending current legislation to provide for teaching schools at a national level by the department of basic education

ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
1. GOVERNANCE AND OWNERSHIP	
<p>1.1 Any HEI/TEI is listed as a constitutional institution (Schedule 1 of the Act) and the legal framework delineated in the Act relating to public entities.</p> <p>1.2 The model will provide tight systemic control on a broad national basis if the TS concept is taken to scale.</p> <p>1.3 The DBE will be in over-arching control of school governance and management and will be the fiscal custodian of these schools.</p>	<p>1.1 The establishment of a completely new policy framework on a national level in accordance with the provisions of NEPA (Act 27 of 1996) is required.</p> <p>1.2 Establishing or mending education policy at this level involves multi-party consultation and agreement, including the CEM and ELRC as well as the Financial and Fiscal Commission.</p> <p>1.3 TSs will need continuous sectorial support from the provincial education departments, including the infrastructure and maintenance, curriculum and school support and labour.</p>
2. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	
2.1 The funding model will be in line with the Public Finance Management Act.	2.1 Medium term baseline funding is allocated over a term of three years and will have to be encapsulated in the

<p>2.2 Strategic prioritization of funding to support the purpose of TSs can be aligned with the same funding models linked to Teaching Hospitals or Health Care Training Clinics. This implies ring-fenced funding for TSs to be financially sustainable in the long term.</p> <p>2.3 If these schools are transferred to Higher Education it will mean that the DBE will directly become responsible for the infra-structure, maintenance and development of the schools.</p>	<p>budget process for Basic Education, which may impact negatively on the timeframes linked to the establishment of TSs.</p> <p>2.1 It will be the responsibility of the HEI/TEI and the appropriate school governance structure to present the DBE with an annual performance based budget for TSs. This is a technical process and will require additional training and resourcing.</p> <p>2.3 This model requires a total audit of assets and existing infra-structure.</p> <p>2.4 Schools and HEIs will continue to be dependent on the DBE for support. This has logistic and financial management implications</p>
<p>3. STAFFING</p>	
<p>3.1 The DBE will have control over the appropriate remuneration of staff working at TSs.</p> <p>3.2 Appointment of “fit for purpose” staff will be a definite possibility.</p>	<p>3.1 Staff will possibly have to be transferred to be in the direct employ of the DBE and not the province. However, the Minister can regulate the staffing of TSs to become a provincial competency.</p>

5.5 Findings and recommendations

It has emerged/become apparent from the research that although Models 1 and 2 can accommodate some of the of the challenges pertaining to TSs, neither of these is an appropriate model for the organisation, governance and funding of teaching schools in South Africa, as contemplated in the *Integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa, 2011–2025*.

The Independent (Private) School Model (Model 3) provides an appropriate model for establishing TSs within the current legislative framework within a short time-frame. This model has the advantage of minimal legislative adjustments and fits the current legislative framework best. The current legislative framework for independent schools allows enough flexibility for the establishment and governance of TSs at all the appropriate levels, including the fiscal level. The challenges are mainly technical and related to a feasible and appropriate subsidy model.

Model 4 is regarded as a feasible model with the advantage that it provides for tight financial and regulatory control by the Minister. It may, however be too technical in nature due to major legislative changes needed and an act of parliament to be promulgated to provide for a special education dispensation, not provided for by the SASA.

6. FUNDING THE ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATIONS OF TEACHING SCHOOLS

6.1 State subsidy and school fees

According to Section 48 of the Act, the Minister of Basic Education may, by notice in the Government Gazette, determine norms and standards for the granting of subsidies to independent schools, after consultation with the Council of Education Ministers and the Financial and Fiscal Commission and with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance, out of

the funds appropriated by the provincial legislature for that purpose, grant subsidy to an independent school. It should be noted that only non-profit independent schools receive subsidies from the state, and these are never more than sixty percent of the equivalent cost of government schooling, even when the school is located in a disadvantaged and impoverished area.

It should be noted that schools in previously disadvantaged communities or rural areas linked to HEIs may be no-fee schools, hence a 100% subsidy would be required. This is a possibility as the Minister of Basic Education has the power to determine specific subsidy formulae. This funding option is discussed in detail in 3.3 (Model 3).

