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Executive summary

This report concerns the National Teacher Development Framework project which is aimed to assist the Government of Samoa to develop a comprehensive system for the development and management of high quality teachers and to provide a foundation for the Education Sector Project II. The report consists of three sections; i.e. Section I - Background; Section II - Sector Overview; Sector III - Policy Framework for the draft NTDF. The most important findings from the report are described below.

Previous initiatives that embrace a whole-school [or comprehensive school] approach have raised the level of trust, motivation and level of support from parents and the community, and this increases the potential to improve community support and funding. It is recommended that these types of initiatives continue to be undertaken in Samoa to improve the working environment of teachers and ultimately teaching-learning environments.

A three-part strategy is recommended for the retention of good teachers: 1) A whole-school approach to establish and support strong learning communities; 2) Teacher preparation programs that set and meet high standards; 3) Professionally rewarding career paths for teachers, with mentoring and support programs for new teachers. At the same time, the report recommends that a more detailed assessment is needed of current and projected student staff ratios, issues in teacher deployment to certain parts of the country, shortages of teachers observed in specific subject areas, etc.

Recommended options to meet the increasing demands for professional development include: 1) Increase the number of personnel in SOD with responsibility for professional development; 2) Establish a Professional Development Division within MESC; 3) Continue and expand support of CMAD, FOE and NUS; and 4) Outsource some teacher development to providers who are competent and capable of delivering professional development courses, as approved by SQA.

In general, it is recommended that the following new approaches should guide future teacher development activities: 1) an initial determination of needs, interests, and strengths of teachers and other staff is essential before professional development activities are designed; 2) teachers, principals and other local participants along with administrative officials need to be involved in planning the program; 3) in-service programs should allow high levels of local participation in both the design and implementation; 4) the in-service curriculum needs to provide a balance of pedagogy and subject matter and include practical methods to teach subject matter; 5) in-service programs should take the special problems of teachers in rural areas into account; 6) programs that focus on continuous development to guide, monitor, and support necessary skills, knowledge, and new ideas tend to be more successful in bringing about change at the classroom level than those that seek quick fixes to fill up deficiencies or those that simply provide a qualification.

At the teacher level, support should be provided for: i) coaching in classroom skills and management from mentors and peers; ii) a continuing study group with other teachers with similar in-service experiences; and iii) coordination of the in-service with the regular supervision of teachers. On teacher training, the report furthermore identifies the strong reliance on external donor funding of teacher development and recommends that, order to reduce this dependency, financing of teacher development needs to be seriously considered by all stakeholders, i.e. Government, communities, parents, students and teachers themselves.
A more teacher friendly performance appraisal process is required that can be linked to teacher licensing, salary increments, and promotion opportunities. This system should distinguish between new and experienced teachers, with adequate support systems and should be linked to established performance Standards and, consideration should be given to peer performance appraisal as well as self-appraisal, allowing teachers to reflect on the performance indicators against which the teachers will be assessed later in the year.

There is a need to develop long-term sustainable career paths for all MESC staff through the linking of professional development, job performance and rewards. This also applies for staff at all levels of the system dealing with the operation and management of the education management information system [EMIS]. Issues of staff motivation and commitment need to be addressed by linking Professional Certification with career paths and appropriate salary increments related to job tasks.

The Policy Framework for the Draft National Teacher Development Framework [NTDF] focuses on the following key policy areas:

- **Pre-service Recruitment and Selection**: Teacher recruitment will be based on performance in the Pacific Senior Secondary Certificate [PSSC] and personal attributes for teaching. Teacher selection will be based on performance and attributes for teacher training.
- **Teacher Certification/Registration for Quality Teachers for Learning**: All teachers will be registered. In the course of further refinement and development, it will be determined whether “all teachers” include also teachers from mission and/or private schools and that coverage of policy is in line with existing legislation.
- **Teacher Placement**: Teacher placement will be made in the best interests/needs of the students and the schools.
- **Teacher Performance Appraisal**: Teaching will be monitored through a quality monitoring process.
- **Professional Development**: Teaching quality will be sustained through professional development.
- **Career Pathways**: Equitable professional opportunities will be provided for teachers to pursue a broad range of career pathways in both teaching and non-teaching roles.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation [M&E]**: To make the most efficient [optimum] use of human, financial and material resources.
- **Teachers’ Conditions of Employment**: Provide teachers, principals and SRO with a healthy and secure working environment and appropriate recognition for their services to ensure quality teaching for learning.
- **Education Management Information System [EMIS]**: Provide an efficient EMIS to support quality teaching for learning.

A set of standards is incorporated into the draft NTDF, including Professional Baseline Standards, Minimum Standards for teacher training institutional/organizational capacity to deliver appropriate types and levels of teacher training programs, and Minimum standards for monitoring and evaluation of teacher performance for initial registration plus periodic reviews. In addition, a series of guidelines is proposed for: a) articulation between pre-service and in-service and other professional upgrade training programs; b) accrediting in-service and professional upgrades to formal qualifications; c) developing teaching portfolios to evaluate classroom based performance of teachers; and d) monitoring of institutional collaboration, joint projects with schools and/or teacher professional organizations in respective areas. Recommendations are finally made for a NTDF Institutional set-up, including a Teachers Advisory Committee, a Teacher Development Unit in SOD, a School Performance Unit, and a School Personnel Unit and concludes with a Draft NTDF Implementation schedule.
I. BACKGROUND

A. Introduction

The Technical Assistance [TA] is designed to assist the Government of Samoa [GoS] to develop a comprehensive system for the development and management of high quality teachers. With the modernization of curricula and development of improved teaching resources, there was the realization that similar improvements and investment had not been made in the area of teacher development.

Following the bidding process, SPAN Consultants in association with CCI Australia was appointed the Consultant. Contract negotiations were conducted between the Bank and the Consultant, with representatives of the Government as observers, and the Terms of Reference [ToRs] were agreed upon without major change. The TA Team commenced its assignment on 19 March 2007.

The Inception Report submitted on 30 May 2007 reconfirmed the need for a National Teacher Development Framework [NTDF]. There were no significant changes recommended in the methodology agreed upon during the contract negotiations between the Consultant and the Bank.

B. The Technical Assistance

B1 Introduction

The TA aimed at establishing a framework for the development of an effective approach to the teacher development programs. This is an essential requirement to ensure sustainability of the Education Sector Project [ESP] II, with the TA outputs providing the foundation on which the ESP II can assist in the development of policy to replace the current ad-hoc approach. The end result will be a more coherent and coordinated approach to teacher development.

B2 Scope of Activities

According to the ToR [see Appendix I], the “TA is to help the Government develop a comprehensive system for development and management of high quality teachers” [par. 4]. At the same time, they stress that the “TA scope will not undertake the full development and implementation of the actions identified” but that “it will provide a strong platform for MESC to work from” [par. 8].

Outputs and related performance indicators identified in the Design and Monitoring Framework included in the ToR are the following:
Teacher development framework, policies and procedures

- Proposal for a national development framework [NDTF]

Action plans, with phased and costed investment

- Phased action plans for teacher recruitment, initial training and continued professional development
- Estimates of investment and recurrent cost of action programmes
- Management and monitoring system and institutional framework for supporting the operations of NTDF
- Sample of expected teacher competencies
- Teacher registration and performance appraisal guidelines
- Revised Government policy ready for implementation

B3 Methodology

The TA activities were implemented in two phases with Phase 1 consisting of 11 weeks, followed by a 4-week break to allow stakeholders and the ADB to review outputs. Phase 2 was 6 weeks, providing a total project duration of 21 weeks.

During Phase 1, TA activities focused primarily on information gathering and stakeholder consultation. The TA reviewed documentation concerning inter alia current approaches to teacher development and associated institutional and management structures. In addition, an assessment was made of the capacity of the Education Management Information System [EMIS] in better informing a number of critical areas in teacher development including teacher performance monitoring, supply and demand forecasting, teacher deployments, and the potential for policy analysis and providing other data for system monitoring.

A series of formal workshops was conducted in various locations with a range of participants to consider broad NTDF approaches and development:

- Workshop on Education Management Information Systems [EMIS], 27 April 2007
- Upolu Island Workshop on Teachers Needs Analyses based on Teachers’ Competencies and their Indicators, 7 May 2007
- Workshop on Teachers Needs Analyses based on Teachers’ Competencies and their Indicators, 23 May 2007
- Workshop on reviewing MESC Strategic Policies and Planning for Teacher Development and Focusing on the Government wide Implications for Potential Reforms in Structures and Systems as a result of Introducing a NTDF, 29 & 30 May 2007

The TA also consulted with staff in the Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture [MESC], in particular with the School Operation Division [SOD], Policy Planning and Research Division [PPRD], Curriculum, Materials and Assessment Division [CMAD], Corporate Services Division [CSD], Principal Information Technology Officer, as well as with the Faculty of Education [FOE], the Oloamanu Professional Development and Continuing Education Centre, the National University of Samoa [NUS] and the Samoa Distance and Flexible Learning Centre of the University of the South Pacific [USP].
A needs analysis was undertaken using a focus group approach, coupled with an analysis of existing documentation and experiences of other projects and programmes. An overview of the documentation used is found in Appendix 2.

A series of Focus Group meetings discussed indicators for teacher supply and demand, teacher profiles, issues hindering teachers to perform to their fullest potential, an overview of training and professional development, job practices and conditions of work, the policy tools currently in place to address teacher quality and supply, the processes of recruitment and promotion and salary structures. The responses from the Focus Groups were presented at a meeting of stakeholders chaired by the CEO of MESC.

As part of the analysis, school visits were conducted during six days to observe classroom practices and assess teacher performance. Visits were conducted to two urban primary schools and two urban secondary colleges, and two primary and four secondary schools/colleges in rural areas. Four urban primary classes and four urban secondary classes were observed at different levels/subjects and four rural primary classes and eight rural secondary classes were observed at different levels/subjects. Permission for the visits was obtained from the CEO of MESC; institutions visited were selected by SOD. Observation in schools/colleges was open and unstructured; classroom observations focused on: [a] the extent to which student-based teaching styles had been adopted; [b] the extent to which multigrade teaching in-servicing was implemented in classroom practice; and [c] the general classroom management situation.

Phase 2 activities commenced at the beginning of July 2007 and were designed to consolidate the Phase 1 findings and produce the draft NTDF. These activities included a stakeholders’ workshop conducted by the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture [MESC] to seek feedback regarding the contents of the draft NTDF. This workshop was held on 26 and 27 July 2007.

**B4 Verifiable Outcomes**

In line with the list of outputs mentioned in the ToR and reflected above, the TA outputs realized include, in addition to the sector analysis provided in section II, a policy framework for the draft National Teacher Development Framework, which can be found in section III of this report and includes:

- Policies and procedures for National Teacher Development Decision Making;
- A set of Minimum Standards;
- A series of Guidelines in various key areas – including Guidelines to monitor institutional collaboration, joint projects with schools and/or teacher professional organizations in respective areas; and
- A draft NTDF institutional structure and implementation schedule. The latter includes a series of performance indicators as a basis for future monitoring as well as cost indications and sources of funding.

A draft Teaching Profession Bill, accompanied by Guidelines to implement the proposed legislative changes was prepared as well. However, upon discussion with MESC it was understood that the existing Education Bill could serve the purpose for teacher registration and other outcomes of the NTDF. Since the draft legislation could be used for any amendments or additions to the existing Education Bill, the draft Teaching Profession Bill and re-
related guidelines for implementation of proposed legislative changes are furnished in Appendix 4 to this report.

B5 Implementation Arrangements

The Executing Agency for the TA was the Ministry of Finance, with MESC being the Implementing Agency.

The TA team, consisting of four international and five domestic consultants\(^1\), commenced on 19 March 2007 with the arrival of the Teacher Education Planning and Institutional Development Specialist-Team Leader [TL] and the Teacher Education/Quality Assurance Specialist [TQS] who were accommodated in an office at MESC.

MESC appointed a TA coordinator and the five domestic consultants [three from MESC and two from the Faculty of Education [FOE] of the National University of Samoa [NUS]]. Protocols were established for the involvement of the Education Steering Committee [ESC].

As part of the assignment, three generic reports were produced by the TA team, i.e.

- an inception report [submitted on 2 May 2007 and approved by ADB on 2 June 2007];
- an interim report [submitted on 7 June 2007, and commented upon by ADB on 15 June 2007 and by MESC on 9 July 2007. The interim report was approved by the ADB on 4 August 2007];
- a final report, the draft of which was submitted on 16 August 2007. Comments on the draft final report were received from AusAID on 4 September 2007, from MESC on 24 October 2007, from ADB on 28 November 2007, and from NZAID on 28 November 2007. A consultation session was held with MESC on 27 and 28 November 2007 to discuss the comments received.

These comments were carefully considered when preparing this comprehensive revision of the draft final report in order to comply with the requirement stipulated in the ToR that the “TA output will be presented in a single comprehensive report compiled from the individual reports” [Par. 4].

B6 Report structure

The structure of the report is as follows:

- Section I presents the background to the report
- Section II provides a sector overview and includes information on the Samoa education context.
- Section III concerns the policy framework for the draft National Teacher Development Framework. It pays attention to policies and procedures, minimum standards, guidelines, institutional structure and reporting mechanisms.

\(^1\) International experts were: Patricia Thompson, Teacher Education Planning and Institutional Development Specialist - Team Leader; Ian Birch, Teacher Education/Quality Assurance Specialist; Susan Larsen, Legal and Education Policy Development Specialist; Bruce Craig, Financial Planning Specialist. National experts were: Tilianamu Afiamsaga, Education Administration and Policy Specialist; Fepule'ai Sinapi Möli, Teacher Education Specialist; Ruby Vaa, Participatory Planning Specialist; Josefa Leiataua, Teacher Training Specialist; Afa Lesa, Finance and Legal Specialist.
The appendices to the report include:

- The Terms of Reference for the assignment [Appendix 1]
- The documentation used in the course of the assignment [Appendix 2]
- People met and workshop participants [Appendix 3]
- Draft Teaching Profession Bill 2007 and related guidelines [Appendix 4]
II. SECTOR OVERVIEW -
THE SAMOA EDUCATION CONTEXT

A. Introduction

The Government has sustained a strong commitment to education, and substantial achievements have been made in achieving educational goals. However a number of challenges remain, and these include low levels of student achievement, access to quality schooling in disadvantaged areas, low secondary completion rates, high repetition and dropout rates, and an inadequate supply of well-trained teachers coupled with high turnover.

Progress has been made in curriculum modernization, improved classroom resources, and teaching approaches. The Government recognizes that teacher quality is a critical determinant of education quality. However low salaries and limited opportunities for professional development have made it difficult to attract and retain well-qualified secondary graduates in the teaching profession. Compounding these problems are pre-service programs that have not kept pace with curriculum modernization, resulting in many teachers being unfamiliar with the teaching practices required for effective curriculum implementation. One response has been externally funded in-service training; however the coordination of this assistance with other Government-funded activities has been poor.

B. Education Policy

The education system in Samoa consists of 8 years of compulsory primary education for all persons aged 5 to 14, 5 years of secondary education [15 to 19 years], and 4 years of higher education. With a literacy percentage of 98.6, Samoa ranks 77th on UNDP's Human Development Index as far as adult literacy is concerned.

From 1995 to 2005, development in Samoa was guided by the Government’s Educational Policies and Strategies 1995-2005, which were designed around the four key concepts of Equity, Quality, Relevance and Efficiency. On these four concepts, the National Curriculum Policy Framework of January 2006 highlights [page 3-4]:

**Equity**  
Equity requires that the system will treat all individuals fairly and justly in provision of educational opportunity. Policies and practices which advantage some social groups and disadvantage others will be avoided, while those which address existing inequalities in access, treatment and outcome will be promoted.

**Quality**  
Educational quality is exemplified by high standards of academic achievement, cultural understanding and social behaviour and results from a complex interplay of professional and technical factors, and social and cultural practices. Policies promoting these will focus on the learning institutions and specifically on day-to-day classroom practices including the monitoring, assessment and reporting of student outcomes and teaching effectiveness.

**Relevance**  
Relevancy in education implies a system which is meaningful, recognised, applicable and useful to one’s life. It should enhance individual and community well-being and ultimately national development, including cultural, humanistic and spiritual aspects. Policy decisions will address what is relevant to the individual learner, to the community and nation.
Efficiency

Efficiency in education is demonstrated by leadership and management practices which ensure optimum use of resources – human, financial and material – at all levels, efficient service delivery, effective communication and coordinated and transparent decision-making. Policies will reflect the need to be both efficient and effective.

Two major reviews were done of the implementation of the Educational Policies and Strategies 1995-2005 out of which was produced the current MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006 - June 2015 [2006], which under the heading of Teacher Training states that:

- Standards for pre-service qualifications for teachers will be consistently reviewed over the next 9 years
- All teachers will be encouraged to have a first degree with a teaching professional qualification
- All teachers in the public service will hold a professional qualification in teaching
- University graduates will acquire teacher training qualifications before entering the teaching service

Moreover, in section 3.15.3, the document highlights that “A national teacher development framework will be established to guide on teacher development policy and to monitor the implementation of quality programs” [for additional references, relevant to the assignment, please refer to box 1 below].

Box 1: Key elements from the MESC Strategic Policies and Plan 2006-2015

On teacher qualifications and pre-service and in-service training

p. 46-47: All teachers will be encouraged to have a first degree with a teaching professional qualification. All teachers in the public sector will hold a professional qualification in teaching. University graduates will acquire teacher training qualifications before entering the teaching service.

p. 46: Standards for pre-service qualifications for teachers will be consistently reviewed over the next 9 years.

p. 25: A plan for the incorporation of the foundation program into the school system will be developed and implemented.

p. 26 and p. 46: Teachers will be supported through regular in-service training programs. Professional Development courses for teachers will be offered via open and distance learning. Teacher education will be on-going and in-service training accessible for professional development and lifelong learning. Teacher education programs will be of the best quality.

On distribution of teachers across the country

p. 46: Strategies will be developed to address the mismatch between locations of need and teacher preferences.

On teacher employment conditions

p. 46: The holder of a position of responsibility will hold that post for a minimum of time of three years before they are eligible to apply for another position of responsibility. Teachers will progress in the approved PSC Teaching Career and Salary Structure based on continuous excellent performance over a three year period. Teachers outstanding performance will be recognized through special merit awards and further training opportunities.

p. 46: A system of incentives and awards will be developed and implemented to attract and retain teachers in the service.


On EMIS

Pp 43-44 Reliable communication systems through networking [both electronic and other means] between all levels of education will be established. MESC will take a more strategic approach to the management of ICT so that it can be fully utilized in the delivery of information and education services. MESC will centralize the collection and storage of its planning data. The School Census forms will be improved to ensure that data is collected in the form that is required for the EMIS. MESC will review its current processes.
and practices in Records management and the archiving of both paper and electronic information. A computerized records management system will be put in place that will allow for efficient access to and retrieval of documents and other information. A file audit will be conducted in all divisions to be accompanied by a training of filing clerks. The timely collection of data will be supported by a strong research capacity that will drive policy development and disseminate findings. The functions and structure of the ICT Unit will be reviewed to reflect its responsibilities of monitoring and management of ICT at the central office and schools.

**On School management**

p. 49 : The management of schools will be reviewed. Personnel capability and succession planning will be addressed. The organization structures will be reviewed to meet the expanding needs of the Ministry. School Review Officers will be supported and recognized in their roles. Management at all levels will be strengthened. The partnership with school committees and school communities will be further strengthened.

The above policies addressed the major issues highlighted in the Government of Samoa - ADB Education Sector Review [2004] and MESC-PRIDE Samoa Education Sector Evaluation Study-Final Report [2005]. For teachers’ policies, the Rawlinson Report 2002 was also quite pivotal as it, like other reports, highlighted amongst others:

- The high attrition of teachers from the teaching service reflecting the low perception of status of the profession
- The need for improvement of teachers’ conditions of service and salaries.

Other reports by Evans 2004, Coulter 2001, Scofield 2003, and the MESC-SFS Submission to PSC for Salary Re-grading for Teachers, 2005, have helped to substantiate these issues.