6.2 Ring-fenced funding

Ring-fenced funding has to be in line with the Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999) to ensure transparency, accountability and sound management of revenue, expenditure, assets and liabilities. Such funding can only be paid to an HEI/TEI. An HEI/TEI is listed as a constitutional institution in Schedule 1 of the Act and the legal framework delineated in the Act relating to public entities. Strategic prioritisation (such as HEIs/TEIs linked to TSs for the purpose of teacher education) and re-prioritisation of medium-term baseline allocations over the strategic period of three years will have to be encapsulated into the budget process for higher education. A possibility could be that the same type of funding could be provided to TSs as the funding provided to the health care sector where HEIs are linked to Teaching Hospitals or Health Care Training Clinics. This would imply providing ring-fenced funding to HEIs/TEIs to establish and manage TSs. (A typical example is the current Clinical Training Grant that has been allocated to the Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of Johannesburg.)

This funding model is discussed in detail in 3.4 (Model 4).

6.3 University funders and donations

Handling university funding and donations is normally the responsibility of a specific division of the university, which has a broader mandate than to generate funding for a specific faculty. Some universities have a centralized approach to fund-raising and donations, while others adopts a more decentralised approach, where faculties may generate their own third-stream income funding for a specific project or for non-core academic activities.

In the main HEIs are knowledge-generating institutions that put their intellectual capital to work by creating knowledge (by means of research, whether self-initiated or solicited) and by disseminating knowledge (by means of teaching and learning and through consultation) through the activities of their academic employees.¹⁸ In putting its intellectual capital to work, HEIs are able to generate income through academic activities other than “core” state-subsidised teaching and learning and research activities (and associated academic support and development activities). These activities are mainly linked to research funding or entering into specific projects, such as the delivery of extra-curricular, short learning programmes. The involvement of academics in teacher education at TSs should be regarded as “core” state subsidised teaching and learning activities in a specific programme.

If the teaching staff members at the TS are appointed as “adjunct-lecturers”, they will be regarded as fixed contract employees and should be paid a stipend by the HEI. Such an approach is not feasible in the long term due to the stipulations of the Labour Relations Act (LRA) regarding “contracted” personnel. Another problem is that it places the burden of financing their employment in TSs on the HEI, which means that the subsidy allocation to the institution by the state must be adjusted accordingly. This only reverts the funding to the state.

¹⁸ Policy: Human Resource Management of “Noncore” Income Generating Activities of Academic Employees. University of Johannesburg, 2005.

6.4 Attracting external funding and donations

External funding is usually made available for a very specific purpose. Funders all have one thing in common: they require an extensive funding proposal document including a very specific itemised budget breakdown and specific reporting requirements. HEIs that do receive funding will have to provide proof of a track record in managing large scale projects and must be internationally reputable. If TSs are taken to scale, dependency on fund raising and donations by HEIs to sustain the TS system is not a feasible approach.

6.5 ETDP-SETA contributions

The Sector Education and Training Authority (SETA) is mandated to promote and facilitate the delivery of education, training and development in order to enhance the skills profile of the Education, Training and Development (ETD) sector and contribute to the creation of employment opportunities especially for those previously disadvantaged. The ETDP-SETA is one of 18 SETAs of the total number of 21 SETAs that have been re-established with no changes for the period 2011–2016 (*Certificate no. 07/ETDP/01/04/11 by the Minister of Higher Education and Training*).

The functions and responsibilities of SETAs are set out in Chapter 3, section 10 of the Skills Development Act, 1998. According to the Act The National Qualification Framework (NQF) is the framework, based on eight levels, on which any qualification or learning outcome has to be registered.

SECTION 4: NORMS AND STANDARDS FOR TEACHING SCHOOLS

PREAMBLE

In determining what the Norms and Standards for TSs should entail, research was conducted in various settings across the globe, including Finland¹⁹. The comments made in the submission by the Financial and Fiscal Commission on *Norms and Standards for School infrastructure (2009)* were carefully scrutinised, together with the *Draft Regulations for Minimum Norms and Standards for School infrastructure (12 September, 2013)* and *Notice 932 of 2013 (Government Gazette No 38837 of 2013)*. Other documents that were analysed related specifically to norms and standards for teacher qualifications, namely *Norms and Standards for Educators*²⁰ as well as the *Recognition and Evaluation of Qualifications for Employment in Education, (2000: 30)*.

Two invaluable sources of information were the establishment of the Funda UJabule School by the University of Johannesburg (UJ) as a public teaching school on private premises and the establishment of a teaching school (Mareleng Primary School) in close proximity to the Teacher Education Campus situated in Siyabuswa, Mpumalanga. In both these cases Memoranda of Agreement were signed between UJ and the Departments of Education. Whereas Funda UJabule could be built and designed by UJ as a “fit for purpose” school, it was different with an existing rural school such as Mareleng Primary, where aspects of the basic infra-structure were either dysfunctional or non-existent. In both these locations teacher development and effective school governance had to receive priority.