**C. Education Expenditure/Financing**

Samoa has a community-based education system, whereby local village committees manage the primary and junior secondary schools and the Government pays teacher salaries, and funds free stationery, curriculum development, and textbook sets, while the village committee levies fees for construction and maintenance of facilities and other operating expenses.

The GoS commenced to use output budgeting in 1996, with each output managed by an “output manager”. Each Department/Ministry prepares its estimated revenue and expenditure on an annual basis for the financial year, which ends 30 June.

The allocation of financial resources is prepared by the Corporate Services and is subject to final approval by the Ministry of Finance [MoF], which submits the estimates to the Cabinet through the Minister of Finance, who subsequently tables the estimates in Parliament for approval.

The National Estimates for the financial years ending 30 June 2005/2006 and 30 June 2006/2007 respectively are as indicated in table 1 on the next page.

---

2 Taufeulungaki, Ana et al. Samoa Education Sector Evaluation Study 2005
3 GoS/DOE-ADB ESP 1 TA 3498-SA Report by Ralph Rawlinson, 2002
4 Evans, J 2004 Teacher Career Structure- A Discussion Paper
5 GoS-ADB Technical Assistance No 3498-SAM; Coulter, F. Teacher Training Specialist –Final Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total estimates for 20 Ministries</td>
<td>322.8 million</td>
<td>360.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education sector share of the estimated total</td>
<td>97.2 million [26.9%]</td>
<td>56.2 million [17.4%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC approved amount [of the above approved estimates]</td>
<td>30 million</td>
<td>33 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The estimate for Teacher Development</td>
<td>.44 million [1.39%]</td>
<td>.45 million [1.48%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An indication of the use of the 2006/2007 approved MSEC estimates by the different MSEC outputs is furnished in the following graph.

The available data indicates *inter alia* that:
- Of the available government resources 93% are used for paying salaries in primary schools and some 80.5% in secondary schools
- Some 80% of teacher training workshops are donor funded. Sustainability of this training will face problems when donor project funds are exhausted or withdrawn.

Moreover, the information collected in the course of the assignment indicates that currently there is hardly a financial model for teacher training; rather limited funds are being put to use to carry out this important task of the Ministry.

In its Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006 – June 2015, the Government highlights that there is “[insufficient] recurrent budget to finance maintenance, curriculum materials and learning resources especially in the primary and secondary sub-sectors” [page 51].

### D. Schools

#### D1 Number of Schools

In 2005, there were a total of 203 schools, of which 159 were primary schools, 8 were combined primary and secondary schools, and 36 were secondary schools. Of the 159 primary schools, 140 were government, 13 were mission and 6 were private. In the primary-secondary category, 1 was a government school, 5 were mission and 2 were private schools. At the secondary level, 24 were government schools and 12 were mission schools.

---

6 In addition to the above approved estimates, an additional annual contribution through the Faculty of Education (NUS) is provided by the Government as a subsidy for Teacher Training Students.


8 Available data for 2006, mention a total of 166 Government schools, 30 Mission schools and 8 privately owned schools. Unfortunately, the data is not consistent.
D2 Student Enrollments

Data on overall student enrollments in primary and secondary schools for the different parts of the country is furnished in the table below. The data indicate that overall, after increasing in the years 1998–2003, enrolment has been stable since 2003. Year one enrolments in Government schools in 2007 were 164 below those of a decade ago.

Table 2: Student enrolment in primary and secondary schools 1998–2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apia Urban</td>
<td>19,229</td>
<td>19,507</td>
<td>19,803</td>
<td>20,342</td>
<td>20,747</td>
<td>20,923</td>
<td>20,961</td>
<td>20,944</td>
<td>21,176</td>
<td>21,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Upolu</td>
<td>17,074</td>
<td>17,129</td>
<td>17,222</td>
<td>17,834</td>
<td>18,593</td>
<td>19,507</td>
<td>19,754</td>
<td>19,599</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>19,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upolu Total</td>
<td>36,303</td>
<td>36,636</td>
<td>37,025</td>
<td>38,176</td>
<td>39,340</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>40,715</td>
<td>40,593</td>
<td>40,676</td>
<td>40,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban as % of Upolu</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savai'i</td>
<td>12,885</td>
<td>12,597</td>
<td>12,682</td>
<td>13,212</td>
<td>13,765</td>
<td>14,056</td>
<td>14,224</td>
<td>14,431</td>
<td>14,212</td>
<td>14,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For 2004, the following table provides an overview of the number of schools and the number of teachers for the different types of primary and secondary schools [based on the 2004 Statistical digest].
## Table 3: Overview of the number of schools and the number of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/District</th>
<th>Government Primary</th>
<th>Pri-Sec</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mission Primary</th>
<th>Pri-Sec</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Private Primary</th>
<th>Pri-Sec</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Primary</th>
<th>Pri-Sec</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Schools</td>
<td>No Techers</td>
<td>No of Schools</td>
<td>No Techers</td>
<td>No of Schools</td>
<td>No Techers</td>
<td>No of Schools</td>
<td>No Techers</td>
<td>No of Schools</td>
<td>No Techers</td>
<td>No of Schools</td>
<td>No Techers</td>
<td>No of Schools</td>
<td>No Techers</td>
<td>No of Schools</td>
<td>No Techers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apia Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faleata</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaimauga</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apia Urban Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Upolu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aana No. 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aana No. 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleipata</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoamaa No. 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoamaa No. 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagafoa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faleatasi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelepe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepa/Lotofaga</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safata</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagaga</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Upolu Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taasaleleaga No. 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taasaleleaga No. 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu Aiau No. 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu Aiau No. 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu-o-Tane No. 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu-o-Tane No. 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palauli</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savaii Sisifo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savaii total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA 4738-SAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Teacher Development Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section II - Sector overview**
The largest Government primary school had 1,247 students enrolled, and the smallest had 26. The average enrolment across Government primary schools was 234 students. At the secondary level, the largest Government school had 1,217 students, the smallest 5 [sic], with the average enrolment being 388 students. Similar data for mission and private schools are not readily available but need to be constructed, particularly since access to quality schooling in disadvantaged areas has been identified as a problem.

In 2006, at the primary level, 83% of enrolments were in Government schools, 13% in Mission schools and 4% in Private schools. At the secondary level 61% of students were enrolled in Government schools, 37% in Mission schools and 2% in Private schools. The percentages for primary schools are the same as those reported for 2004 [Education Statistical Digest]; they differ slightly for the secondary schools where, according to the same source, 59% of children were enrolled in Government schools and 39% in Mission schools in 2004. One possible explanation of the increased percentage of enrolments in Mission schools from 13% in primary to 37% in secondary and the decline in Government school enrolments from 83% in primary to 61% in secondary may be due to better retention rates in Mission secondary schools.

Despite many positive achievements, quality and efficiency of education remain issues of concern. The document concerning the Proposed Asian Development Fund Grant - Independent State of Samoa: SchoolNet and Community Access Project of November 2007 highlights in this respect that “[v]ariations in student’s learning achievement and opportunities to learn remain significant, particularly between urban and rural areas. More than 25% of the students enrolling in primary education do not complete the 8-year program. In 2006, the dropout rate was 7% for grades 1–2, 5% for grade 8, 18% for grades 10–11, 3% for grade 12, and as high as 41% for grade 13. Repetition rates at grades 1, 8, 11, 12, and 13 are high and largely unchanged since 1997. In 2006, 88% of primary students progressed to the lower secondary level and 91% progressed to the upper secondary level, but only 53% of 12th graders advanced to grade 13” [page 28].

D3 School Resources

MESC data for 2006 indicates that 74.52% of all students enrolled have desks and 67.58% students have chairs. In terms of equipment, 82 of 141 primary and 25 secondary colleges/schools have computers, 19 have TV and 29 have photocopiers. Similar data for different types of primary and secondary schools from the 2004 Education Statistical Digest give the following picture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: School resources [2004]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.D.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board/Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.C.S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.D.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II - Sector overview
Table 4: School resources (2004) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodist</th>
<th>S.D.A.</th>
<th>School Board/Com</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 15,761 579 16,020 15,963 402 45 66 39

On the issue of teaching and learning materials, MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015 [page 40], inter alia highlight that “the supply of learning materials to schools to date was largely dependent on projects funded by donor agencies. Present quantities are insufficient with the increase in retention rates”. Moreover, while the Ministry is encouraging practical subjects in secondary schools, “the School committees cannot afford the required consumables for practical tasks. As a result, most of the teaching is on theory alone...”. In addition, maintenance problems are observed. Strategies highlighted in the same source [page 58] include, in addition to promoting efforts to improve school libraries:

- “Develop a strategic plan for continuous production of graded readers in Samoan and English
- Procure and distribute annual supplies of consumables for Science and vocational subjects for secondary schools
- Procurement of additional reading materials produced by local writers
- Reprint of curriculum statements and support materials annually
- Improve the Education Broadcasting Unit capacity to produce multi media materials
- Training program for teachers will be designed and developed to produce their own curriculum materials
- Resource centres will be equipped and provided with sufficient resource materials for teachers”

In case a full inventory of school and teaching and learning resources has not yet been undertaken, this will be needed as a basis for comprehensive policies and strategies in this area, taking into account the main issues identified in the Strategic Policies and Plan. These need to be considered in finalizing the draft NTDF.

D4 Teacher Numbers and Qualifications per school

During 2007 there were 1,485 teachers in Government schools, with 1,039 primary, 444 secondary and 2 primary-secondary teachers. This total number is an increase of eight in comparison with 2006. A large majority of the teachers [over 90%] is qualified, i.e. is “a teacher who has a formal qualification from a teacher training institution such as the FOE [NUS] and Trained Teacher’s Certificate” [Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015, page 45]. 2004 data for mission and private schools give the following quantitative picture [see also the table above]:

- Mission schools: 154 primary, 99 primary-secondary and 258 secondary school teachers
- Private schools: 68 primary, 3 primary-secondary and 14 secondary school teachers

D5 School size, teacher-student ratios, hours of attendance and teaching loads

a) School size

School size is set to a maximum 750 students [no. of classrooms x 40 to a maximum of 750] for primary and secondary schools [for primary schools this is specifically mentioned in the Education Policies 1995-2005 of July 1995 [page 17]: “The maximum enrolment number for any primary school will be 750”]. Based on the available data, only a limited number of primary and secondary schools exceed this upper limit.
b) Student - teacher ratios


- Single grade classes – target ratio 1:30 [maximum 40]
- Dual grade classes – target ratio 1:25 [maximum 30]

D6 Multiple grade classes - target ratio 1:20 [maximum 25]

For secondary education, the Education Policies 1995-2005 of July 1995 [page 28] state that the “base teacher-student ratios will be 1:25 or 1:20 in schools with an enrolment of less than 200”.

In practice, the student-teacher ratio has been climbing steadily in recent years in primary education from 24 to 32.5 but flattened out to 32 in 2007: the secondary ratio reduced slightly to 20.6 in 2007 compared with 20.7 in 2006. However, according to MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015 [page 45], this overall figure “does not reflect the shortage of teachers in specific subject areas. Generally speaking there is a shortage of teachers in all subject areas but especially in Mathematics, Science, pure sciences and Agricultural Science”.

One complication in Samoa is the insistence by villages that each must have its own primary school and, no matter how small, at least two teachers.

a) Hours of attendance

The regulated hours of school attendance are as follows:

- for Years 1 - 3, 8:00 am to 12:30 pm, including a 30 minute break;
- for Years 4 - 8, 8:00 am to 1:30 pm with a 30 minute break; and
- for Years 9 - 13, 8:00 am to 1:45 pm with a 30 minute break.

b) Teaching loads

The MESC requirement for normal hours of duty for teachers is 40 hours per week. Primary teachers may be assigned up to 25 hours per week of class teaching time and secondary teachers between 16 and 20 hours per week. Deputy principals are expected to teach a minimum of 10 hours per week. In addition to class teaching, teachers spend time on lesson preparation, assessment and marking, and school administration, other school activities [including computer activities, sports training and cultural day preparation] and meetings with parents and school committees. Details on the actual teaching load are not available – but teachers tend to claim that they comply with the 40 hours set by the Government. At the same time, there is discursive evidence from community members, government personnel and TA observation that teacher absenteeism from class is practiced, although its frequency has not been measured.
D7 Teacher Demand and Supply

a) Situation Analysis

The TA was advised that the Pelican data is unreliable as of December 2005, therefore there was no capacity to undertake a detailed teacher supply and demand study as was done by Rawlinson [2002] and Pillay [2004].

A current teaching vacancies list was examined and this showed 204 vacancies for primary teachers [not including supervisory/administrative positions] and 69 positions for secondary teachers. This was in contrast to estimates derived from the Pelican data indicating a shortfall of 205 primary and 16 secondary teachers.

In terms of demand, the TA concluded that between 103 and 236 primary teachers are required immediately [depending on who determines the need and how the need is determined], and up to 67 secondary teachers. The proposed fast tracking for graduating 100 primary teachers over four years in ESP II will be significant in meeting this demand.

The primary teaching force improved by one in 2007 over the 2006 number and the secondary by seven. Noting the slow decline in primary enrolments and the variable ups and downs in secondary enrolments, the 2007 data gives rise to the hope that at least the annual gap between attrition and new appointments may have been narrowed, if not eliminated in the primary levels at least.

b) Recommendations

Given the present difficulty in obtaining data and the fluid state of the attrition-employment markets, this TA did not attempt any projections of the kind undertaken by Rawlinson [2002] and Pillay [2004]. A more detailed assessment will be needed of current and projected student staff ratios, issues in teacher deployment to certain parts of the country, shortages observed in specific subject areas, etc. This assessment needs to cover both Government and non-governmental schools. The assessment is required to support future policy on teacher incentives. In general terms, the TA recommends accelerating the graduating process for teachers, and diminishing the attrition rate for teachers and student teachers to address present shortfalls and maintain future annual increases in the number of teachers.

E. Curriculum

A National Curriculum Policy Framework was prepared by MESC in January 2006. The Framework pays attention to issues such as curriculum principles and goals, curriculum policies, assessment, and curriculum planning and review at school and national levels. The document highlights that “[the] national curriculum is the approved statement of learning that applies to all schools” [page 36] and apply for the Samoan education system as a whole.

In its document, “Proposed Asian Development Fund Grant Independent State of Samoa: SchoolNet and Community Access Project” of November 2007, the ADB observed the following [page 29]: “The status of the school curriculum in Samoa is problematic; revisions made through piecemeal interventions by donor agencies have resulted in poor articulation between grade levels and across subjects. Also absent are clear guidelines of expected learning outcomes that set out the literacy, numeracy,
and problem-solving skills, as well as social and cultural skills, that children should master as they progress through school systems. Improvements required include: (i) an updated comprehensive K–12 curriculum policy framework; (ii) subject and year level syllabus statements; (iii) classroom activities that emphasize more active, student-centred learning activities; and (iv) strengthened pedagogical and discipline knowledge teaching skills and the range of classroom assessment techniques that are essential for high-quality teaching and learning. These issues have implications for quality and efficiency at both the primary and secondary level. The Government intends to develop an integrated curriculum for primary years 1–3 and subject-specific curricula in seven subject areas for years 4–8, providing easy articulation with the secondary curriculum. A secondary education curriculum framework for years 9–13 is being translated into subject syllabi and implemented. There is a need to provide teachers’ manuals, textbooks, and learning materials, and to design and deliver in-service training programs, for the secondary level. More effective instructional practice will also have to include more effective use of formative and summative assessments. Modern assessment strategies have been introduced in recent curriculum projects supported by development partners. These are, however, not yet widely applied.”

The minimum hours of instruction are as follows [see also the table below]:

- for primary Years 1 - 3, 20 hours per week spread across nine/ten subject areas;
- for primary Years 4 - 8, 25 hours a week spread across five core subjects and three preferred non-core subjects;
- for secondary Years 9 - 11, 25 hours per week spread across seven core and four optional subjects; and
- for Years 12 - 13, 25 hours per week spread across one core subject [English] and sixteen optional units of which four are only available to year 12 students and two only available to year 13 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Curriculum subjects and hours of instruction per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [assemblies/recess]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional studies [food and textile technology, ICT, agricultural science, business studies]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours of instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Examinations

Examinations are required at the end of Years 8 and 12 for further progression to Years 9 and 13 respectively. During 2006, 93% of enrolled students sat the Year 8 National Examinations, an increase of 2% from the previous year. For Year 12 students, the number of students sitting the examinations was lower in 2006 than the previous two years as enrolments in year 12 during 2006 were lower than in 2005. The dropout rate from Years 12 to...
13 was 37% for 2006-7, which was lower than in the previous year and the lowest in the decade with the exception of 2003-4.

At the end of Year 13 students may sit the Pacific Senior Secondary Certificate [PSSC] examination, which is administered by the South Pacific Board of Educational Assessment, and which is essential for admission to the NUS. Faculties within the NUS determine the pass standard required in the PSSC for entry into that faculty.

According to the ADB’s document for the SchoolNet and Community Access Project of November 2007 [page 30], “[the] Samoa primary education literacy level one [year 4] and two [year 6] tests, which assess students’ risk of not reaching literacy and numeracy standards, as well as year 8 examinations, indicate unsatisfactory results. For example, in year 4, students at risk in English increased from 29% in 1997 to 51% in 2003; in year 6, students at risk in numeracy increased from 63% in 1997 to 71% in 2003. In year 8, raw scores in all five subject areas tested declined. At the secondary level, scores on the year 12 examination in the 15 subject areas declined over the 5 years between 1997 and 2002. Though they increased in most subjects in 2004, they remain low. In the 2005 Samoa School Certificate examination, the average grade in core subjects was 31% in mathematics, 37% in English, 22% in geography, and 53% in agricultural science and general science. Although questions may be asked about the reliability, validity, and suitability of these tests to accurately measure changes in student performance over time, fundamental problems are affecting school education in Samoa”.

Data on the scores on the national year 8 and 12 examinations, incorporated into the completion report for the Samoa: Education Sector Project of December 2007 [page 41] are reflected below.

### Table 6: Average Raw Scores at National Year 8 Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Science</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Education Sector Project records from revised project framework and Project Completion Report Mission calculations.

### Table 7: Average Raw Scores at National Year 12 Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Science</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing/Computer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Textiles</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Technology</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Education Sector Project records from revised project framework and Project Completion Report Mission calculations.

From the same source [page 42], scores at the PSSC [per subject] are reflected in the table below for the period 2001-2005.
In addition to the above formal examinations, tests are also administered to identify students at risk in English, Samoan and numeracy. The Samoa Primary Education Literacy Levels [SPELL] One and Two Tests are administered in Years 4 and 6 respectively in the areas of Samoan, English and numeracy. Results for the SPELL One tests indicated that students at risk increased in English for boys and girls during 2006 when compared to 2005 and 2004. Students at risk in Samoan in 2005 continued a run of reductions in the percentage of students at risk for boys and not for girls. For numeracy, 3-4% reductions were evident in students at risk in 2006, which has the highest attrition rate of the three subjects in the test. Girls were significantly less at risk than boys in all subjects.

For SPELL Two results, students were less at risk in 2006 compared with 2005 in all areas except two where they were on par with 2005 scores. According to MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006 – June 2015 [page 41], “achievements in the SPELL tests have improved over the last 3 years. There’s been a steady reduction in the number of students considered “at risk”, especially at year 4”.

G. Teacher Salaries

The Samoan “Teaching Profession Career and Salary Structure July 2005-July 2007” distinguishes between Salary Grades T1 to T8 for primary, secondary and college level teachers and [vice] principals [with salary amounts being equal for all three levels]. Within each grade there are five [T4] or six levels, while T8 distinguishes only four levels. The teacher salary structure follows the salary structure of the Samoan public service, which comprises 15 brackets, i.e. from A1/L1 to SpGr 1 and SpGr 2, subdivided into five or six sub-levels. The following table provides information on the different salary grades and levels, related titles and requirements as well as salaries as at July 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary grade</th>
<th>Position level</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>25% of 42% (01/01/07)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Beginning Teacher</td>
<td>Diploma in any of the teaching subjects from a recognised tertiary Institution</td>
<td>11026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progression to Level 1 having a satisfactory PA year report</td>
<td>11819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary/Secondary/College teacher Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TA discussed teachers’ salaries, particularly as they relate to nurses, noting the parity in salaries as per the chart on the right. Other government servants’ salaries may be up to 50% higher for comparable years of service. One service, the police service, has higher salary scale altogether under a special award.
H. Teacher Development

H1 Pre-service Teacher Training

a) The Faculty of Education [FOE] at NUS

The Faculty of Education [FOE] at the National University of Samoa [NUS] has the primary role as provider of teacher training. In the NUS Calendar 2007 the teacher education programmes offered by the Faculty are:

- Foundation Certificate in Education [FCE], which was launched in 2004
- The 2-Year Diploma in Education [Dip.Ed.] programme for pre-service students
- The 4-Year Bachelor of Education degree [B.Ed.] programme for pre- and in-service students
- The one-year Graduate Diploma of Education programme for graduates with first degrees from recognized universities who wish to gain a professional qualification for teaching

The FOE has a teaching faculty of 21 academic staff. The budget for 2006-2007 was $150,000\(^9\) compared to Faculty of Arts, $100,000, Faculty of Commerce $150,000, Faculty of Science $200,000 and Nursing $75,000. The status of FOE resources in 2007 is the result of reforms carried out in which programs were restructured in order to deploy the resources needed for effective teacher education. As a result of an external review of the faculty in 2004, NUS is also deploying additional resources by way of equipment and other hardware for FOE.

The Effective Full Time Student [EFTS] approach to funding has been abandoned. The present process provides for a base figure for funding after discussions between the Budget Officer and Deans. This is followed by the movement of funds between faculties with a surplus [e.g. Commerce] and those with a deficit [e.g. Education].

All lecturers at NUS are expected to teach, conduct research and provide service to the community/university and discipline. Their workload allocation is 40% teaching; 40% research, and 20% service to the community. Currently adherence by FOE to the workload allocation is similar to other faculties of NUS. All FOE teaching staff are also required to complete the NUS Annual Academic and Teaching Staff Appraisal.

Two FOE staff obtained Ph.D.s between 2001 and 2005 and currently another 2 are pursuing Ph.D.s [one by distance and one offshore]. Following amalgamation with the NUS in 1997, the FOE had only two master’s degree holders among its staff. At present, there are now five master degree holders with five more completing their master’s degrees by distance and one offshore. Consequently the majority of FOE staff are engaged in research work through their studies, which in turn could be expected to inform the work that they do. The Centre of Samoa Studies facilitates research publication by staff of NUS.

\(^9\) In Samoan Tala [WST].
(1) **Foundation Certificate of Education [FCE]**

Since the launch of the FCE in 2004, the following enrolments were recorded by the NUS Student Services Section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An issue noted with respect to enrolment is the quality of recruits. The present entry criteria in terms of PSSC scores do not necessarily select the more able students, although this is a difficult assumption to test. A related issue is the requirement for primary teacher training recruits to have studied mathematics up to at least Year 12. The difficulty here is that mathematics is not compulsory in Years 12 and 13.

The maintenance of the entry criteria at a comparatively low level for initial teacher training is a function of the current teacher demand, and it is unlikely that the entry score will be varied significantly in the interests of quality improvement until this demand for teachers declines.

The attrition rate from the FCE is considerable as shown in table 11 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in which students started</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Total enrolment</th>
<th>% Graduating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>46.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>45.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>40.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since NUS has only recently started with tracking graduate destinations, the reasons for this high attrition rate are not fully known. It may be partly explained by the fact that not all students were sponsored by MESC, and that some use the lower entry criteria for the FCE to gain university admission. Other factors affecting attrition may include the academic quality of the students, low interest in and lack of relevance of the courses offered, low motivation attributable to the teaching, content and assessment of courses, and English language competence. Once the NUS tracking system is in place, a more definitive set of reasons may emerge.

Historically, students attending Teachers College paid fees and were issued with stationery. However teacher education students attending NUS have the same status as all other students as NUS policy does not mandate the issue of student stationery. Consequently there is a perceived lack of resources and equipment for teacher education students which may lead to reduced quality of the students’ training.

(2) **Diploma of Education [Dip.Ed.] program**

An FOE student is not considered a teacher trainee until enrolled in the first year of the 2-year Dip.Ed.; therefore FOE students are not considered as teacher trainees.

The attrition rates for the Dip.Ed. Program are high. For example, during 2006 there were 310 students enrolled in semester 1, while only 239 enrolled in semester 2, giving an attrition rate of 22%. This has fallen in 2007 with 261 enrolled in semester 1 and 230 enrolled in semester 2, giving an attrition rate of 11.8%. Completion rates for the Dip.Ed. are therefore an issue, with 205 enrolled in 2005, and with only 80 graduates in 2006, of which at least 8 did not proceed to teach in MESC.
Clear inefficiencies result when scholarship trainees funded by MESC fail to complete their training or complete it but do not move to work in MESC schools. The reasons for this attrition are unclear, as the NUS has only just begun tracking the destination of graduates and the reasons for students dropping out.

The ensuing issues arising are how to remedy the loss between enrolment and graduation, and graduation and employment in MESC. A number of options are available including MESC discontinuing student support and reverting to fees with or without the support of a loans’ scheme or a similar alternative, reimbursement of student fees if graduates proceed to teach with MESC, and reduced support for the number of students in the FC and the Dip.Ed. with reallocated funds to support teachers taking up the B. Ed. studies as a form of IST support.

Alternate methods of training might also be considered such as crash courses as proposed for ESP II or employing and licensing persons as teachers who are assessed as competent but without teaching qualifications.

(3) **Approaches to teaching practice**

Since amalgamation with NUS, the FOE has struggled to establish a good model for Teaching Practice [TP] of an uninterrupted four weeks in schools. After eight years, the model considered to be most useful is:

- students take most of their courses serviced by other university faculties during the foundation year;
- timetable FOE courses during the second and third year to enable students to spend the four uninterrupted weeks of TP in the schools without having to return to university for lectures;
- FOE taught courses are made up of ten weeks of university instruction and four weeks of TP [for each of four semesters] in the two years for the Dip.Ed.

The limitations of the Practicum are caused by a range of reasons including:

- The time allocated and the timing of the Practicum;
- The lack of incentives for associate teachers, principals and schools as FOE partners in teacher training.

(4) **Alternative delivery modes**

Distance/multi-media delivery modes are being explored by NUS for all of its programs. There are many teachers who are on Savai’i and the outer rural areas of Upolu who wish to pursue further studies but cannot because of distance from NUS. The newly established SchoolNet system has the potential to provide distance delivery modes for teachers. The effectiveness of this delivery mode has been largely unexplored in Samoa as currently there is limited capacity in the system for extensive distance/multi-media teacher development delivery.

b) **University of the South Pacific**

Through the University of the South Pacific [USP] office in Savai’i, it is possible for students to complete a B.Ed. degree, and therefore it is regarded as a teacher development in-
stitution. Three teachers have completed the B.Ed. at USP, where part of their course was completed by distance mode and part at USP. The students were provided with scholarships.

The fees at USP are almost double those at FOE, making this option for teacher development very expensive; however a loan system for students is under consideration. Given that there is no ongoing incentive from MESC to complete a B.Ed. at USP. Formerly USP and FOE had an MOU for cross crediting of courses, however this has now lapsed.

H2 In-Service Teacher Training

a) Introduction

There have been a number of external teacher in-service providers including various institutions such as Auckland College of Education, Auckland University, UN agencies such as UNESCO and technical assistance through donor projects. Locally, ad hoc non-continuous program providers have included the health department, the police traffic department, and the agriculture department. The only local formal providers have been USP and NUS, which provide formal qualifications as well as in-service training whenever the need arises. There are a number of other Government agencies that have provided in-service training in the past or have the potential to provide such training, and these are described below.

b) The NUS FOE Bachelor of Education Program

The B.Ed. is a hybrid award capable of being a first degree achieved at the end of four years of teacher training, or alternatively teachers start teaching after two years training having achieved a Dip.Ed. and follow a stairway progression from the Dip.Ed. to the B.Ed. This route provides not only professional development but also the potential to improve qualifications and salaries.

The number of teachers enrolled in the B.Ed. is small: 34 in 2005, 46 in 2006 and 36 in 2007; in-service teachers are in the majority accounting for 75% of enrolment in 2005, 77% in 2006 and 80% in 2007. An assumption therefore is that teachers who can afford the fees are indeed using the B.Ed for professional development and improving their qualifications. However the small number of teachers enrolling is of concern if MESC intends, as stated in the Strategic Plan, to make teaching a degreed profession, especially as [a] there is no scholarship scheme to support in-service teachers while pursuing the B.Ed. and [b] there is a lack of school level support for attending classes.

Consequently the B.Ed is generally not the first choice for teacher professional development, possibly because of its length, the courses on offer, and the lack of incentive for completion [although there is a salary grade at T4 for persons with a B.Ed. and four years’ teaching experience]. There is a possible benefit from moving elsewhere in the public or private sectors. Other restraints on proceeding to a B.Ed. have been the general lack of its promotion in MESC and, in particular, the lack of support from school principals. An additional discouragement may be the 15% increase in NUS fees in 2007.

The situation may be improved with a proposal by MESC to support ten teachers a year for B.Ed. studies in 2008. Given the low return for MESC’s investment in the NUS Foundation and Dip.Ed. Courses, the cost of supporting B.Ed. studies could be met by capping the
number of students in these two programs. For example the Foundation Course could be limited to 100 students, and the savings diverted to the B.Ed. program.

Outside of the formal B.Ed. program, FOE staff are not always available for other teacher in-service activities when these are held during the NUS academic year. Partnerships between the formal providers and MESC have not been formalized e.g. between NUS and MESC or between MESC and USP. However, there are general understandings, for example, NUS and USP market their teacher development courses and teachers as individuals freely choose the program in which they wish to enroll.

c) Other In-service Providers

(1) The Oloamanu Centre

The Oloamanu Centre for Professional Development and Continuing Education was first set up in January 2006 and absorbed the previous Staff Development Centre of the Samoan Polytechnic as a result of the Polytechnic and NUS merger. The Centre comprises a Director, who also teaches, three professional staff, and one secretary. The Centre reports directly to the Vice Chancellor of the NUS and is funded from the NUS annual budget.

The current Director of the Centre, the former Dean of Education at the FOE, divides her time approximately 70:30 between teaching and administration. Two professional staff known as Professional Development Officers are full-time teachers and the third one divides his time approximately 50:50 between teaching and administration.

The Centre has a number of roles and responsibilities including:

- training of all teaching staff at the NUS. This role has extended to members of the Samoa Association of Technical and Vocational Education Training Institutions [SAT-VETI] as a result of the direct involvement of the previous CEO of the Polytechnic in that organization;
- coordination and eventual management of the In Country Training program;
- management of the Executive Development Program for the senior executives in the public sector; and
- development of the distance learning facility for the university.

Moreover, the Centre is to ensure that all programs offered on a short-term basis [professional and continuing education courses] by the university through its schools and faculties are of good quality. The Centre provides curriculum revision expertise and course design support. It is through the Centre that all community courses and continuing education courses by the university are facilitated.

The Centre offers courses leading to a Graduate Certificate of Attainment in Adult Education and a Graduate Certificate of Achievement in Adult Education. The Centre has joined with the Commonwealth of Learning in its Virtual University for the Small States of the Commonwealth [VUSSC] enterprise. This is to provide training for course design on print based, online and virtual classroom e-learning.

There is the potential for the Centre to offer a range of professional development programs in education, and just not for teachers. The Executive's Development Program, which is an accredited professional development course equivalent to the first year of a master’s degree...
for Assistant Chief Executive Officer [ACEO] in the Public Service, is one example of such a course. The Centre could, therefore, play a pivotal role in advancing professional development for MESC and/or mediating the outsourcing of professional development requirements.

The Centre is housed in a small building that is only just adequate for the present staffing and student complements. Resources are very limited with only one desktop computer available for students. Internet connection through wireless to the NUS network is available and is now very efficient. There is no library, however the capacity enhancement plan for the Centre includes the addition of several computers with Internet connection to provide an electronic library.

The Centre has an approved budget within the NUS budget, however this is inadequate for the required equipment, consumables, and other resources required for teaching, and is expected to generate its own revenue to provide these needs. As the Centre assumes its responsibility for distance modes of teaching-learning, considerable hardware will be required, and thus funding has been sought from the Public Sector Infrastructure Facility.

(2) MESC: The Curriculum Materials and Assessment Division

The Curriculum Materials and Assessment Division [CMAD] is divided into six units; Primary, Secondary, Special Needs, Languages, Educational Broadcasting, and Assessment. The main roles are curriculum and materials development and assessment, and within each of these areas there is a responsibility for professional development. Recent curriculum and materials development activities have included developing, implementing and reviewing Early Childhood Education [ECE] curricula, and developing new curricula and materials for years 9 to 13 within ESP I. For ESP II, primary curricula will be developed, trialed and implemented.

In the area of assessment, CMAD has the responsibility for annual National assessments including:

- Literacy and numeracy assessments for Years 4 and 6;
- Year 8 selection examinations;
- Year 12 and 13 examinations.

The principal training programs in CMAD comprise curriculum/subject in-servicing. In 2006, for example, in-servicing was undertaken of all secondary teachers in the new curriculum and materials. Training is designed and delivered by subject taught and year level.

Trainers are selected from subject committees, FOE, NUS and USP staff, and they are provided with a three-day training program. The trainers are paid WST100 per day, and usually conduct five day workshops with teachers and report on proceedings.

A focus of training in recent times has been multi-grade teaching [MGT], which is often regarded as a second-rate mode of education, however requires teachers more highly trained than single grade teachers. CMAD endeavours to involve School Review Officers [SROs] in curriculum in-service training programs, inviting their participation at the site of the training. SROs are key players in MGT in-servicing, along with SOD, with CMAD developing the training modules.
CMAD has a flexible approach to in-service training and responds to all requests from other MESC divisions and schools.

CMAD comprises an Assistant CEO and 35 staff. All staff have come from the teaching force except one person responsible for Special Needs education, who has had training experience with blind persons in previous employment. In addition to their formal capacity building activities, CMAD staff undertake monitoring of teachers on an annual basis; they also respond to particular requests from principals and provide remedial support where it is required.

CMAD is located separately from MESC, but close to the main office. It is presumed that CMAD will be housed in the new education office being constructed under ESP II.

The two main functions of CMAD – curriculum and assessment – receive close to equal funding. The complaint is that despite the assessment being replicated every year with equal or increasing numbers of students to be assessed, the budget is reduced.

d) Other organizations that may impact on teacher development

(1) MESC: School Operation Division

MESC is responsible for teacher development for the public education sector, whilst also assisting the private sector. The responsible division within MESC is the School Operation Division [SOD], under the Assistant CEO. There are two MESC officers directly responsible for teacher development. In undertaking their mandate, SOD is able to draw on other expertise such as CMAD and FOE [NUS].

Along with the general mandate to provide professional development for teachers, the Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006 – June 2015, [“Strategic Plan”] for teacher development requires more specifically that:

- Teachers will be supported through regular in-service training programs;
- All teachers in the public sector will hold a professional qualification in teaching (currently approximately 6% of the teaching force do not hold a professional qualification);
- Professional development courses for teachers will be offered via open and distance learning; and
- Monitoring and evaluation of all teacher development activities will be reviewed and strengthened.

The published training program from SOD for 2007 includes induction courses for principals and a diabetes awareness programs run jointly with the Ministry of Health. Library and Literacy team visits as well as programs for SRO and teachers are also scheduled and planned. The principal classroom emphasis is on multi-grade teaching funded by the Pacific Regional Initiative in the Development of Basic Education [PRIDE].

The SOD is housed in the office of MESC. The present inadequate premises are being replaced under ESP II. The new offices are expected to be completed in the second half of 2008.

In terms of funding, approximately three percent of the MESC budget is spent on teacher development.
(2) **Samoan Qualifications Authority**

Although not established as, nor intended to be, a training provider, it is pertinent to mention the role of the Samoan Qualifications Authority [SQA] in this context. Established by an Act of Parliament, the SQA has amongst its principal functions, the accreditation of post-school courses, which by definition include teacher development programs.

Policies, criteria and standards for registration and accreditation of providers and programs are being fine-tuned. The Samoa Qualifications Framework has been developed, and the process is underway for the selection and training of assessors of courses for credit. When the SQA is fully operational, it will be of considerable benefit to MESC, FOE, USP and other providers. It should also guarantee to employers that outsourcing post-secondary professional development could be undertaken with confidence.

(3) **Externally funded projects**

In addition to formal in-service programs organized under MESC, there has been considerable effort under donor funded projects [accounting for 80% of all teacher training as observed above]. These include the following:

- The AIDAB Western Samoa Secondary Teachers Professional Development Project 1992-94. This project was to upgrade the knowledge and skills of junior secondary teachers who had only primary training. The project was in response to a request by the DOE for in-service training to support the junior high school curriculum project that was put in place by AIDAB from 1985-1990. Almost all teachers in the junior high schools were trained as well as training activities directed mainly for the subject organizers to be trainers.
- SPBEA Training for teachers on internal assessment, assessment for learning and monitoring of school based assessment focusing on School Certificate and PSSC subjects. This had been going on periodically since 1996. Many secondary teachers continue to be part of this training.
- The NZODA Teacher Quality Improvement Project 1991-1996 [TEQIP], which undertook activities in e.g. [a] curriculum revision of the teacher education/training programs for primary and secondary teacher trainees; [b] staff development through workshops and attachments in New Zealand for staff of the Teachers Colleges that were later on merged with WUS [1997]; [c] scholarships to study towards first degrees in New Zealand; [d] provision of books, videos, journals and other resources.
- The UNESCO/NZODA Supporting Teacher Education in Pacific Schools [STEPS] project 1996-2003. This regional project provided in-school support for teachers in five secondary schools; Avele, Samoa, Vaimauga, Faleata and Leifiifi and three primary schools in Samoa. Adviser teams or single technical people worked over periods of time helping to improve staff practice.
- AUSAID Primary Education Materials Project 1 and 2 [1995-2001] provided in-service training for almost all of the primary school teachers in Samoa. The impact of this training was generally very positive; however more accurate details are not recorded.
- The NZODA Samoa Secondary Education and Resources Project [SSECRP] 1998-2004. In-service training focused on workshops to develop the curriculum statements for the new single stream curriculum, and training SRO, principals and teachers on the
understanding of these curriculum statements once they were ready. All secondary
teachers had a three day training, designed to promote understanding of school man-
gagement requirements for implementing the new curriculum, while SRO were trained
on in-service related duties.

- ADB Education Sector Project I, 2001-2004. Part of this project included the design
and implementation of in-service training to enable teachers to teach the NZODA
funded new curriculum which at that stage had produced pupils resource books and
teachers guides in all subjects up to year 11 and was intending to use commercially pro-
duced books for years 12 and 13. For primary teacher training, the ESP I TA in primary
in-service training produced six modules for the training of teachers which included ge-
neric skills and interactive methodology. Training completed in 2005 and all primary
school teachers were trained in these modules.

- Within the frame of the joint EU/NZAID Pacific Regional Initial Initiatives for the De-
livery of Basic Education [PRIDE] project [since 2003], teacher training has been under-
taken. E.g. in-service training was provided for secondary school teachers in five subject
areas of Computer Studies; Health and Physical Education; Performing Arts; Visual
Arts; and Music. Teachers were trained on the effective use of curriculum statements
and teaching guides.

Due to the very nature of these project based activities, delivery would not have been sus-
tained or institutionalized. It would therefore be desirable that future training activities of
this type be embedded in a suitable framework that provides a systematic and coordinated
approach to teacher development.

H3 Analysis and Recommendations

From the above overview it can be concluded that from an institutional and organizational
perspective, pre-service training activities are currently not well coordinated with in-service
activities. Attrition from pre-service programs is a serious problem. This situation is further
compounded by the lack of incentives for undertaking teacher development, resulting in for
example a very limited uptake and staircasing from Dip.Ed. to B.Ed., which is also not
helped by the lack of support for teachers, especially in part-time situations. Also, academic
or other credits for teacher development are not systematized, which again results in a mini-
mal take-up.