It emerged from the research and practical experiences that the primary purpose for the establishment of Norms and Standards for Teaching Schools must be to promote equitable provision of an enabling physical teaching and learning school environment²¹. The norms and

¹⁹ Finland Ministry of Education. 2007. Improving School Leadership in Finland. 2007:14

²⁰ <http://www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/notices/2000/not0082.html> Nov 29, 2013.

²¹ Basic Education, Department of. Government Notice. R. 920 South African Schools Act (84/1996. Regulations relating to minimum norms and Standards for Schools.

standards for TSs should ensure that school facilities are designed in relation to spaces or physical facilities for the betterment of the teaching and learning processes and for enabling the involvement of student teachers. Furthermore, quality schooling is not only influenced by access to physical infrastructure but also by the quality of school management and a track record of educational outcomes.

DEFINING NORMS AND STANDARDS FOR TSS

The norms and standards for TSs should determine the minimum requirements that should be in place to enable TSs to fulfil the roles envisaged in the framework for TSs. Norms and standards indicate the appropriate infra-structure requirements as well as core values and attributes that the school leadership and teacher cohorts need to embrace in order to fulfil their roles as specified for TSs effectively. Within this definitive framework of what the norms and standards for TSs linked to HEIs/TEIs imply, the following aspects should benchmark the over-arching standards for TSs:

- 1) Appropriate organisational systems and infra-structure
- 2) Appropriate leadership and governance structures
- 3) Norms and standards for school funding and appropriate staff establishment formulae
- 4) Appropriate “fit for purpose” staffing requirements.

Norms and standards for TSs give content to the ultimate purpose of establishing and maintaining TSs as an integral component of teacher education, in that these ensure that a set of basic norms and standards is available to every HEI/TEI and TS across the country. The standards are non-negotiable and do not depend on availability of resources in a specific province, region or district. Where there are measurable requirements in place it becomes possible for the stakeholders concerned to have clarity as to the quality and status of these schools.

In the Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) with the Departments of Education in Gauteng and Mpumalanga, the following were highlighted:

1. Identification of school site
2. Establishment and registration of the school
3. Commencement of the School as a TS
4. Admission of learners
5. Appointment and remuneration of staff
6. Operating budget
7. Governance of the school
8. Implementation of the MOA.

It is important for HEIs/TEIs to understand that such agreements (which might not be necessary in the future), are subordinate to the stipulations of the SASA and appropriate provincial regulatory framework. The Norms and Standards for TSs will differ significantly from those for ordinary public schools with regard to the overall size and composition of learner teacher ratios, physical working space (class size), and location.

Standard: location of teaching schools

The standard for the location of a TS is that it must be a school within walking distance from the HEI/TEI campus. TSs must be easily accessible as they are to be utilised by teacher educators as centres for research into teaching and learning and to strengthen teacher education programmes, involving student teachers.

Standard: school infra-structure

The proposed norms and standards for TSs should indicate the minimum norms and standards as prescribed by the South African Schools Act (SASA) (Act 84 of 1996, ss.5-5A) and in accordance with the proposals contained in the Government Gazette of 1995.²² with the following exceptions:

- 1) School sites should be large enough to accommodate both school buildings and sports fields. The school site of the specified size should also provide adequate recreational space for children.
- 2) The recommended standards for site sizes are as follows: Primary School: 2.8-4 ha; Secondary School: 4.8-6 ha. This is similar to the current dispensation for public schools.
- 3) Site suitability: The site should be situated in a secure and safe environment and must be easily accessible to the student teachers and teacher educators.
- 4) School and classroom capacity: Classrooms should provide adequate working space for both the class teacher and the student teachers, without cramping the learning space. The size of classrooms may vary according to specific curriculum requirements.

Currently the recommended size for a classroom is 50m² for Grade R (35 learners) and 50m² (40 learners) in other classes. This does not provide adequate space for student teachers to observe or participate in classroom activities. In order to provide such space the recommended standard for existing schools becoming TSs should be adjusted in accordance with learner numbers, as indicated below:

²² The South African Schools Act, Act 84 of 1996: No 36837. Notice 932 of 2013, 12 September 2013.

Recommended standards for public school

Note: Calculations based on experience gained from Funda UJabule and Mareleng Primary schools (excluding Secondary schools).

Grade R	20-25 learners	Size: 50m ²
Grade 1 -7	25-30 learners	Size: 50m ²
Secondary school (ordinary classes)	25-30 learners	Size: 50m ²

Recommended standard for TSs

Grade R	25-30 learners	Size: 60m ²
Grade 1 -7	25-35 learners	Size: 60m ²
Secondary school (ordinary classes)	30-35 learners	Size: 60m ²

Learning space for laboratories and libraries at secondary school level need to be adjusted appropriately within five years, using Government Gazette, No 36837 (Notice 932 of 2013, The South African Schools Act, Act 84 of 1996: 12 September 2013) as the basis of calculation.