On the issues of pre-service and in-service teacher training, please also refer to section III B5 and III D1 of
this report. See also section III C2 which provides minimum standards for teacher training institu-
tional/organizational capacity to deliver appropriate types and levels of teacher training programmes.

Further, the institutions responsible for in-service activities are stretched in terms of per-
sonnel and resources. For example, two functions of the MESC TDU are to coordinate the
supply of technical expertise for training and to conduct training in collaboration with
CMAD and other training providers. However the TDU capacity is stretched in delivering
training, and the use of a limited pool of providers means that effective coverage is limited.
The outsourcing of teacher development has not yet been developed to its full extent.

Recommended options to meet the increasing demands for professional development in-
clude:

- Increase the number of personnel in SOD with responsibility for professional develop-
ment;
Establish a Professional Development Division within MESC;
Continue and expand support of CMAD, FOE and NUS;
Outsource some teacher development to providers who are competent and capable of delivering professional development courses, as approved by SQA.

Within MESC and schools there needs to be a broader conceptualization of teacher development to include the broader school community and sections of MESC itself. While MESC supports on-site, in situ classroom/school based teacher development, this is not occurring to the extent necessary for effective whole school performance and improvement of student achievement. Here it is recommended that capacity in schools be developed to enable them to foster their own community of professionals by linking community and school. Further, it is important that teacher development be seen as a continuous process from pre-service through to in-service, especially school based training.

Practice teaching is an essential component of teacher training; however it appears as if this school-based training has become problematic as tertiary institutions and MESC have separate mandates, staffing, rules and so on. The FOE’s mandate is to provide a Dip.Ed./B.Ed. through NUS approved courses in which school-based training has little place, except for the practicum. There is a need to improve the quality of this school-based training, and recommendations for achieving this are:

- Ensuring the practicum is provided a dedicated allocation by FOE and MESC in school-based training programmes, in which teacher trainees and practicing teachers can focus entirely on the requirements of the practicum as school-based teacher training;
- Nominating “FOE Partner Schools” after visitations and discussion with principals and teachers, which will remain constant for as long as is agreed;
- Nominating “FOE Partner Teachers” after visitations and discussion with principals and teachers, which will remain constant for as long as is agreed;
- A statement clearly setting out for all parties, including the trainees, what the expected purpose, inputs and outcomes of the Practicum are, including:
  - The number of days in schools before students will be required to engage in teaching;
  - The number of periods and the details of the classes they will be required to teach;
  - The expected role of FOE staff in the Practicum, including the preparation for it and follow-up to it;
  - The assessment of the Practicum. The presentation of a Portfolio should be required of all trainee teachers to complete the Practicum, apart from classroom and other assessment.

It is important that key personnel in the school community such as Principals, SRO, School Committee members and parents are supportive of classroom reforms. However this is difficult if they are not all fully informed or involved. For example, the TDU in SOD deals with teacher development, however there appears to be no clear written function in SOD that includes the training of SROs who play an important role in school performance and improvement [see in this respect also chapter E of section III of this report which, amongst others, makes suggestions on the Teacher Development Unit of SOD within the framework of the NDTF’s organizational set-up]. The Training Schedule School Calendar Year 2007 showed limited training for teachers, Principals and SROs. One of the root causes of the
limited activity in the TDU, and SOD in general, is the fact that there were five unfilled staff positions.

Distance and Flexible Learning support for teacher development is an area that needs to be explored, as it is occurring to a very limited extent through the USP office in Savai'i for students completing their B.Ed.

The monitoring and evaluation [M&E] of teacher development, particularly in relation to the meeting of teachers’ needs identified in their Performance Appraisal [PA], is not sufficient to adequately inform on school improvements both in feedback to the school and for MESC requirements. Similarly, the teacher development data entry on the teachers’ profile is lacking which proves inefficient for recording and planning future activities. It is therefore recommended that M&E of teacher development be clearly embedded in MESC systems and actively used for planning purposes.

Another recommendation is the re-conceptualization of the role in schools of SRO. There is the potential to give these officers a more important role of introducing school and teaching/learning innovations.

Reforms are required and these should be linked to other initiatives in the areas of teacher accreditation, rewards and incentives, and the Teacher Professional Standards.

I. **Teacher Development finance**

I1 **Situation analysis**

There is no financial model for training in use at present. Moreover, the available data indicate a strong reliance on external donor funding of teacher development, which hampers its sustainability. Developing a financial model for teacher development in a bottom up manner furthermore proved impossible due to the lack of accurate financial data. The use of a fixed and variable model would improve understanding of teacher training costs. However, this will depend on the ability of MESC and the Government to revisit its funding policies in this area.

I2 **Recommendations**

In order to reduce dependency on external funding, financing of teacher development needs to be seriously considered by all stakeholders, i.e. Government, communities, parents, students and teachers themselves. A more balanced sourcing of funding needs to be realized [Government, cost recovery mechanisms, teacher contributions, donor funding] for this purpose.

MESC and Government should consider an awareness programme to ensure that communities and parents are aware of the costs of teacher development. Government should also consider an appropriate cost recovery mechanism.
J. Teacher Recruitment and Retention

J1 Situation Analysis

a) Teacher Recruitment

During the school year a combined MESC and FOE team visits schools and addresses every sixth form class about teaching as a career. In some years this team is very proactive, in other years the program has not been actively carried out.

The current recruitment process commences with MESC advertising for students intending to apply to study at the FOE/NUS to register firstly at MESC. Interviews are conducted by MESC and checks made that they satisfy the NUS entry requirements. Applicants are allocated into either primary or secondary training and these lists are then forwarded to FOE/NUS for enrolment. FOE/NUS checks that the NUS minimum requirements are met and students are then enrolled.

MESC pays the fees for all its sponsored students. In the past three years, FOE was not represented at the student interviews; this has been redressed in the pre-service recruitment for 2007.

Current MESC policies and procedures for the allocation and distribution of teachers to schools is outlined in the School Staffing Manual where teacher allocation is based on a teacher-student ratio worked from actual enrolment data, with the teacher-student ratio of 1:30 for primary schools and 1:20 for secondary schools. Special entitlements apply for small schools with flexibility to address the subject requirements in secondary schools. The introduction of the school staffing policy has been a significant move towards a more equitable distribution of teachers.

However, there are limitations in meeting the needs of some individual schools, particularly small rural schools. While most schools fall within the policy guidelines, there are still schools that have a shortage of teachers, whereas others may have a surplus. The expansion of the system and development of new curriculum areas, particularly in secondary education, has not kept pace with teacher development to enable qualified teachers to teach in these new curriculum areas.

Many other factors affect the efforts to effectively distribute or place teachers to meet school needs. These include teacher preferences for where they want to teach, teacher attrition, resignations, retirements, dismissals, maternity and other leave. All these factors need to be considered to ensure that students are not left without a teacher and are being taught by qualified teachers. There is a need to review current policy taking full consideration of all relevant factors.

b) Teacher Retention

Data for 2007 at the time of the TA showed that 34 teachers have become “unavailable”. Eleven for family reasons, six terminated or resigned, five moved to other positions in MESC, four relocated overseas, and for five teachers no explanation was available.
The Government’s Strategic Plan to address teacher retention problems is a bonding system. However the MESC CEO commented during the TA Focus Group review on 8 May 2007 that the system is not working, and can and will not be enforced. The argument is that as long as persons who complete either the FOE Foundation Course or the Dip.Ed. or B.Ed. and leave the education system but continue to work in Samoa, they are an asset to the country. Under these conditions, MESC is carrying a training burden from which other public sector or private sector employers may benefit.

Teacher turnover is expensive, and this churning staff turnover requires administrators to find replacements, and the risk here is that quality teaching may be compromised in an effort to find sufficient teachers to staff the classrooms, which ultimately may impact on student achievement. In terms of implementing teaching reforms, the substantial investment in teacher training and school reform implementation may be lost to high rates of teacher turnover because the teachers that are trained leave before the reform can become established practice in schools.

It was beyond the scope of the current TA to conduct a full analysis of the causes of teacher attrition and retention, however the four major factors that generally influence whether and when teachers leave a specific school or the profession entirely are salary, working conditions, teacher preparation, and the mentoring support provided during the early years of teaching.

J2 Recommendations

There is a need to balance efforts to recruit and prepare high quality teachers with strong teacher retention strategies. The misperception that teacher shortages are the primary problem can have serious consequences, and may provide impetus for poor policy decisions such as attempting to offset high attrition rates by simply increasing the supply of replacements.

a) Recruitment

While teaching may offer a degree of status, career and financial stability, the Samoan teaching service increasingly needs to compete with other sectors for well-qualified staff. Consequently remuneration and career advancement opportunities need to be competitive.

Recommended incentive measures to attract good quality candidates into the profession include improved opportunities for career progression, professional development opportunities, pay and performance management systems that present or reinforce the image of the profession as an attractive one. Another important consideration in Samoa, given the high attrition rates, is a consideration of measures to attract back those who may have left the profession.

In addition to incentives, approaches to teacher education need to be examined. In Samoa teacher education has been entirely university based, and high attrition rates in these programs is a problem. Therefore, the development of different routes into teaching, such as employment based teacher training routes could be used to expand the supply and broaden the range of good quality candidates who enter the teaching profession. For example, the pattern of teacher education could be diversified with more involvement of schools in the initial training. This has the advantage of linking teacher education with practice and real-life
classroom situations, and has a positive effect of teacher supply since trainee teachers are serving while being trained.

On the issue of teacher recruitment, please also refer to section III B1 of this report. Furthermore, the Articles 15 to 18 of the draft Teaching Professional Bill provided in Appendix 4, concern inter alia basic criteria on who may teach in a school.

b) Retention

Essentially, the retention of good teachers requires positive reinforcement of the factors that may have influenced their initial recruitment. This needs to be coupled with opportunities for development and progression that can be of benefit to teachers themselves, schools and pupils. A three-part strategy is recommended:

- A whole-school approach to establish and support strong learning communities;
- Teacher preparation programs that set and meet high standards. Short-term, quick-fix approaches to placing teachers in the classroom will simply fuel high teacher attrition rates;
- Implement professionally rewarding career paths for teachers, with mentoring and support programs for new teachers.

Another issue that needs to be addressed is what happens when a teacher decides to resign. There needs to be a systematic process of exit interviews to ensure that Principals and MESC managers know why people are resigning and perhaps provide the opportunity for finding solutions to any problems which may be encouraging a teacher to leave.

K. Human Resource Management

K1 Introduction

Human Resource Planning in MESC is severely limited, given the staff available for the tasks required and the number of unfilled vacant positions. SOD alone has five positions vacant. Demand for more staff will accelerate with the introduction of the appraisal system for all MESC personnel, and particularly for teachers and principals.

The following sections will consider the HRM areas of Teacher Licensing, Performance Appraisal, Conditions of Service, and EMIS.

K2 Teacher Licensing

a) Situation Analysis

There are currently no national minimum professional standards established for teachers, which if met, entitles them to obtain a license or be registered as a practicing teacher. Teachers are certified after a probationary period of two years. In government schools certification is based on the teacher’s annual report. In non-government schools recommendations for certification of teachers come from their respective Directors. The School Review Officers visit and monitor these teachers. The demand for teachers may lead to unqualified teachers remaining in the teaching service. At present there are six such teachers.
b) **Recommendations**

Some teacher trainees are appointed to schools without completing their Dip.Ed. These teacher trainees seek to be posted closer to FOE/NUS to facilitate their return to complete courses. Clear guidelines must be provided and enforced for completion of their diploma to ensure a robust registration system and compliance with teacher standards.

Information on teacher registration ought to be maintained and fed into the Teachers’ Profiles and entered onto the EMIS. More comprehensive teacher data on teachers will enable a more comprehensive picture of teacher qualifications, experience, and professional development and outcomes of appraisal to be readily available. Such information reassures parents and the public that a national minimum standard for the teaching profession is available.

A broader issue is that teacher training and teacher employment and licensing are under different auspices. Even after two years probation, there may be different expectations by MESC of teachers and that for which their teacher training provided. It is noted that attempts are being made through dialogue between MESC and the FOE to alleviate this problem.

*On the issues of teacher certification and registration, please refer in particular to sections III B2, III C1 and III C3 of this report.*

**K3 Performance Appraisal**

a) **Situation Analysis**

A Performance Appraisal [PA] System has been established for all school personnel, and this is a key element in the MESC Human Resource Development Framework and NTDF. The focus of any such system should be to assess performance, identify and document aspects of performance over the year, and to facilitate the positive development of skills and knowledge in order to help improve performance.

However, the current PA is based on job descriptions rather than teachers’ competencies and standards. This emphasis on job descriptions occurred as a result of the original design of the PA system, and because competencies are not embedded in the training system. Consequently the PA is not designed specifically for the appraisal of teachers and principals, and therefore is not providing information on performance against standards and competencies.

As there is no adequate database, the PA data cannot be entered on teachers’ profiles and quality teacher development needs cannot be systematized. Reasons for these deficiencies include [a] the PA forms are not user friendly and [b] data from the PA is difficult to record for EMIS purposes. Additionally, the PA emphasizes a supervisory system rather than a holistic approach of self, peer and supervisory appraisal based in the school wide improvement process, which is not the most effective approach to teacher development.

b) **Recommendations**

A more teacher friendly PA process is required that can be linked to teacher licensing, salary increments, and promotion opportunities, and this should be compatible with the EMIS.
The PA system should distinguish between new teachers and experienced teachers, with adequate support systems. The PA should be linked to established Standards.

In the PA system, consideration should be given to a peer performance appraisal. Peer learning by students and teachers is often underrated, despite international literature advocating its extent and influence. Peer appraisal might be more significant in achieving quality improvement in teaching than advisory appraisal. A component of self-appraisal should also be included, allowing teachers to reflect on the performance indicators against which they will be assessed later in the year.

On the issue of performance appraisal of teachers, please also refer to the sections III B4, III C1, III C3 and III D3 of this report. Monitoring performance issues are also addressed in Part V of the Draft Teaching Professional Bill that is furnished in appendix 4 of this report. Purpose of this Part IV is “to provide a system for monitoring the performance of approved teachers to ensure that the teaching professions are maintained”.

K4 Conditions of Employment

a) Situation Analysis

Generally, as illustrated in chapter G, the promotional and salary increment opportunities for teachers are limited. In part this situation exists because MESC has not pursued a strong promotion policy. Compounding the problem is a Government decision to freeze the implementation of all increments.

The general lack of clear career pathways may result in trained teachers becoming untrained managers. This is the result of having only a single-track career pathway model instead of a range of pathways.

With some exceptions, government housing has been provided, and/or travel allowances were provided for teachers who may be placed away from home. When this has not been the case, costs are incurred by those teachers and efficiency losses may result.

General inefficiencies in the M&E of compliance with teachers’ conditions of service will ultimately impact on their conditions and work efficiency will be affected. Similarly, there is limited M&E of teachers’ compliance with duty statements resulting in inefficient use of teaching-learning time, providing a poor role model of teachers for students. The causes are varied but may include teachers’ attitudes, monitoring and feedback by principals.

b) Recommendations

There is a need to develop long-term sustainable career paths for all MESC staff through the linking of professional development, job performance and rewards. Issues of staff motivation need to be addressed by linking Professional Certification with career paths and appropriate salary increments related to job tasks. Further, there is a need to link training activities to proper rewards, recognition and career development opportunities in order to maintain staff commitment and motivation. There is a need to monitor principals also.

On the issue of teacher employment conditions, please also refer to the sections III B3, III B6, and III B8 of this report.
K5  Education Management Information System

a)  Situation Analysis

The MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015 states in 3.14 Information and Communications Technology [ICT] in Education: “The Ministry has made significant investments in computer hardware, software and training and now has a fully integrated computerized system. It utilises Ministry specific as well as Government wide management information systems”.

Clearly MESC has recognized the importance of gathering data and has provided personnel, equipment and materials. However there appears to be limited capacity in the analysis and use of the data collected. Consequently data may be collected and filed but not used for effective evaluation and monitoring of systems and functions. This situation is a result of lack of resources and trained personnel, probably as a lack of appropriate prioritization in budget allocations.

b)  Recommendations

Personnel training at all levels is required to maximize the EMIS. There is also a need to allocate dedicated and skilled staff to operate and manage the EMIS. Once the operational aspects can be improved, there needs to be increased and easy access to data which will improve the capacity of the EMIS to provide timely and useful feedback in M&E.

The issues of monitoring and evaluation as well as EMIS are further addressed in sections III B7 and III B9 as well as III D4 of this report.

K6  Broad HRM Recommendations

The current reform environment in Samoa is supportive of improvements in staff development and reward systems, minimum standards and staff performance appraisal systems, and therefore linkages between staff development, job performance and reward systems. However what appears to be lacking is any provision for the development of a clear and comprehensive HRM “roadmap”, including MESC capacity building in HRM policy development and facilitation of the necessary organizational mandates required for the institutionalization of these processes.

In the absence of an adequate HRM policy framework there is the long-term risk that staff development activities and other reforms will become increasingly wasteful of resources due to poor targeting and ineffective strategic planning.

Therefore there is the need for staff development and rewards systems to be conceptualized within a broad HRM policy framework. This framework would need to involve determinations and strategic planning in the areas of staff utilization and turnover, in addition to supply and demand forecasting. Additionally, a range of policy issues associated with employment must be dealt with, including for example job descriptions, staff recruitment and selection processes.

In the process of developing and institutionalizing a MESC HRM system, capacity development will be required in: i) technical skill development; ii) organizational development [changes in policy and operational processes]; and iii) system development.
L. Work Environment

L1 Situation Analysis

Despite some ameliorations in school teaching-learning environments, there is still considerable room for improvement as observed during the teacher profiling and school observations undertaken by the TA. This is, at least to a certain extent, also confirmed by the incomplete data on teaching and learning facilities provided in section D3 above. Given that international studies show that teachers regard an attractive work environment as more important than salary increments, attention to the former may have considerable benefits in retaining teachers – in addition to enabling the implementation of new teaching and learning approaches and curricula. A comprehensive inventory of available facilities will be needed.

MESC central office staff currently work in poor conditions and are situated in different buildings. However this situation will be improved under ESP II when the new office for central administration is constructed.

L2 Recommendations

The consideration of school teaching-learning and work environments in isolation of the broader school and community environment is an oversimplification of a complex issue. In recent years approaches to reform have been based on the assumption that school reform, to bring about measurable improvement, must embrace a whole-school [or comprehensive school] approach that involves home, school, and community. Typical components include School Based Management [SBM], Community Participation [CP], and approaches to active student learning. Where these initiatives have been implemented, SBM has created a sense of responsibility through open school management. This openness has raised the level of trust, motivation and level of support from parents and the community, and this increases the potential to improve community support and funding. It is recommended that these types of initiatives be undertaken in Samoa to improve the working environment of teachers and ultimately teaching-learning environments.

M. Teaching Methodologies

M1 Situation Analysis

Classroom observations made during the TA suggest that some improvements are required in teaching methodologies. For example, the classroom practices observed included the use of chanting or whole class responses, and teachers relying on corporal punishment as a classroom management tool. This therefore brings into question the effectiveness and sustainability of ESP I activities in this area. Additionally, while curriculum introduction may have been effective, there appeared to be widespread complaints from teachers generally about the failure of ESP I to deliver all the support materials proposed.

Student focused learning practices were occasionally observed by the TA team during classroom observations, but were by no means standard practice. Multi-grade teaching was still a real challenge for some teachers, despite the in-service training which has been provided.
The lack of teachers also takes its toll on likely successful class practice. Teachers required to teach as “volunteers”, i.e. teaching in a curriculum area for which they are not trained, readily admit their limitations in terms of curriculum content and classroom techniques.

**M2 Recommendations**

Questions concerning the effectiveness of teacher professional development will arise when teachers attending these programs are unable to implement new ideas for teaching in their classrooms. Consequently, these teachers invariably find themselves teaching in the same way that they have done prior to engaging in professional development activities.

In developed and developing countries, new approaches to TD have emerged over time. Against the background of the above assessment, it is recommended that within the Samoan context the following characteristics of these new approaches should guide future teacher development activities:

- An initial determination of needs, interests, and strengths of teachers and other staff is essential before professional development activities are designed.
- Apart from close consultation about their needs, teachers, principals and other local participants along with administrative officials need to be involved in planning the program. The most effective and relevant in-service programs are those that allow high levels of local participation in both the design and implementation. There is also sometimes a need to involve local parents and community members. Here, teachers, principals, and teacher educators work as a team in the school to educate the community about its schools, the curriculum, and at the same time learn about the characteristics of the local children and families.
- The in-service curriculum needs to provide a balance of pedagogy and subject matter and include practical methods to teach subject matter.
- Teachers in rural areas face special problems and in-service programs should deal with these.
- Programs that focus on continuous development to guide, monitor, and support necessary skills, knowledge, and new ideas tend to be more successful in bringing about change at the classroom level than those that seek quick fixes to fill up deficiencies or those that simply provide a qualification. This ongoing support is essential for effective transfer of skills and is easiest developed through the school-based model. The main support comes from within the school environment [e.g. principal, other teachers]. At the teacher level, support should be provided for: i] coaching in classroom skills and management from mentors and peers; ii] a continuing study group with other teachers with similar in-service experiences; and iii] coordination of the in-service training with the regular supervision of teachers.
III. POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR THE DRAFT NATIONAL TEACHER DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK [NTDF]

A. Draft NTDF Policy

**Vision:** An attractive, dynamic, and motivated teaching profession of qualified, trained and committed teachers who are able to encourage and improve student learning.

The principal NTDF policy is: The Government of Samoa through the Ministry of Education, Sports, and Culture [MESC] and appropriate partners will provide a teaching service of the highest possible quality.

The detailed policy framework to achieve this principal policy comprises the following five elements as outlined below:

1. Policies and procedures;
2. Minimum standards;
3. Guidelines;
4. Institutional structure; and
5. Reporting mechanisms.

A1 Policies and Procedures for a Draft NTDF

These policies and procedures address:

1. Pre-service Recruitment and Selection
2. Teacher Placement
3. Teacher Certification/Registration
4. Teacher Performance Appraisal
5. Professional Development
6. Career Pathways
7. Monitoring and Evaluation
8. Teachers’ Conditions of Employment
9. Education Management Information System [EMIS]

A2 Minimum Standards

Minimum standards are provided for:

1. primary and secondary teachers [professional baseline standards];
2. teacher training institutional/organizational capacity to deliver appropriate types and levels of teacher training programs;
3. monitoring and evaluation of teacher performance for initial registration and periodic reviews.
A3 Guidelines

Guidelines are provided for:

1. articulation between pre-service and in-service and other professional upgrade training programs;
2. accrediting pre-service and professional upgrades to formal qualifications;
3. developing teaching portfolios to evaluate classroom based performance of teachers;
4. monitoring institutional collaboration, joint projects with schools and/or teacher professional organizations in respective areas.

Guidelines accompanying the draft Teaching Profession Bill are provided in Appendix 4 of the report.

Guidelines for teacher remuneration and incentive schemes to ensure equity and fair distribution of teachers through the country need to be developed as well. These need to be based upon and take into account [an in-depth analysis] the current salary structures and non-financial reward/incentive systems for teachers as well as current overall public service regulations [and how teacher salaries fit within this broader framework] and policy reforms to adjust these regulations ¹⁰.

A4 The Draft NTDF Institutional Structure

The Draft NTDF Institutional Structure clarifies the role of the proposed new Teachers’ Body and the focus and functions of the three Units in the Schools Operation Division [SOD].

A5 Draft NTDF Implementation schedule

It is envisaged that the Education Sector Project [ESP] II consultant appointed by MESC and coordinator of the ESP II Secretariat will monitor and report on developments towards the finalization of a NTDF and, consequently, on progress in its implementation. Performance indicators/targets are included in the draft implementation schedule.

¹⁰ In doing so, the broad principles to apply are: [a] adequate rates of pay for teachers; and [b] regular salary increments along an extended salary scale [as current scales may be short in Samoa, implying that teachers, within their career, reach the top scale fairly quickly, then no option but to move out of classroom for salary increase]. There will be a need to decide on the duration of incremental progression, e.g. biennial incremental progression. This will extend the period over which teachers are evaluated for progression - with a longer scale teachers can see salary progress through a reasonable length of their career. Attention needs to be paid to the system of non-service increments that can be used for recognition of qualification improvements and as encouragement for teachers to apply for and remain in schools that are difficult to staff. Other considerations would be: [a] If there are difficulties in recruiting subject specialists, then their entry level on the salary scale should be raised. For example, if level 4 is the entry point for teachers with qualifications that are not subject specific, then the entry point for subject specialists should be level 5; [b] Progression along the salary scale should not be linked directly to non-credentialed professional development activities as this has the potential to provide problems of equity; [c] There needs to be some provision for teachers who take on leadership or administration roles [e.g. through a salary on top of base scale, plus a time allowance to ensure that the additional duties outside of the classroom can be completed]. One issue is that for most teachers the administration/management path may not be attractive if alternatives classroom-based career paths are put in place, especially if these alternatives do not provide real salary and conditions improvements above those of classroom teaching, hence the potential risk of creating shortages in middle and senior management jobs. Therefore the extension of the salary scale is the key mechanism for recognizing the classroom teacher, and additional salary and non-contact would be the elements to remunerate these other options to classroom teaching.
B. Policies and Procedures for a draft NTDF

B1 Pre-service Recruitment and Selection

a) Policy

Proposed Policy: Teacher recruitment will be based on performance in the Pacific Senior Secondary Certificate [PSSC] and personal attributes for teaching. Teacher selection will be based on performance and attributes for teacher training.

MESC current policy [MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015] page 46: “Standards for pre-service qualifications for teachers will be consistently reviewed over the next 9 years”. And page 25: “A plan for the incorporation of the foundation program into the school system will be developed and implemented”.

b) Rationale

Improve entry criteria to teacher training and attract the best people to become teachers.

c) Process

Teacher selection will be broadened and not just based on academic achievements. The university preparation requirement prior to initial certification will provide the opportunity to assess and evaluate a teacher candidate’s potential to perform effectively as a classroom teacher.

The teacher selection and recruitment processes will recognize that: [i] selection begins with self-selection by prospective teachers; and [ii] the process of teacher selection is a continuous one involving the application of established criteria in determining whether candidates are suitable to enter and to continue in teacher preparation programs, to receive initial and permanent certification, and to practice the profession of teaching.

d) Procedures

The pre-service recruitment and selection of teachers will be designed along a continuous process and include the following elements:

1. Recognition that teacher candidates self-select teaching as a career choice.
2. Candidates will be provided with opportunities to study the teaching profession and organization of the teaching service early in their preparation during the Foundation Certificate of Education Course.
3. Appropriate introductory practicum will be provided, and this will be used as an indicator of teaching success and as a demonstration of professional commitment and responsibility.
4. The selection process will involve elements of: [a] demonstrated psychological capability to teach effectively; [b] demonstrated ability in the communication skills required in teaching; [c] good academic achievement; and [d] skills in establishing and maintaining the appropriate interpersonal relationships for teaching.
5. There will be involvement and responsibility of practicing teachers in the summative evaluation of teaching practice activities of trainees.
6. The internship program will provide the basis for the gradual immersion of the individual into full-time teaching.

Alternative approaches to recruiting and training teachers should continue to be explored and implemented in MESC to meet demand requirements, including:

1. Fast tracking as for primary recruits for ESP II;
2. Fast tracking to meet curriculum specialist requirements;
3. Alternative packages of supervisory/mentor programs in schools with courses at an institution; and
4. Employment based teacher-training routes.

See further chapter C of this section, which furnishes minimum standards for academic and professional competencies for primary and secondary teachers, and for each subject as well as minimum Standards for teacher training institutional /organizational capacity to deliver appropriate types and levels of teacher training programs. In the course of further development and refinement of the draft NTDF, a more detailed program for teacher recruitment and selection will need to be incorporated. Attention needs to be paid to tallying the process of recruitment and selection with the MESC/school year.

B2 Teacher Certification/Registration for Quality Teachers for Learning

**Proposed Policy**: All teachers will be registered. In the course of further refinement and development, it will be determined whether “all teachers” include also teachers from mission and/or private schools, and that coverage of policy is in line with existing legislation.

a) **Policy**

MESC current policy [MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015] page 46-47: “All teachers will be encouraged to have a first degree with a teaching professional qualification All teachers in the public sector will hold a professional qualification in teaching. University graduates will acquire teacher training qualifications before entering the teaching service.”

b) **Rationale**

There is a need for a registration system that provides public assurance of the competence of a person in a given profession, by giving official recognition to the person when they prove to an official adjudicator that they have the minimum qualifications required in order to satisfactorily perform the duties of the profession.

c) **Process**

The teacher registration system will ensure that there is a minimum quality standard applied to all teachers entering the general education system in Samoa. Maintenance of a register would assist MESC and other employing bodies in making appointments, and reassure parents and the public that a national minimum standard for the teaching profession is in place.

d) **Procedures**

1. Beginning teachers will undergo a two-year probation period;
2. Close mentoring will continue to be provided throughout the first year of the proba-
    tion by the principal;
3. Accredited induction programs will continue to be developed and implemented to
    support beginning teachers;
4. MESC appraisals meetings will be carried out twice a year during the probation period.

Suggested procedures for Teacher Registration are detailed in the Guidelines section [Sec-
    tion III D. of this document] outlining guidelines for establishing a system of teacher regis-
    tration and accreditation.

B3 Teacher Placement

Proposed Policy: Teacher placement will be made in the best interests/needs of the stu-
    dents and the schools.

a) Policy

MESC current policy [MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015] page.46:
   “Strategies will be developed to address the mismatch between locations of need and teacher preferences.”

b) Rationale

The need to ensure quality teaching by having all classes staffed by competent teachers.

c) Process

The placement of teachers will be a system wide responsibility providing the best possible
match of teacher’s skills and qualifications with a particular school vacancy. Teachers will be
interviewed by the appropriate authority – as determined by existing legislation – and will be
invited to express their own preferences and advised of vacant positions suitable to their
expertise. The authority responsible for teacher placement will be determined when finaliz-
ing the draft NTDF taking into account existing legislation.

d) Procedures

The following factors will be considered in the allocation and placement of teachers:

1. The needs of students;
2. The grade level, the training specialization of the teacher [primary, secondary] and sub-
    ject specialty;
3. Career plans and other personal circumstances of the teacher;
4. Particular needs of the school;
5. Teacher-student ratios disaggregated to schools and classes.

Priorities will be established for placement depending on circumstances, including:

1. Teachers who have been inappropriately placed will have high priority;
2. Teachers will remain for three years in their first full appointment, except in exceptional
    circumstances;
3. Teachers requesting a change in placement will only change school site if their request
    can be met;
4. Tied placements [where a teacher may tie an application for placement with another teacher] will only be effected when both teachers can be placed.

The school Principal shall be responsible for the specific assignments of the teachers in her/his school.

**B4 Teacher Performance Appraisal**

- **a) Policy**

  **Proposed Policy:** Teaching will be monitored through a quality monitoring process.


- **b) Rationale**

  The delivery of high quality teaching is essential for improving student outcomes. Teacher Performance Appraisals (PA) provide teachers with objective and meaningful appraisals of their teaching. They can be expected to encourage professional learning and growth and identify opportunities for additional support where required.

- **c) Process**

  Two PA processes will be implemented to support teachers: one for beginning/new teachers and another for those further advanced in their careers [experienced teachers].

- **d) Procedures**

  1. The PA for **new** teachers will have the following features:

     - A requirement to undergo two PAs during the first 12 months of teaching. Two satisfactory PA ratings are required to complete the new teacher induction period.
     - The PA will focus on competencies for new teachers.
     - The process will focus on new teacher’s skills, knowledge and attitudes with strengths and areas for growth identified. Based on these assessments, the next steps for improvement will be planned.
     - Professional dialogue will be required between the school Principal and teacher, including a pre-observation meeting in preparation for a classroom observation and a post-observation meeting after the classroom observation. The dialogue during these meetings will provide opportunities for reflection and collaboration to promote professional growth.
     - Additional support will be provided to teachers where required.

  2. The PA for **experienced** teachers will have the following features:

     - Teachers will be required to have one appraisal every five years.
     - Components of the PA will include identification of strategies, in consultation with the school Principal, for professional growth and development for the years between appraisals, a summative report documenting the PA, a rating scale, and a process for providing additional support.
• Professional dialogue will be required between the school Principal and teacher, including a pre-observation meeting in preparation for a classroom observation and a post-observation meeting after the classroom observation. The dialogue during these meetings will provide opportunities for reflection and collaboration to promote professional growth.

The PAs will take into consideration the minimum standards for academic and professional competencies for primary and secondary teachers, and for each subject that are furnished below.

B5 Professional Development

a) Policy

Proposed Policy: Teaching quality will be sustained through professional development.

MESC current policy [MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015] page 26 and 46: “Teachers will be supported through regular in-service training programs. Professional Development courses for teachers will be offered via open and distance learning. Teacher education will be on-going and in-service training accessible for professional development and lifelong learning. Teacher education programs will be of the best quality”.

b) Rationale

All school personnel need to engage in professional development for lifelong learning.

c) Process

Professional development may follow from system changes, such as the introduction of a new curriculum. Professional development will also follow from the PA findings, and may be provided by CMAD, MESC, the universities or other providers.

d) Procedures

1. The Teachers’ Development Unit in SOD will have the responsibility for:

• Management of the PA process
• Monitoring the PA process to ensure that the appraisal documentation and its outcomes are directed towards the enhancement of teaching-learning quality
• Monitoring all PA returns to ensure that appraisal data are recorded electronically
• Development of a comprehensive Professional Development plan for all teachers, principals and SRO which will be upgraded annually from PA returns
• Monitoring and reporting to the appropriate authority for incentive recognition of the professional development completed by teachers
• Identifying and collaborating with a range of accredited training providers such as NUS, FOE, Oloamanu Centre, USP, SFS and MESC in the provision of professional development for teachers, principals and SRO. In this respect, the Oloamanu Centre of NUS will indicate to MESC the availability of FOE and other faculties to be involved in the annual Professional Development plan
• Identifying how much professional development it is able to deliver, e.g. 30% of primary teachers and 50% secondary teachers annually, and the 3 Professional De-
velopment allocated days a year being used for school based professional development. Supporting up to 100 NUS graduates to complete a B.Ed.
- Implementing, as well as monitoring and evaluating programs.

2. Replace the previous IST Committee with a new In-service Training Committee to develop and coordinate a sector wide collaboration in the provision of teachers’ professional development. This Committee with representation from MESC PDU, MESC CMAD, SFS, FOE, NUS, USP, as well as Mission and Private Schools provided that this is in line with current policies and legislation. The Committee will determine the Professional Development schedule in October for the following year, structure it into an annual plan and will monitor and evaluate implementation. The MESC CEO will select the chair from among the membership.

The PDU will also be responsible for modifying the present Teachers Profile to include all pertinent information from the PA process to assist in accurate decision-making about teachers. The Profile should become a one-stop reference point to find all the required information about any teacher by personnel in MESC and/or the teacher, whilst controlling for confidential matters. The Teachers Profile will need to be compatible with the EMIS system.

MESC will continue to provide for scholarship students in the FOE in the Foundation Dip.Ed. program and may increase scholarship opportunities for B.Ed. students.

Recognition of Credits

NUS - through the FOE in the first instance but not exclusively so - will identify preferred conditions for credit awards in cooperation with training providers in MESC and elsewhere for recognition of credits for in-service training for FOE-taught degrees at NUS. Furthermore [see also D-2]:

1. The conditions decided upon will be formally approval by NUS
2. On-going dialogue between MESC and NUS will be maintained to maximize the possibility of credit awards, compromising neither the actual requirements for the inservicing required in MESC of teachers nor NUS academic requirements
3. The PDU in SOD will review all in-servicing to see how programs might be packaged to qualify for a credit rating
4. MESC will pursue the possibility of negotiations on credits for in-servicing with USP and other tertiary or professional institutions in the region and beyond, following the above or amended steps

The Memorandum of Understanding between NUS and USP will be revived on the premise that “neither should do separately what can be done co-operatively”[11].

---

[11] For example, the provision of Distance and Flexible Learning [DFL] programs.
B6  Career Pathways

a) Policy

Proposed Policy: Equitable professional opportunities will be provided for teachers to pursue a broad range of career pathways in both teaching and non-teaching roles.

MESC current policy [MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015] page 46: “The holder of a position of responsibility will hold that post for a minimum of time of three years before they are eligible to apply for another position of responsibility. Teachers will progress in the approved PSC Teaching Career and Salary Structure based on continuous excellent performance over a three-year period. Teachers outstanding performance will be recognized through special merit awards and further training opportunities.”

b) Rationale

The teaching professional will remain attractive and dynamic if trained teachers have access to a broad range of career pathways in both teaching and non-teaching roles.

c) Process

MESC will promote and facilitate access to career pathways for teachers including classroom teacher, Principal, SRO, counseling, and MESC positions.

d) Procedures

1. On their first appointment, teachers who have completed the academic requirements – minimally a Dip.Ed. – and after an interview to establish their suitability will be designated as a Qualified Teacher [see also C-3.1].

2. On the successful completion of two-years of probation and a satisfactory PA [see also the section above on Teacher Performance], teachers will be designated as a Registered Teacher [see also C-3.2].

3. Teachers will be required to serve as teachers in the same school for a period of three years as required in the Strategic Plan. During this time, they will take part in the PA process to provide the diagnostic support for each teacher in mapping their future teacher development pathway.

4. Following the first three years of teaching service, a career path will be developed to enable a teacher to remain a teacher for the longer term or move from teaching into the management/administration or counselling fields.

5. These paths are neither linear, nor static, nor exclusive. Crossovers need to be made readily available, depending on qualifications. New paths may open up as education expands to accommodate new concerns: education counsellors, for example.

6. In terms of status, salaries or conditions, no one career path shall have precedence over another, and this will be reflected in the determination of awards for employment on the varying pathways.

7. Different pathways will require different types of teacher development mapping. A teacher on the path to becoming a mentor teacher would be expected to be building up a portfolio of experience, preferably leading to formal recognition by way of certification or degree. Similarly, a teacher pursuing a school management career would be expected to be involved in management studies, preferably leading to formal recognition by way of certification or degree.
B7 Monitoring and Evaluation [M&E]

a) Policy

**Proposed Policy**: To make the most efficient [optimum] use of human, financial and material resources.

MESC current policy [MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015] page 49: “The management of schools will be reviewed. Personnel capability and succession planning will be addressed. The organization structures will be reviewed to meet the expanding needs of the Ministry. School Review Officers will be supported and recognized in their roles. Management at all levels will be strengthened. The partnership with school committees and school communities will be further strengthened. Review and revise Performance Appraisal documentation of school personnel.”

b) Rationale

M&E is critical to systems and personnel review, and is most effective if data is analyzed, reported and acted upon. The M&E system is a dynamic and interactive process involving all stakeholders, including communities and parents, who have a major stake in the output capacity of MESC and MESC programs.

c) Process

M&E of the performance of Teachers, Principals and SRO will be carried out through the PA process. M&E of schools will be based on MESC school improvement plans and processes, and the school review processes. M&E of MESC management and administration will also be based on the PA process.

d) Procedures

1. The PA and EMIS systems will be compatible to record, analyze and feedback data to teachers, principals, SRO and TDU in areas such as:
   - Appraisal for promotion, transfer etc.;
   - Professional development progress;
   - Preparation of references and other types of testimonials;
   - A record that can update any teacher of what is currently held in the Ministry’s databases about him/herself.

2. Strengthen the School Performance Unit [SPU] in its school monitoring and evaluation functions to be responsible for the M&E of:
   - [a] School improvement and performance including:
     - Initial assessment against baseline checklist;
     - Development of school improvement plans;
     - Collection of school performance and school improvement data;
     - Identify under performing schools;
     - Inputting data into the EMIS.
   - [b] School management, including:
     - Feedback to schools, principals and SRO;
     - Distribution of management guidelines for school committees and principals;
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3. The Teachers’ Profile will include all EMIS information providing a one stop reference point to find all the required information about any teacher and thereby facilitating accurate decision-making.