Facilities

The list of facilities should be extended to include the following:

Demonstration and observation rooms. These are designed to create rooms with a one-way view between the demonstration and observation areas. The purpose is to allow demonstrations of good teaching practice to larger groups of student teachers or to allow peer evaluation of teaching practice. The observation room should be designed in an

auditorium style with appropriate writing space. An effective one way sound system should be installed.

Student activity space. A space large enough for smaller student groups should be available where students may engage with their mentors and/or engage in group work. Wi-Fi connectivity should be available in this room as a standard feature. An inter-active white board should also be standard with video and “skype” linkage in both the demonstration rooms and the student activity areas.

Information and communication technology (ICT) and internet connectivity. Because teachers at teaching schools are also developed to become mentors, Wi-Fi connectivity should be a standard feature in all classrooms to allow them broader access to the HEI/TEI digital environment, including internet and digi-books. Also – teachers at these schools should be enabled to use ICTs in their teaching.

Standard: school management and leadership

It is important to set norms and standards which will regulate the relationship between institutional governance and effective school leadership as well as the core competencies required for effective school leaders at TSs, regardless of the organisational or environmental context.

The norms and standards related to the recruitment and employment of school managers and teachers are encapsulated in the Employment of Educators Act 76 1998 as amended. The Directorate: Education Management and Governance Development (DoE, 2006) has determined the core purpose of principalship as the following:

- 1) To provide a standard for leadership and management in all areas of the school

- 2) To enable the creation and support of conditions under which high quality teaching and learning may take place and which will promote the highest possible standards of learner achievement
- 3) In terms of the SASA (section 16A) the standard for school principalship is normally characterised by six core components. These constitute the generic roles of the principal in any school context, including TSs:
 - a) Leading and managing the core business of teaching and learning in the school
 - b) Shaping the direction and development of the school
 - c) Assuring quality and securing accountability
 - d) Developing and empowering self and others
 - e) Managing the school as an organisation
 - f) Working with and for the community

In the context of TSs, however, three more core standards for school principalship (SP) need to be added:

- g) Leading and managing the school as a “teaching school”, which adds a distinct “fit for purpose” leadership competency
- h) Knowledge of the requirements for and developments in teacher education at HEIs/TEIs
- i) The ability to function and participate in a different governance context than the traditional SGB, which may take the form of a Teaching Education School Board (TESB) in which the HEI/TEI will be strongly represented as a custodian of the school. This will require a certain level of competence and even experience in corporate governance of the school principal.

Norms and standards for governing teaching schools

Note: The norms and standards related to the recommended governance structure for teaching schools should be understood against the background of the current legislative

framework for schools (SASA) and its inherent limitations, to enable appropriate governance of teaching schools (see document: *Establishing an appropriate governance and management model for teaching schools in South Africa, pp 24-31*). Section 28 (Election of members of Governing Body) and the appropriate formulae for calculating the number of members to be elected for each category will no longer have reference. This is especially important considering Activity 4.5(c) and (d) of the ISPF: 18.

Roles and obligations of the governance structure

The roles and obligations of the governance structure for TSs will be the following:

- 1) to make recommendations for a functional and financially viable operational structure for the school
- 2) to provide information and advice to the management and teacher educators of the HEI/TEI involved in the TS on matters affecting the effectiveness of teacher education at the school
- 3) to draft the constitution in terms of which the governance structure will be established and operated
- 4) to identify and recommend individuals for potential employment as staff at the teaching school (subject to their appointment and the “fit for purpose principle”) (see: *Establishing an appropriate governance and management model for teaching schools in South Africa (pp 24-31)*)
- 5) to review and advise on an appropriate infrastructural design for the TS affiliated to the HEI/TEI
- 6) to take responsibility for and ensure compliance with the functions previously defined as Section 21 functions (SASA).