4. The MESC M&E system should be aligned with other Government M&E systems.

5. The rollout of the MESC M&E system within MESC and schools will involve the following steps:
   - Development, distribution and implementation of various Planning and M&E tools including systems, toolkits, and guides;
   - Improvement of Planning and M&E skills and systems;
   - Improvement in the quality, frequency and flow of Planning and M&E information.

B8 Teachers’ Conditions of Employment

a) Policy

Proposed Policy: Provide teachers, principals and SRO with a healthy and secure working environment and appropriate recognition for their services to ensure quality teaching for learning.

MESC current policy [MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015] and PSC Conditions of Service page 46: “A system of incentives and awards will be developed and implemented to attract and retain teachers in the service.”

b) Rationale

The well-being and appropriate and timely remuneration of teachers, principals and SRO is essential for an effective education system.

c) Process

SFS, PSC and MESC collaborate to ensure quality conditions of employment.

d) Procedures

1. MESC to review the data input and analysis of teachers’ information pertaining to their position in the salary and career structure and take appropriate action to redress any discrepancies.

2. MESC, PSC and SFS will determine an annual award round process for negotiations of teachers’ conditions of employment.
3. M&E of compliance with teachers’ conditions of service such as levels of remuneration and reward for outcomes of Performance Appraisal is reviewed and strengthened.
4. Evaluate and monitor the performance of schools annually and follow up on school improvement plan reports to analyze and report on the learning and teaching environments in schools.
5. Provision of PD for teachers who take up PR positions that include administrative duties.
6. MESC and SFS hold meetings to clarify the career and salary structure of teachers, promotion opportunities and how teachers move from one level to another. This is particularly important in relation to the Performance Appraisal System;
7. MESC to review with teachers, SRO and school communities the travel allowance and/or accommodation of teachers to ensure that teachers are supported when posted to areas other than their home location;
8. M&E of teachers’ performance including monitoring and feedback by principals to ensure that teachers are aware that they are performing well and are acknowledged. M&E of principals’ and SRO’s compliance with job descriptions should also provide timely and effective feedback to schools and their communities.

In finalising and finetuning the NTDF, the above procedures will need to be further developed, detailed and adjusted, taking into account details of teachers’ employment conditions. This will have to be done within the context of the current legal conditions, including those pertaining to the public service as a whole and within the framework of current policies on changing public sector and teacher employment conditions. Within this broader context, perceived discrepancies will need to be addressed.

**B9 Education Management Information System [EMIS]**

**a) Policy**

*Proposed Policy: Provide an efficient EMIS to support quality teaching for learning.*

MESC current policy [MESC Strategic Policies and Plan July 2006-June 2015] pages 43-44: “Reliable communication systems through networking both electronic and other means between all levels of education will be established. MESC will take a more strategic approach to the management of ICT so that it can be fully utilized in the delivery of information and education services. MESC will centralize the collection and storage of its planning data. The School Census forms will be improved to ensure that data is collected in the form that is required for the EMIS. MESC will review its current processes and practices in Records management and the archiving of both paper and electronic information. A computerized records management system will be put in place that will allow for efficient access to and retrieval of documents and other information. A file audit will be conducted in all divisions to be accompanied by a training of filing clerks. The timely collection of data will be supported by a strong research capacity that will drive policy development and disseminate findings. The functions and structure of the ICT Unit will be reviewed to reflect its responsibilities of monitoring and management of ICT at the central office and schools.”

**b) Rationale**

The development of a centralised, dynamic, interacting EMIS enables data to be accessed and shared. Used effectively, it promotes the efficient capture of data from its source, the flow, processing and storage of that data, and the flow of useful and timely information back to Output Managers.
c) Process

The process of establish the EMIS will include components of data collection, data processing and analysis, identification of indicators and tools to assist decision-making, and dissemination and distribution of the information produced by EMIS to MESC and the general public. All these functions and components must be fully operational; if one of them is absent or faulty, the entire EMIS will be ineffective. MESC will establish appropriate organizational structures and managerial capacities to control the operation of the whole EMIS system.

d) Procedures

(1) Phase 1: Establish EMIS Management Team

A person competent in statistics, education indicators, and in information system organization will direct the EMIS Management Team. This person will be attached to the MESC department in charge of the EMIS. The team will include one or several representatives of each of the departments producing and using the information processed in EMIS, including the pedagogical departments [primary, general secondary and technical secondary, higher education], the department of teaching and administrative personnel, the department of teacher training, and persons from the department of planning and statistics. Endorsement for the Team’s timetable and necessary resources will be approved by MESC.

(2) Phase 2: Analysis of the existing situation

The EMIS Management Team will make an analysis and assessment of MESC to determine the management systems producing and using information. Then the team will conduct a detailed survey of the information managed by each management system, identifying and defining the precise scope of EMIS. The different fields covered by EMIS will be defined, including for example schools, pupils, teachers, administrative personnel, finance, pedagogical materials and equipment, etc. At which level the information should be available for each of the fields will be determined as well. From this analysis and decisions concerning the scope and fields of EMIS, decisions in consultation with MESC will be made on the organization and management of EMIS information.

(3) Phase 3: Technical Phase

Based on the planning in Phase 2, decisions will be made on the organization and logical and physical processing of data. Decisions will be made on the type of material retained for computer networks [server and work posts] and the operating system of the servers and workstation.

(4) Phase 3: Publication of Information

The first priority will be to provide information to policy and decision-makers to demonstrate the system's efficiency and benefits. Secondly, other service users will be allowed access [after some training] to carry out their own queries on the database. The third priority will be the publishing of more standard information such as a statistical yearbook, either electronically or on paper.

(5) Phase 4: Set up Indicators

The following types of indicators will be established:
1. Students: the different enrolment and admission rates by gender, age, and by region. Indicators on repetitions and access at the end of the primary, also by gender and by region.
2. Teachers: the level of qualification and certification by gender, student/teacher ratio, the age pyramid of the teachers by gender.
3. Financing: the proportion of budget allocated to education, the proportion of education expenditures in the GDP and the GNP, the proportion of education expenditures incurred by the local community and authorities, and by the private sector, student unit cost in relation to GDP per capita.

(6) Phase 5: EMIS Training

Following the development phase of the system, system wide training will be provided for all personnel involved with EMIS. The training will be differentiated according to the type of personnel depending on if they are producers or users of information. Some persons and some services will be both producers and users of information.

C. Minimum Standards

C1 Professional Baseline Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12: Professional baseline standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 Professional knowledge | 1.1 Have knowledge of and participate in professional development programs  
1.2 Have knowledge of and are competent in implementing school policy  
1.3 Have sound knowledge of and are competent in relevant curriculum  
1.4 Have sound knowledge of and are kept informed of developments in learning and assessment theory |
| 2 Teaching Techniques | 2.1 Prepare lesson plans using appropriate teaching objectives and learning activities  
2.2 Prepare well for all subjects, especially those in which the teacher is not strong  
2.3 Develop and demonstrate teaching and learning strategies, using a range of effective teaching techniques  
2.4 Demonstrate flexibility and responsiveness to students’ and class concerns  
2.5 Develop and use assessment strategies that are consistent with sound teaching and learning practice  
2.6 Reflect on teaching and evaluate programs with a view to improvement  
2.7 Use appropriate technology and resources in the delivery of programs |
| 3 Motivation of Students | 3.1 Demonstrate effective techniques for motivating students  
3.2 Engage students in learning  
3.3 Demonstrate and establish high expectations that value and promote learning |
| 4 Classroom Management | 4.1 Apply positive behaviour management. Establish good relationships with students and respect their individual needs and cultural backgrounds  
4.2 Create and maintain a safe physical environment that is conducive to learning  
4.3 Create an environment of respect and understanding. Provide and maintain |

12 The Strategic Plan proposes that Standards for pre-service qualifications for teachers will be consistently reviewed over the next 9 years.
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5 Communication

- Demonstrate skills of effective communication. Communicate clearly and accurately in either or both English and Samoan language
- Provide feedback to students
- Share information with colleagues
- Communicate with parents/guardians
- Interact with communities to encourage increased involvement in the school

6 Support for and cooperation with colleagues

- Co-operate, establish and maintain effective working relationships with colleagues
- Prepared to take classes for colleagues absent through misfortune

7 Contribution to wider school activities

- Participate in and contribute to the life of the school beyond narrow teaching obligations
- Support the Principal, Deputy Principal and SRO in working for the advancement of the school

C2 Minimum Standards for teacher training institutional /organizational capacity to deliver appropriate types and levels of teacher training programs

All accredited teacher education and training institutions must have the following:

1. Qualified teacher educators with the requisite academic and professional qualifications of no less than a master\d\s degree including qualifications in the teaching area;
2. Qualified teacher educators who had taught in either primary or secondary schools or both with no less than five years experience;
3. Qualified teacher educators who engage in research to inform their practice;
4. Qualified teacher educators who have the requisite skills and experience to be supervisors for the studies during Teaching Practicum;
5. Quality pre-service concurrent teacher education/training programs that comprise fifty percent theory and fifty percent practice in which teacher trainees undertake studies at no less than a minimum time duration of four semesters or two years. Each semester to comprise a minimum of ten [10] weeks of face to face instruction and four [4] weeks of field studies or Teaching Practicum in schools;
6. A minimum qualification for a beginning teacher of a Diploma of Education that is at Diploma Level 2 in the Samoa Qualifications Framework [SQF];
7. A quality assurance mechanism for the determination, development and approval of its programs. All programs to be accredited and subjected to periodic audit by the SQA;
8. Policies and procedures to ensure adequate and appropriate learner information, entry and support for the program;
9. An adequate and dedicated annual budget that supports the teaching of its programs;
10. Demonstrated capacity in terms of connectivity, LAN, access to the internet and adequate equipment such as computers and accessories;
11. Adequate and appropriate physical and learning resources to support the delivery of its programs;
12. A process of formative evaluation and monitoring that enables a review of its programs every three years;
13. Fair, valid and effective system for assessing learners against program outcomes;
2.14 Adequate and appropriate research is conducted to meet the requirements of degree and post graduate qualifications and programs.

C3 Minimum standards for monitoring and evaluation of teacher performance for initial registration plus periodic reviews

The NDTF will propose a pathway for all teachers beginning after graduation from NUS comprising [i] certification as a qualified teacher followed by [ii] certification as a registered teacher.

3.1 Qualified Teacher: A person will be classified as a qualified teacher when they have completed the academic requirements – minimally a Dip.Ed. – and after an interview to establish their suitability. The academic course completed will be relevant to the position to be taken up e.g. primary course for primary teaching; Samoan major for teaching Samoan at the secondary level etc.;

3.2 Registered Teacher: A person will be classified as a registered teacher when they have satisfactorily completed two-years teaching, assessment for which will be principally based on the teacher appraisal system adjusted to take account of the fact that the teacher is newly graduated. The minimum standard required will be a classification of “satisfactory” on the continuum from “outstanding” to “unsatisfactory”;

3.3 Initial registration will also be dependent on the extent to which newly appointed teachers have completed the probation period of 6 months required by the PSC and 2 years required by MESC;

3.4 Periodic reviews will comprise annual reviews also based on the teacher appraisal process. It is noted that the appraisal process provides for teachers to nominate remedial and developmental IST. Unless this is not offered by MESC, periodic reviews will also assess the extent to which teachers have availed themselves of IST.

D. Guidelines

D1 Guidelines for articulation between pre-service and in-service and other professional upgrade training programs

1.1 Recruitment into pre-service teacher education and training to be the joint responsibility of MESC and the FOE/NUS

1.2 Review, design and development of courses and programs for pre-service teacher education and training to be a collaborative effort between MESC and relevant agencies of the NUS such as FOE, Faculty of Science [FOS], Faculty of Business and Entrepreneurship [FOBE] or Faculty of Arts [FOA]

1.3 All pre-service courses should correspond to existing service requirements e.g. curriculum, special needs and inclusive education

1.4 All pre-service teacher education and training to take place in a formal post school institution that is also an SQA accredited institution in Samoa and including other recognized overseas institutions

1.5 The professional development for teachers may take place in a formal and accredited institution or may be provided by MESC or other non formal providers

1.6 Pathways to articulate current pre-service teacher education and training programs and professional development for teachers include the following:

1. The Dip.Ed. qualification staircases to the B.Ed. program such that the Dip.Ed. is fully cross-credited for the first two years of the B.Ed.
2. Recognition of prior learning: All professional development is considered on a case by case basis and maybe cross-credited for the Dip.Ed., the B.Ed. or any other first degree at NUS;
3. PD that is provided by any nonformal provider to be packaged in identifiable learning units to enable ease of accreditation by any formal institution;
4. Responsibility for the packaging of PD/learning units for accreditation by NUS into its formal qualifications to reside with the SOD/PDU in collaboration with the NUS/Oloamanu Centre and NUS/FOE;
5. Such packages should not exceed 50% of the requirements for any formal academic or professional qualification at NUS.

D2 Guidelines for accrediting in-service and professional upgrades to formal qualifications

2.1. FOE will initiate the following steps for recognition of credits for in-service training for FOE-taught degrees at NUS
2.2. NUS – presumably through the FOE in the first instance but not exclusively - so – should identify preferred conditions for credit awards in cooperation with SOD and the principal professional development providers in MESC and elsewhere
2.3. The conditions decided upon should receive formal approval from the NUS and MESC
2.4. The proposed PDU in SOD should review all professional development to see how programs might be packaged to qualify for a credit rating
2.5. On-going dialogue between MESC and NUS should be maintained to maximize the possibility of credit awards, without compromising either the actual requirements for the professional development required in MESC or NUS academic requirements
2.6. Parallel Step: MESC should pursue the possibility of similar negotiations on credits for professional development with USP and any other preferred tertiary or professional institution in the region and beyond, following the above or amended steps.

D3 Guidelines to develop teaching portfolios to evaluate classroom based performance of teachers

3.1. The Performance Appraisal Manual of 2005 [page 15] identifies the types of documentary evidence teachers are invited to present in support of their performance as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Observational</th>
<th>Work Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graphic</td>
<td>Test results</td>
<td>Reports on activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Assignment results</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical</td>
<td>Benchmarks</td>
<td>Feedback from students/parents/evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance data</td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. In addition to using the portfolio for appraisal assessment purposes, the portfolio may be used as:

- A resource package for classroom teaching
- Support documentation for job interviews
- A showcase of accomplishments and skills
3.3. In addition to the contents identified in the Appraisal Manual, teachers’ portfolios might include evidence of:

- Core educational beliefs
- Official MESC documents
- Sample lesson plans, particularly plans that have received peer or principal recognition
- Assessment practices
- Summaries of best practice identified
- Research and/or relevant Web discoveries
- Photographs of classroom activities
- Principals’ evaluations
- Letters of recommendation
- List of references.

3.4. A portfolio is only as useful as its organization. A table/index of contents is a necessity for ready reference and a covering statement on the purpose and contents of the portfolio. A diary of usage is also an asset for any reviewer.

D4 Guidelines to monitor institutional collaboration, joint projects with schools and/or teacher professional organizations in respective areas

a) Institutional Collaboration

“Collaboration is a mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve common goals. The relationship includes a commitment to: a definition of mutual relationships and goals; a jointly developed structure and shared responsibility; mutual authority and accountability for success; and sharing of resources and rewards.”

4.1 MESC, NUS and FOE

NUS will continue to be the focal point of pre-service teacher training and cross-accrediting with USP.

The Dean of FOE/NUS is an ex officio member of the MESC Core Executive and MESC and FOE meet quarterly in any one year to discuss issues and resolve problems.

4.1.1. Promotion and marketing of teaching as a career.

It is a function of the MESC School Operations Division to promote teaching as a career. MESC operates a Joint Marketing Committee with representatives from FOE. NUS holds a Career Day where FOE promotes teaching and FOE staff may be asked to visit schools to market teaching as a career.

Monitoring mechanisms

- The Joint Marketing Committee meets three times a year. Minutes of marketing/promotion meetings are kept.
- MESC and FOE will develop and implement an annual plan that shows strategies to promote teaching as a career.

---

An annual report is presented to MESC Core Executive and FOE/NUS.

4.1.2. **Recruitment and selection of teacher trainees.**
NUS entry criteria are used. FOE and MESC continue to collaborate on the interviews, provisional assessment and selection of candidates for pre-service teacher training.

*Monitoring mechanisms*
- FOE and MESC collaborate on assessment processes to select suitable candidates.
- MESC and FOE develop and implement an annual plan for selection & recruitment procedures.
- An annual report is presented to MESC Core Executive and FOE.

4.1.3. **Teaching Practicum**

*Monitoring mechanism*
- 1) FOE and MESC will jointly review the practicum to provide the best possible school-based experience for trainee teachers.

4.1.4. **FOE Pre-service Course Design, Development and Evaluation**

i) The competencies, indicators, standards and values, developed by MESC as part of the Teacher Performance Indicators are incorporated into FOE courses.

ii) All pre-service courses should correspond to current service requirements e.g. curriculum, special needs, and inclusive education.

*Monitoring mechanisms*
- MESC and FOE will jointly review the Performance Appraisal System and FOE courses will reflect PA competencies, indicators, standards and values.
- MESC approves access of teacher trainees to utilize the Teachers’ Resource Centre at Malifa. Use of the Centre by pre-service students would include:
  - identification of materials and resources that students could use free of charge
  - MESC to specify days and times for students to visit the Resource Centre
  - identification of materials and resources that students will pay for.
- Evaluation of training from graduates teaching in the schools is essential to provide updates on the impact of training. Tripartite feedback from NUS, MESC and FOE of participants’ responses is important for research and planning.

4.1.5. **Professional Development**

*Monitoring mechanisms*
- Replace the previous IST Committee with an In-service Training Committee to develop and coordinate a sector wide collaboration in the provision of PD for teachers. The PD Committee with representation from MESC TDU, MESC CMAD, SFS, FOE, NUS, USP, Mission and Private Schools will determine the PD schedule in October for the following year into an annual plan and will monitor and evaluate the implementation of PD.
- Teacher, Principal and SRO development will follow from the performance appraisal findings, especially their needs analysis. This training may be provided by CMAD, MESC, the universities or other providers.
- The current TDU in SOD will collaborate with a range of accredited training providers such as NUS/FOE/Oloamanu Centre, USP, SFS and CMAD in the provision of PD for teachers, principals and SRO.
Through the Oloamanu Centre, NUS will indicate to MESC the availability of FOE and other faculties to be involved in the annual PD plan.

MESC will continue to support scholarship students at the FOE in the Foundation and Dip Ed programmes and might consider expansion of its current support for students in the B.E programme;

Recognition of Credits: NUS presumably through the FOE in the first instance but not exclusively so – should identify preferred conditions for credit awards, in cooperation with the principal in-service training providers in MESC and elsewhere for recognition of credits for in-service training for FOE-taught degrees at NUS.

- The conditions decided upon should receive formal approval from the NUS;
- On-going dialogue between MESC and NUS should be maintained to maximize the possibility of credit awards, compromising neither the actual requirements for the in-servicing required in MESC of teachers nor NUS academic requirements.

4.1.6. Establishment of a Teacher Registration System

Monitoring mechanism

- MESC will collaborate with PSC, NUS, FOE and SFS, USP to establish a Teachers’ Registration Advisory Committee/Board to oversee the implementation of the Teachers’ Registration System

4.2 MESC, PSC and SFS

4.2.1. MESC, PSC and SFS will determine an annual award round process for negotiations of teachers’ conditions of employment

Monitoring mechanisms

- Meeting schedules are planned.
- Minutes of meetings are kept.
- Annual Reports on the award round process are made to SFS Executive and MESC
- MESC, PSC and SFS will strengthen collaboration to develop transparent, updated Career and Salary Structures, including information on Career Pathways and promotion points.

4.3 MESC, SFS and the Council of Pacific Educators [COPE]

4.3.1. SFS can apply to COPE for project funding to use for training purposes.

Some of the purpose of this training in the past has been to examine women’s roles in organizations, organizational strengthening, human rights training and support for MESC curriculum training.

Monitoring mechanism

- SFS submits to the IST Committee by November each year their plan for the use of COPE training funds so that the training can be incorporated into the PD Plan for the following year.

4.4 MESC, SFS and Education International [EI]

4.4.1. SFS is affiliated to EI and is part of EI campaigns, e.g. Global Education Campaign and Education for All [EFA] initiatives.

Monitoring mechanisms
- SFS report to EI on undertaking activities in specific areas such as ECE, Special Needs. An Annual Report is published and presented biennially to the COPE Congress.
- SFS collaborated with MESC on developing the Samoa Action Plan for EFA and continues to be involved with EFA developments.
- Progress of work in EI and EFA could also be published in MESC news ‘Tala Mai Malifa’ and training included in the annual PD Plan.

4.5 **FOE, MESC and Pacific Association for Teacher Education [PATE]**

4.5.1 **Capacity Building for Teacher Educators**
Whenever possible MESC and FOE together to explore various opportunities to develop the capacity of all teacher educators, including joint participation and presentations at conferences.

**Monitoring mechanism**
- The PDU in MESC utilizes the skills and knowledge of FOE staff in PD.

4.6 **NUS and other universities in NZ and Australia.**

4.6.1 **Otago University:** Collaboration involves staff exchanges and collaborative research. **Canterbury University/College of Education run a post graduate programme in Samoa** to undertake studies in Masters Degrees.

**Monitoring mechanisms**
- All of the collaborative activities are reported by the Oloamanu Centre to NUS.
- The opportunities for principals, teachers and SRO to continue with studies will be publicized to MESC and school communities as part of promoting Career Pathways.
- MESC encourages school personnel to undertake professional development in university studies as part of the PA process.

4.7 **MESC and MOF**

4.7.1 **Budget Process**

**Monitoring mechanisms**
- MESC will strengthen collaboration with MOF to ensure an accurate and timely budget process, in accordance with service wide deadlines.

4.8 **USP and NUS**

4.8.1. **MoU for Cross-crediting purposes**
USP cross credits courses from the NUS Dip Ed program to the first year USP B.Ed program.

**Monitoring mechanism**
- USP and NUS review the MOU and explore ways to strengthen the collaboration for cross crediting purposes.

4.8.2. **Post Graduate Studies**
The FOE staff has undertaken USP distance courses in the past and USP staff has acted as supervisors and markers of NUS students engaged in postgraduate studies. This collaboration has lapsed for a range of reasons e.g. costs to universities and staff, unavailability of face to face tutoring, and difficulties of distance studies to maintain motivation of students.
**Monitoring mechanisms**

- The NUS and USP continue to collaborate in finding ways to best meet the needs of teacher educators.
- The FOE and USP staff hold meetings to discuss some strategies for supporting postgraduate studies.

4.8.3. Development of courses for Agricultural Science teachers

The USP Alafua Campus is able to provide excellent resources for teachers wishing to study in agriculture.

**Monitoring mechanism**

- USP and FOE will explore ways that teachers could be trained in agricultural science

4.9 USP, NUS and MESC

4.9.1 Development of DFL Professional Development Programmes

In 2003 USP, the former Samoa Polytechnic and MESC organized and implemented a DFL Conference for stakeholders. Three teachers in Savai’i graduated in 2006 with a USP B.Ed. Some teachers in Savai’i are attending USP TESOL courses in 2007.

**Monitoring mechanisms**

- The above initiative needs to be built on through USP, NUS, and MESC collaborating on ways to deliver DFL PD for teachers, principals and SRO particularly in Savai’i
- USP, NUS, and MESC explore ways to fund DFL studies for teachers and provide incentives for teachers to undertake DFL studies through
  - accessing in-country training funds
  - exploring loans from the National Provident Fund

4.10 “Whole of Government” procedures for ICT purposes.

4.10.1 MESC’s administrative processes, particularly those relating to human resources and finance, are frequently part of “whole of government” procedures set by the central agencies.

In general a number of functions have been delegated from the Public Service Commission to line agencies according to an implementation schedule approved by Cabinet. The formalised National ICT Steering Committee has documented the guiding principles for the course of ICT in Samoa. Therefore the MESC ICT Master Plan 2004 - 2007 is reflective of the Samoa Information Communication Technology Guiding Principles to promote consistency of ICT processes within the public sector.

**Monitoring mechanisms**

- Continual liaison with PSC and Ministry of Finance to determine changes in operational procedures and reporting requirements resulting from the devolution process as appropriate.
- Attend meetings and workshops
- Participate in policy and technical groups
- Participate in government-wide ICT groups
- Document historical, current and planned situation of fibre optic Network as managed by SamoaTel
- Investigate the options available for a Wide Area Network [WAN] with other Government ministries.\(^\text{14}\)

4.11 Joint School Projects

The MESC PEO Coordinator of Projects compiles and updates a Register of all Development Projects including the purpose, current status of the project and progress report to CDC. The MESC Annual Report includes a section on the status of development projects. Most project coordinators monitor and evaluate their own projects and submit reports. The PEO Coordinator of Projects could have a strengthened role in providing an external review of monitoring and evaluation procedures. The monitoring and evaluation of projects will be strengthened in the implementation of the ESP II Project, Component 4.

4.11.1 Associated School Project [ASP net], UNESCO

Monitoring mechanisms
- Quarterly meetings held.
- Written quarterly reports on progress to the PEO Coordinator of Projects.

4.11.2 Grassroots Human Security Grant Aid FY 2006 JICA

Monitoring mechanism
- KVA Consulting Company is monitoring the implementation of this project. A report provided to the PEO Coordinator of Projects on request.

4.11.3 Inclusive Education [IE] UNESCO

Monitoring mechanism
- Written quarterly reports provided in accordance with the criteria, timeline and template provided by the PEO Project Coordinator.

4.11.4 Multi-Grade Teaching Program [MGTP] PRIDE

Monitoring mechanisms
- Evaluations and reviews from Facilitators, SRO, Principals and Teachers leading to a report to be presented to the PEO Coordinator of Projects.
- Interviews with Facilitators, SRO, Principals and Teachers conducted by an external reviewer.

4.11.5 Science and Mathematics Improvement Project for Basic Education [SMIPBE] JICA and GoS

Monitoring mechanisms
- Phase 1 Terminal Evaluation Report was discussed at a JCC Meeting March 2007. The SMIPBE project was evaluated using five criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The evaluation outcomes taken into account in planning Phase 2 of the project.
- The above five criteria could be applied in the monitoring and evaluation of Phase 2 and applied as a model for other projects.

4.11.6 SchoolNet Project: ADB funded

A TA was funded by the Asian Development Bank [ADB] for piloting an appropriate model for introducing ICT in schools [SchoolNet]. It also sought to extend this ICT exposure to school communities to improve their knowledge and capacity to become active and productive members of the local communities. The TA was required to i) improve quality and efficiency of education; ii) enable access to global information; iii) enable increased sharing of information between schools and with communities; and iv) achieve the GoS Education for All and Millennium Development Goals for education.
**Monitoring mechanisms**

- The Final report of the TA was published in January 2007\(^1\). It describes the issues and lessons learned, makes recommendations for the future and entry points for further support for SchoolNet.
- M&E of the project has been conducted by the STEP UP Team since June 2006. The team is finalizing evaluations and reporting in August 2007.
- The project is being expanded through ESP II.

---

\(^1\) Samoa Supporting the SchoolNet and Community Access Pilot Project ADB TA No. 4305-SAM Final Report January 2007 MESC and ADB by Helsinki Consulting Group, ANZDEC and Queensland University of Technology.
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Credits, rewards, incentives
Major contractor for outsourced PD
Data collection/dissemination

Teacher Advisory Committee
- Registration
- National Standards, Competencies and Indicators, Code of Conduct
- Accrediting and Monitoring of Credits for Professional Development
- Quality Control of Teacher Education Programs with SQA-FOE, USP, SFS
- National Teacher Education Plan

Quality Assurance

IST Committee

MESC

Private Providers
CMAD

Finance and HR, PSC/MOF - Development Partners

SQA
NUS
USP

 Accredited Providers
NUS
FOE
Oloamanu Centre
USP
SFS

SFS
E1 Teachers Advisory Committee

The purposes and processes for the Teachers Advisory Committee are:

i) To provide public assurance of the competence of a person in a given profession, by giving official recognition to the person, when they prove to an official adjudicator that they have the minimum qualifications required in order to satisfactorily perform the duties of the profession;

ii) To establish an objective, merit-based and transparent system, being based on the equitable application of ‘professional standards which set out the minimum qualifications and other necessary skills, knowledge and experience that a person must have for entry to the profession;

iii) To monitor and enforce professional standards, by providing for the ongoing training of members of the profession, investigating complaints and conducting hearings into allegations of unsatisfactory performance or professional misconduct, and taking appropriate corrective action.

iv) The Teachers Advisory Committee will comprise:
   1. representatives of MESC
   2. representatives of PSC
   3. teachers and principals appointed by SFS
   4. representatives of SQA
   5. representatives of FOE
   6. representatives from the Directors of Missions
   7. representatives from Private Schools
   8. community representatives appointed by MESC

The Teachers Advisory Committee might meet three times a year.

v) The Teachers Advisory Committee will determine the minimum qualifications, experience, knowledge required for registration.

vi) The Teachers Advisory Committee will collaborate with a range of stakeholders particularly in the development and monitoring of competencies and standards e.g. MESC, SQA, SFS, and FOE.

vii) The Teachers Advisory Committee will be involved in monitoring teachers’ behavior in compliance with established professional standards and standards of registration.

viii) The Teachers Advisory Committee will collaborate with MESC, SQA, FOE, and USP in the Quality Assurance monitoring of teacher education programs.

ix) The Teachers Advisory Committee will develop, implement, and evaluate a national teacher development plan.

E2 Teacher Development Unit in SOD

The functions of the Teacher Development Unit in SOR will include:

Performance Appraisal of teachers, principals and SRO:
- Coordinate annual reviews [performance appraisal] of teachers, principals and SRO;
- Collect and collate performance appraisal data;
Analyze performance appraisal data;
Identify training [professional development] needs of teachers, principals and SRO;
Design professional development programs;
Identify providers for the programs;
Implement the programs;
Monitor and evaluate the programs;
Feed appraisal outcomes to salaries, to teachers’ portfolios, to teachers, principals and SRO, respecting confidentiality.

**Coordinating PD Needs Analysis and Responses:**
- Package training needs and identify response to these needs [e.g. Outsource as appropriate to accredited providers; Or plan package to be addressed by the unit with unit personnel; Or plan package to be addressed by projects].

**Coordinate credits, rewards, and incentives:**
- Plan and execute awards system;
- Based on performance appraisal, advise HR regarding rewards, incentives;
- Enter appropriate data in teachers’ profiles/feedback to teachers, to Core Executive/Teachers’ Body.

### E3 School Performance Unit

The functions of the School Performance Unit will be to:

- Coordinate annual reviews of teachers;
- Undertake human resources functions [recommend salary increments, teaching staff entitlements and working conditions, complaints handling, disciplinary procedures handling etc];
- Facilitate the collection of school performance and school improvement data;
- Identify under performing schools;
- Input data into EMIS systems;
- Feedback to schools, principals and SRO;
- Identify in-service training needs, develop training schedule for school personnel and coordinate development of training material with training providers; identify resource persons;
- Assess training impact;
- Liaise with FoE on pre-service teacher training;
- Review curriculum provided by the school;
- Review teaching approaches and facilities; and
- Maintain school records, provide audit response and conduct special studies.

### E4 School Performance Unit

The functions of the School Improvement unit will be to:

- Preliminary assessment against Baseline checklist;
- Develop School Improvement Plans;
- Monitor Annual Assessment of schools;
- Conduct triennial school reviews;
- Data gathering and analysis for school performance assessment and data base management;
- Collaborate with Sports and Culture Division as well as with CMAD, FoE and other relevant Ministries and Departments;
- Disseminate management guidelines for School Committees and Principals;
- Support School Committees and Principals in school management;
- Training Needs assessment and conducting training for School Committees and Principals;
- Record Maintenance; and
- Development and monitoring of implementation strategies.

## E5 School Personnel Unit

The functions of the School Personnel Unit will be to:

- Recruitment and selection into FOE programs with FOE and SFS;
- Recruitment, selection and appointment of teachers and principals to all schools and SRO to various districts;
- All functions as under school staffing in the MESC Current Organizational Structure [e.g. Recruit, appoint and post teachers; Maintain personnel records for all teachers, principals and SRO; Maintain school staffing database; Forecast staffing needs; Advise Core Executive on staffing strategies; Ensure schools are staffed equitably; Coordinate with donors regarding teacher supply; and Market and promote teaching as a career].

## F. Draft NTDF Implementation schedule

The TA has prepared a summary Draft NTDF Implementation Schedule [see table 14 below] to assist further progress in moving from a draft to an actual NTDF. As this TA falls within ESP II, it is envisaged that the ESP II MESC Core Executive will ensure monitoring and reporting on developments towards the finalization of the NTDF and, consequently, on progress in its implementation. Performance indicators, as a basis for monitoring, are included in the table.

### Table 14: Draft NTDF Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Activity</th>
<th>Date Completion</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/Target</th>
<th>Cost/ Source16</th>
<th>Responsible MESC Office/ Officer</th>
<th>Risk/risk alleviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a Draft NTDF</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Draft NTDF endorsed by MESC</td>
<td>MESC: CEO</td>
<td>No agreement on a NTDF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for Teacher Remuneration and Incentives proposal activated</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>524 teachers being paid at increased levels</td>
<td>1,109,613WST MESC budget</td>
<td>MESC: CEO/ACEO CSD and SOD</td>
<td>No resources budgeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Registration Body established.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Teachers being registered</td>
<td></td>
<td>MESC, CEO</td>
<td>Disagreement with concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Committee established</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>PD committee meeting</td>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>MESC, CEO</td>
<td>Disagreement with concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 NAC = No Additional Cost
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Obstacle/Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOD fully staffed</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Full complement of SOD staff employed</td>
<td>GoS</td>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS system fully operational</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>EMIS servicing all needs</td>
<td>ESP II: MESC Consultant</td>
<td>The budget of 15,000 needs to be reassessed for possible increase to support a fully functional EMIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Appraisal process revised</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Revised PA document</td>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>SOD, PEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New P. Appraisal Implemented</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>All teachers appraised annually</td>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for credits for PD determined</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Guidelines approved and published</td>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>FOE, Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for FOE Practicum determined</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Guidelines approved, published and implemented</td>
<td>FOE, MESC, SOD/ACEO</td>
<td>Obstruction in the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher profile process upgraded and fully oper-</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Profiles available</td>
<td>NAC: if SOD fully staffed</td>
<td>SOD, PEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC-wide PD Plan for teachers completed</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>400 different teachers each year being provided with ten days PD per annum</td>
<td>280,000 WST p.a.</td>
<td>PA data not processed, Funding not allocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION 5

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR TA 4738-SAM: NATIONAL TEACHER DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

I. ISSUES

1. Critical issues noted in the country's development strategies for 2002–2004 and 2005-2007 are (i) an uncoordinated approach to teacher development and supply of well-trained teachers, (ii) lack of national standards for teacher competencies, (iii) inadequate subject and pedagogical knowledge and skills to encourage higher order learning, and (iv) insufficient knowledge of contemporary classroom management practices. These issues contribute to (i) low levels of student achievements and of functional literacy and numeracy, even among the high-school graduates; (ii) inequitable access to quality schooling among the disadvantaged; (iii) high repetition and dropout rates; (iv) higher turnover of teachers; and (v) irrelevant curriculum.

2. Teacher quality is one reason for the low quality of education. While the curriculum is being modernized and new teaching resources are being developed, a similar investment is not being made in teacher development. As a result, both pre- and in-service teacher training has not kept pace with the rapidly changing knowledge, skills, and dispositions required by the new curriculum, teaching approaches, and teaching resources. Given the urgency of the concern about teacher quality, recent teacher training interventions have targeted in-service training supported by external funding, which are not sustained. Such project-based training provides temporary relief but also creates a gap between pre- and in-service teacher training and different levels of teacher proficiency. The technical assistance (TA) will help the design and development of the teacher training activities planned in the Education Sector Project II.

3. To increase the efficiency of the education system, long-term prioritized and sequenced sector reform, and teacher development need to be addressed in the Strategy for the Development of Samoa, 2002-2004. Such an approach with an investment plan will allow better coordination of education assistance, and responsiveness of education services to supply appropriately trained teachers for the different grades and subject specialization.

II. THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

A. Impact and Output

4. The TA is to help the Government develop a comprehensive system for development and management of high-quality teachers. The outputs will be (i) an institutional structure with necessary legislation to manage and monitor the quality of teacher development; (ii) a set of policies and procedures to manage all activities associated with teacher development, quality, and supply; (iii) an agreed financial planning, management, and monitoring system for the reform of teacher development with detailed budgeting and funding options; and (iv) an agreed partnership between all stakeholders involved in teacher development. The TA output will be presented in a single comprehensive report compiled from the individual reports. The design and monitoring framework is in Table A.5.1.

B. Cost and Financing

5. The total cost of the TA is estimated to be $450,000 equivalent, of which $281,000 is the foreign exchange cost and $169,000 equivalent the local currency cost (Table A.5.2). The Government has asked the Asian Development Bank (ADB) to finance $350,000 (78%) equivalent, covering the entire foreign exchange cost and $99,000 equivalent of the local currency cost. The TA will be financed on a grant basis by ADB's TA funding program. The Government will finance the balance of the local
currency cost, equivalent to $100,000, to finance the remaining local currency cost.

C. Methodology and Key Activities

6. The TA will be undertaken over 10 months in two phases. During the first phase, stakeholder consultation will be undertaken to ensure ownership of the recommendations included in the reports and the eventual national teacher development framework (NTDF). This will involve five formal workshops to consider alternative approaches to developing and managing an NTDF. During phase one, existing education documents; census data on teacher recruitment and student enrollments; teacher supply; demand, and quality; available financial resources; and absorptive capacity of teacher development activities will be reviewed. The review will cover capacity and quality of all teacher training institutions in the country and the programs offered by them. A short sample survey will be conducted to collect disaggregated data for net teacher demand and supply, academic and teaching qualifications, demands for subject specialization, teacher incentive schemes, support from education administrators, and issues related to quality service provision. The information will be used to identify the extent of the gap between teachers’ current competencies and those expected to implement the new curriculum, and interventions required for the development of an NTDF that would ensure capacity for sustained development and management of well-trained teachers.

7. During the second phase, the TA will assist the Government in developing a policy framework to help articulate the NTDF by outlining its priorities for pre- and in-service teacher development. The policy framework will include minimum standards for (i) academic and professional competencies for primary and secondary teachers and for each subject; (ii) teacher training institutional/organizational capacity to deliver appropriate types and levels of teacher training programs; and (iii) monitoring and evaluation of teacher performance for initial registration plus periodic reviews. The framework will include (i) guidelines for articulation between pre- and in-service and other professional upgrade training programs; (ii) guidelines for accrediting in-service and professional upgrades to formal qualifications; (iii) guidelines to develop teaching portfolios to evaluate classroom-based performance of teachers; (iv) guidelines to monitor institutional collaboration, joint projects with schools and/or teacher professional organizations in respective areas; (v) guidelines for teacher remuneration and incentive schemes to ensure equity and fair distribution of teachers through the country; and (vi) guidelines for establishing a system of teacher registration and accreditation. The policy framework and procedures will be developed through a consultative process involving all stakeholders. The Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture (MESC) will hold a 2-day formal workshop involving technical experts, teachers, parents, private sector partners in education, e.g., National University of Samoa, church schools, nongovernment organizations, private schools, and other policymakers, to seek feedback from the stakeholders regarding the contents of the teacher development policy framework. The feedback will be incorporated in the final product covering teacher development policy reform and major activities with estimated budget, time frame, and targets for teacher development for the next decade.