The governance structure will be constituted and will operate in accordance with the new proposed policy framework. The governance structure of the TS will typically consist of the following representation (depending on whether it is a primary, secondary or combined school):

- 1) parents of learners at the TS, if reasonably practicable
- 2) the principal in her/his official capacity
- 3) educators employed at the TS
- 4) a member of staff who is not an educator, employed at the TS
- 5) representatives from the HEI/TEI, involved in Foundation Phase Teaching (Primary School)
- 6) representatives from the HEI/TEI, involved in Intermediate Phase teaching (Primary School)
- 7) representatives from the HEI/TEI, involved in Senior Phase teaching (Secondary/High School)
- 8) representatives from the HEI/TEI, involved in Further Education and Training Phase teaching (Secondary/High School)
- 9) A member or members with a sound knowledge of school governance and management, nominated by the HEI/TEI
- 10) a member who is an expert in research, nominated by the HEI/TEI
- 11) not more than two co-opted members who may advise on a) financial management and accounting; and b) legal matters.

Note: Sections 29 to 32 of the SASA should be incorporated into the new policy as a standard and appropriate legal requirement for governing TSs effectively.

Standards related to funding norms for TSs

Currently the set of national norms and minimum standards for school funding in terms of the South African Schools Act, 1996 (No. 84 of 1996) is applicable to all public and independent schools. These include reference to:

- 1) Personnel costs in provincial education departments
- 2) Targeting expenditure for redress, equity and quality
- 3) Fee charging and exemption policy in public schools
- 4) State subsidies to independent schools.

The funding norm for TSs will be in line with the Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999) to ensure transparency, accountability and sound management of revenue, expenditure, assets and liabilities.

The fundamental objectives of financial management in a TS environment will be to facilitate:

- 1) The efficiency and quality of teacher education taking place in the TS
- 2) Optimal utilisation of resources (physical and human resources)
- 3) Appropriate and goal-driven management of operations and infrastructure
- 4) Continuous maintenance and enhancement of the existing physical environment
- 5) Preparation and presentation of the annual budget to the relevant stakeholders.

The funding norm for staffing

The funding norm for staffing must

- 1) Provide for an adequate number of teaching and non-teaching (support) personnel who will fit the purpose of a TS in accordance with the teacher learner ratios suggested earlier.
- 2) Ensure that the cost of personnel establishments will be sustainable within the budget allocations and additional subsidy provisions of the TS.
- 3) Recognise the fact that the teaching staff at TSs will have to work additional hours serving as mentor teachers for student teachers attending TSs and therefore make provision for the payment of stipends or other forms of additional remuneration for such additional duties. These additional hours should be no less than 4 hours per week.
- 4) Determine norms in respect of posts to be allocated to TSs and provide funding for the development of teaching staff at and through the HEIs/TEIs, for the purpose of research and curriculum development in the TS. Although this document does not norm the desired post provisioning for TSs it is necessary to establish a principle in this regard, namely that the relative proportion of personnel costs at TSs should not be regarded to be equitable to that of provincial public schools, where the desired breakdown is 80:20. The preferred breakdown will be 85:15 or lower.
- 5) Provide for the allocation of non-teaching staff to schools, including administrative and support staff. Such allocation should not be linked to learner and staff numbers as in

ordinary public schools, but should consider TSs as a special category of school where administrative duties and on-site administrative support are extremely important.

- 6) Parents' responsibility: The parent body must take all reasonable measures within its means to supplement the resources provided by the state in order to improve the quality of education provided by the school to all learners at the school (similar to the SASA, section 36).

Norms and standards for teachers employed at teaching schools

The basic aim of all teacher education programmes is to produce competent teachers and to develop the necessary professional qualities to ensure lifelong teaching careers for teachers. Teachers at TSs will have to perform roles of mentoring, and methodology teaching in their schools and classrooms and work with student teachers in specific programmes. It is clear that such teachers must be well-qualified and have the ability to fulfil the roles required of them.

The following norms and standards should be applicable to teachers employed at TSs:

- 1) Professional development should be focused on modelling best practice to student teachers, enabling teachers to take on their mentoring roles and the teaching of methodologies to student teachers
- 2) Performance management of TSs teachers should be introduced with a focus on continuing professional development to be "fit for purpose"
- 3) Qualifications required for appointment:
Minimum qualification should be a BEd (Hons) or PGDE. However, a Master's degree will be preferable.
Minimum of 5 years' experience as a teacher.

REFERENCES

Department of *Basic Education*, 1996. South African Schools Act (84/1996. Regulations relating to minimum norms and Standards for Schools. Government Notice. R. 920 Pretoria. Government printers.

Finland Ministry of Education. 2007. Improving School Leadership in Finland. 2007:14

Politicsweb. <http://www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/notices/2000/not0082.html> Nov 29, 2013.

South Africa. 2013. Regulations for Minimum Norms and Standards for School infrastructure (12 September, 2013) and Notice 932 of 2013 (Government Gazette No 38837 of 2013).

The South African Schools Act, Act 84 of 1996: No 36837. Notice 932 of 2013, 12 September 2013.