8. Furthermore, the TA will help the Government begin the process of aligning current teacher training programs to the new quality, efficiency, and sustainability standard. It will help develop: (i) appropriate legislation to implement teacher registration and in-service teacher performance monitoring, (ii) teacher competencies, (iii) processes for monitoring institutional capacity to provide appropriate quality teacher training programs, (iv) a manual of policies and procedures for national teacher development decision making, and (v) a reporting mechanism. The TA scope will not undertake the full development and implementation of the actions identified, but it will provide a strong platform for MESC to work from.

9. The consultants’ will provide one comprehensive report that integrates all aspects from two individual reports for each phase. The first of the two individual reports will include (i) a brief description of the current approach to teacher development and management based on relevant disaggregated data obtained for the surveys and focus groups; (ii) a detailed, but concise and focused analysis of key issues related to quality, efficiency, and cost effectiveness; (iii) concise analysis of causes related to the issues, and (iv) a short description of past performance of the Government and external assistance
in teacher development including in-service teacher training and lessons learned. It will (i) provide a set of quality indicators, with baseline values, expected targets with time frame, and monitoring mechanism; and (ii) formulate a set of recommendations for the conceptualization and development of an NTDF.

10. The second individual report will include policy guidelines including the rationale, processes, and exemplars for (i) developing teacher standards and competencies for primary, secondary, and subject specializations; (ii) monitoring institutional standards and capacity to develop, deliver, and monitor appropriate training programs; (iii) guidelines for accrediting in-service and professional upgrade programs to formal qualifications; (iv) guidelines to develop teaching portfolios to evaluate classroom-based performance of teachers; (v) guidelines to monitor institutional collaboration, and joint projects with schools and/or teacher professional organizations in respective areas; and (vi) guidelines for teacher remuneration and incentive schemes to ensure equity and fair distribution of teachers throughout the country.

D. Implementation Arrangements

11. The Ministry of Finance will be the Executing Agency and MESC the Implementing Agency for the TA. MESC will appoint a senior staff member as coordinator for all matters pertaining to the TA. Five counterpart staff, three from MESC and two from the Faculty of Education of the National University of Samoa, will be appointed to work closely with the international consultants to provide assistance and advice, and help formulate the final documents. The existing Education Steering Committee will be involved to advice on all policy and legal issues associated with the TA. If needed the committee could be expanded to include members to oversee specific areas of TA implementation. The committee will meet at least three times (at the beginning, middle, and end of TA) to provide guidance.

12. ADB will engage four international and five domestic consultants with experience in all aspects of the specified scope of work. The international consultant group will comprise (i) a teacher education planning and institutional development specialist who will be the team leader (4.6 person months), (ii) a teacher education/quality assurance specialist (3.5 person-months), (iii) a legislation and policy development expert (1 person-month), and (iv) a financial planning specialist (1 person-month). The domestic consultants will be (i) an education administration and policy specialist (4 person-months), (ii) a teacher education specialist (3 person-months), (iii) a participatory planning specialist (1.5 person-month), (iv) a teacher training specialist (2.5 person-months), and (v) a finance and legal specialist (1.5 person-months). The consultants will be selected through a firm in accordance with ADB’s Guidelines on the Use of Consultants and other engagement arrangements for domestic consultants acceptable to ADB. Supplementary Appendix D provides the detailed terms of reference for the consultants.

13. The TA will be implemented over 10 months. It is expected to start in June 2006 and be completed by April 2007. The team leader and the teacher education/quality assurance specialist will prepare a TA implementation plan. Within 4 weeks after starting the TA, the team leader will submit a brief inception report summarizing initial findings, identifying specific issues, and suggesting changes to the methodology and program, if any. The consultants will submit (at the end of week 30) a draft final report to Asian Development Bank, Australian Agency for International Development, European Union, Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture, Ministry of Finance, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and New Zealand Agency for International Development for comments before the workshop with all the stakeholders. The consultants will submit three hard copies each of all the reports in a single compact disc (3 copies each) to ADB, one copy each to the other development partners, and six copies to the executing and implementing agencies.
### Table A5.1: Design and Monitoring Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Summary</th>
<th>Performance Indicators/Target</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that a high-quality teaching force staffs primary and secondary schools so that Education for All and Millennium Development Goals can be achieved by 2015 and provide expanded opportunities for quality secondary education</td>
<td>- More than 80% of primary and secondary teachers implement the new curriculum by 2015 using child-centered instructional strategies.</td>
<td>- Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture (MESC) statistics.</td>
<td>- MESC and Faculty of Education are able to resolve the current tension and work collaboratively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Retention, promotion, and transition rates significantly improved above the current baseline level by 2015 (Technical assistance [TA] consultants will determine the baseline and target).</td>
<td>- School review officer reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Observational studies.</td>
<td>- Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A strategic, cost-effective and comprehensive and approach to teacher recruitment, initial training, and sustained development</td>
<td>- Current situation of teacher development, deployment, and instructional effectiveness assessed</td>
<td>- Student assessment and test results.</td>
<td>- The Government will not be able to prioritize and sustain reform with support from key stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Policies options for continuous in-service teacher training and support analyzed with special attention to the needs of beginning teachers and underqualified teachers</td>
<td>- Annual budget allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis of the institutional requirement for effective management of teacher recruitment, deployment, and development</td>
<td>- MESC annual monitoring indicators under benefit monitoring and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The investment and recurrent cost implications of the major policy options and action plans are estimated</td>
<td>- Technical assistance (TA) reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher development framework, policies, and procedures. Action plans, with phased and costed investment</td>
<td>- Proposal for a national teacher development framework (NTDF)</td>
<td>- The inception, midterm, and final report.</td>
<td>- Addressing the education quality and efficiency issues remains the Government's priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Phased action plans for teacher recruitment, initial training, and continued professional development</td>
<td>- Government's endorsement and acceptance of the Teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Estimates of investment and recurrent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Summary</td>
<td>Performance Indicators/Target</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td>cost of action programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Framework issuing an official notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management and monitoring system and institutional framework for the supporting the operations of NTDF agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sample of expected teacher competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher registration and performance appraisal guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revised Government policy ready for implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government review of report and decision on teacher policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 person-months of international consulting services and 12.5 person-months domestic consulting funded by Asian Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpart staff</td>
<td>• Steering committee, technical working group from the Ministry of Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Luki, Asenati  DFL Lecturer USP Alafua
Mah Sun, Maria  PEO Administration
Mauiliu, Magele  Vice Chancellor, NUS
Meleisea, Lemalu S.  SFS Executive Representative
Meredith, Ana  Vaitele Pri. School Comm.
Misa, Olano  School Review Officer
Moli, Fepulea’i S.  CEO
Mulitalo, Faaea  Principal Officer Pr. Curr.
Nomeneta, Faleolo  School Review Officer
Pau’susi, Vaiaso  SEO School Review
Paulo, Penina  SFS Executive Representative
Penitito, Moenono  Anoamaa School Comm.
Petaia, Nuufou G.  ESP II Secretariat
Petana, Hinauri  CEO MOF
Pilaila, Kitenda  ADB Schoolnet Project
Polataivao, Irwin  Principal, Falefitu
Pouesi, Namo  Falefitu School Committee
Pritchard, Janice  ACEO Budget Division, MoF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punavulu, Tui Puni</td>
<td>Finance Registrar, NUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid-Enari, Quandolita</td>
<td>PEO Policy Analysis and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimoni, Reupena</td>
<td>Principal, Samoa College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roache, Faaea</td>
<td>CMAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Potoa’e</td>
<td>ACEO, PSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roebeck, Doreen</td>
<td>ACEO CMAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salu, Leana</td>
<td>Moata’a Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samitioata, Leatuvi</td>
<td>Vailele-uta Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanerivi, Lemalu Lafi</td>
<td>SQA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savea, Logotaeao</td>
<td>Principal, Vaivase Pr. School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuster, Lina</td>
<td>Faculty of Education, NUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seupule, Teutupe</td>
<td>Dir. LDS Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siaosi, Mene</td>
<td>Principal Officer Inf. Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siaosi, So’oalo Mene</td>
<td>PEO Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simanu, Olosau</td>
<td>School Review Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simi, Noumea</td>
<td>Aid and Development, Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solofa, Esekia</td>
<td>Critical Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So’o, Ainslie</td>
<td>Literacy Task Force, CMAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su’a, Laititi</td>
<td>ACEO CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sua Belford, Laititi</td>
<td>ACEO Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taaloga, Malama</td>
<td>PO Teacher Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taimalie, Talaumi</td>
<td>School Review Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talauta, Falesi</td>
<td>Apia Pr. School Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanielu, Eanemest</td>
<td>Secretary, NTDF Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapelu, Mafatia</td>
<td>Manager, Student Admin NUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tariu, Rev. Faapaia</td>
<td>Vailea Faleata Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taumafoai, Rev. K.</td>
<td>Dir. Methodist Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taule’alo, Fereisa</td>
<td>School Review Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taule’alo, Lufi</td>
<td>ACEO School Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toalepaialii, Marie</td>
<td>ACEO PPRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuala, Doreen</td>
<td>ACEO CMAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufuga, Makereta</td>
<td>Principal, Asau College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullaepa, Laulu Ray</td>
<td>Principal Officer School Pers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuipoloa, Elena</td>
<td>CMAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uesile, Manuta L</td>
<td>School Review Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ula, Faalata</td>
<td>Principal, Vaipouli College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasa, Fa’amatuainu S</td>
<td>P Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ve’e, Ruta</td>
<td>Records Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Debbie</td>
<td>Policy Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Gauna</td>
<td>Principal Officer Sec. Curr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 - DRAFT TEACHING PROFESSION BILL 2007

Arrangement of Provisions

2007, No. ...

AN ACT to provide for the administration of the teaching profession in Samoa, and for determining and enforcing standards that apply to the training, employment and duties of teachers, and for related matters.

BE IT ENACTED by the Legislative Assembly of Samoa in Parliament assembled as follows:

PART I - PRELIMINARY

1. Short title and commencement
   (1) This Act may be cited as the Teaching Profession Act 2007.
   (2) This Act commences on a date nominated by the Minister.
   (3) Notice of commencement of this Act must be published in Samoan and English in the Savali, and one other newspaper that is circulating in Samoa.

2. This Act binds the State
   This Act binds the State.

3. Relationship with the Public Service Act
   To the extent of any inconsistency, this Act prevails over the Public Service Act 2004.

4. Definitions
   In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires—
   “advisory committee” means the advisory committee established under section 11 (The advisory committee);
   “approved teacher” means a person who—
   (a) is registered as a teacher; or
   (b) is conditionally registered as a teacher; or
   (b) holds a limited authority to teach;
   “CEO” means the Chief Executive Officer of the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture;
   “Chairperson” means the Chairperson of the advisory committee, and includes any member of the advisory committee who is appointed as a temporary chairperson;

17 The highlighted text indicates words or numbers that may need to be changed according to when the Bill is introduced into Parliament.
“child” means a person under the age of 18;
“conviction” includes a finding of guilt;
“Minister” means the Minister who is, from time to time, responsible for the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture;
“Ministry” means the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture;
“National University of Samoa” means the university of that name established under the National University of Samoa Act 1997;
“principal” means the person in charge of a school;
“register” means a register of approved teachers kept under section 23 (Registers);
“registration” includes conditional registration;
“Remuneration Tribunal” means the tribunal of that name established under the Remuneration Tribunal Act 2003;
“Samoa Qualifications Authority” means the authority of that name established under the Samoa Qualifications Authority Act 2006;
“school” means a Government school, or non-Government school, within the meaning of the Education Ordinance 1959;
“sexual crime” means a sexual crime under part VI of the Crimes Ordinance 1961;
“teach” see section 15(2) (Who may teach in a school);
“teaching profession standards” means the competencies, skills, knowledge, behaviour, and values that enable a person to effectively perform the duties of a teacher.

5. **Object of this Act**

(1) The object of this Act is to safeguard the public interest in there being a teaching profession whose members are—
   (a) competent educators; and
   (b) fit and proper persons to have the care of children.

(2) This is to be achieved by establishing and maintaining a system for—
   (a) approving standards for entry to, and continuing membership of, the teaching profession; and
   (b) registering people as approved teachers if they meet those standards; and
   (c) monitoring and enforcing compliance with the standards by those approved teachers.

PART II - ADMINISTRATION

6. **The Registrar**

(1) There is to be a Registrar, who is an officer of the Ministry appointed by the CEO.

(2) During any period of absence or illness of the Registrar, the CEO must appoint another officer of the Ministry to act as Registrar.

(3) The appointment of the Registrar must be—
   (a) made in writing; and
   (b) published in Samoan and English in the Savali, and one other newspaper that is circulating in Samoa.

(4) However, the validity of the appointment of the Registrar is not affected by the CEO failing to comply with subsection (3)(b).
7. **Registrar’s functions—teaching profession standards system**

(1) The Registrar, acting with the advice of the advisory committee, is responsible for establishing and maintaining a system for—

(a) developing the teaching profession standards that apply to the teaching profession in Samoa; and

(b) reviewing the teaching profession standards, at least once every calendar year, and making any necessary changes to the teaching profession standards; and

(c) monitoring the performance of teachers against the teaching profession standards (including through a system of performance appraisal, for example); and

(d) enforcing the teaching profession standards; and

(e) maintaining accessible records of the decisions of the Registrar about the teaching profession standards.

(2) The teaching profession standards may require, for example, the observance of a code of conduct for teachers.

(3) The Registrar must ensure that the teaching profession standards—

(a) are consistent with the proper and effective administration and operation of schools, and the provision of teaching services; and

(b) reflect matters of Government policy and administrative practice relating to the provision of teaching services, as advised from time to time by the Ministry; and

(c) ensure that the teaching services provided in Samoa meet accepted international standards, and are consistent with the human rights applying to persons in Samoa.

8. **Registrar’s functions—registration system**

The Registrar, acting with the advice of the advisory committee, is responsible for establishing and maintaining a system for—

(a) deciding how a person must satisfy initial and ongoing eligibility requirements for registration or limited authority to teach; and

(b) deciding applications for, or renewal of, registration or limited authority to teach; and

(c) ensuring approved teachers continue to meet the eligibility requirements for registration or limited authority to teach, (including by monitoring the compliance of approved teachers with conditions of registration or limited authority to teach, for example); and

(d) maintaining a register of approved teachers; and

(e) developing or approving training programs—

(i) that are relevant to a person’s eligibility for registration or limited authority to teach; and

(ii) for the continuing professional development of approved teachers; and

(f) monitoring the effectiveness of those training programs; and

(g) collaborating with the following entities about teacher training—

(i) the Samoa Qualifications Authority; and

(ii) educational institutions (including the National University of Samoa, for example); and

(h) collaborating with entities who are engaged in developing whole-of-government policies that relate to the teaching profession (including the Remuneration Tribunal, for example); and

(i) approving procedures for ensuring the security and integrity of the registration system (including the giving of registration certificates by fax or email, for example); and

(j) undertaking or supporting reviews and research relevant to the regulation of the teaching profession.
9. Registrar’s other functions

The Registrar, acting with the advice of the advisory committee, is also responsible for—
(a) promoting the teaching profession to the public; and
(b) informing approved teachers and the public about the operation of this Act; and
(c) reviewing the operation of this Act and reporting to the Minister about its operation; and
(d) any other function that is conferred under the regulations.

10. Powers of the Registrar

(1) The Registrar may exercise any power that is necessary or incidental to any responsibility of the Registrar under this Act or any other applicable law.
(2) The Registrar may, by a written document, delegate any of those powers to an employee of the public service.

11. The advisory committee

(1) An advisory committee is established.
(2) The members of the advisory committee are—
(a) an employee of the Ministry who is appointed by the CEO; and
(b) an employee of the Public Service Commission who is appointed by the head of the Public Service Commission; and
(c) a member of the teaching staff of the Faculty of Education at the National University of Samoa who is appointed by the Dean of the Faculty of Education; and
(d) 4 teachers who are appointed by the Sosaiete Faiaoga Samoa, one of whom is to be appointed to represent teachers in non-Government schools; and
(e) 2 members of the community appointed by the Minister who have knowledge, skills or experience that the Minister considers may assist the deliberations of the advisory committee.
(3) The members of the advisory committee are to be paid, from the funds of the Ministry, the allowances that are approved by Cabinet, from time to time, for members of Government advisory committees.

12. Advisory committee’s function

(1) The function of the advisory committee is to advise the Registrar in relation to the Registrar’s functions.
(2) The Chairperson of the advisory committee may request assistance from the Registrar for administrative support to the advisory committee, including for example in relation to—
(a) the convening of advisory committee meetings; or
(b) the recording of advisory committee meetings.

13. Holding office as a member of the advisory committee

(1) The members of the advisory committee hold office for 3 years, and are eligible for reappointment.
(2) The advisory committee may vote to remove a member on the grounds of—
(a) inability to perform their functions under this Act due to a physical or mental incapacity; or
(b) neglect of duty; or
(c) misconduct that affects, or is likely to affect, the operations or reputation of the advisory committee; or
(d) failure to disclose, and to take all reasonable steps to avoid, any real or apparent conflicts of interest in relation to their membership of the advisory committee; or
(e) using information belonging to or under the control of the advisory committee other than for the advisory committee’s functions; or
(f) failure to act with integrity as a member of the advisory committee; or
(g) misuse of their status or authority as a member of the advisory committee to seek or obtain a benefit for themselves or any other person or body; or
(h) absence from Samoa for longer than 6 months, unless the advisory committee approves the absence; or
(i) failure to attend 3 consecutive meetings of the advisory committee without submitting an apology to the advisory committee for the member’s absence.

(3) The office of a member of the advisory committee becomes vacant if the member—

(a) is removed from office under subsection [2]; or
(b) resigns from office by giving written notice to that effect to the Registrar; or
(c) retires; or
(d) dies.

(4) The office of a member of the advisory committee may be filled in the way that originally applied to the appointment of the member.

14. Meetings of the advisory committee

(1) At the first meeting of the advisory committee, the members of the advisory committee must appoint one of the members to be the Chairperson of the advisory committee.

(2) The Chairperson must ensure that the advisory committee meets at least once every calendar year.

(3) The Chairperson must convene a meeting of the advisory committee if requested in writing to do so by at least 3 members of the advisory committee.

(4) If the Chairperson is absent or unavailable, the members of the advisory committee may appoint another member of the advisory committee to chair a meeting of the advisory committee.

(5) At any meeting of the advisory committee, at least half plus one of the total number of members holding office constitutes a quorum.

(6) Every question before a meeting of the advisory committee must be decided by a majority of votes of the members present at the meeting.

(7) At every meeting of the advisory committee, the Chairperson has a deliberative vote and, in the case of an equality of votes, the Chairperson also has a casting vote.

(8) Except as otherwise provided in this section or in any regulations, the advisory committee may regulate its procedures as it considers appropriate.

PART III - ELIGIBILITY AND SUITABILITY TO TEACH

15. Who may teach in a school

[1] A person may teach in a school only if—

(a) the person is registered as a teacher; or
(b) the person is conditionally registered as a teacher; or
(c) the person—
(i) has been offered a teaching position in that school because an appropriate registered teacher can not be found to fill the position; and
(ii) has a limited authority to teach in that school.

(2) A person ‘teaches’ in a school if the person undertakes duties in the school that include—
(a) delivering an educational program; or
(b) assessing student participation in an educational program.

(3) Subsection (1) does not apply to a person who is a teacher trainee.

(4) A person who contravenes subsection (1) commits an offence.

(5) The maximum penalty for the offence is imprisonment for 5 years, or a fine of 100 penalty units, or both.

16. Criteria for registration or limited authority to teach

A person is entitled to be registered as a teacher, or to be given limited authority to teach, if the person satisfies the Registrar that the person—

(a) is eligible for—
   (i) registration as a teacher; or
   (ii) conditional registration as a teacher; or
   (iii) limited authority to teach; and
(b) is suitable to teach.

17. Eligibility to teach

(1) A person is eligible for registration as a teacher if the person has—
(a) the qualifications and experience that is prescribed under a regulation for registration; or
(b) the education, experience, abilities, and contribution to education that show that the person meets the requirements for registration under the teaching profession standards.

   Example of a person under paragraph (b)—
   A person has a teaching qualification that is not a prescribed qualification, but has long and meritorious teaching experience in a school, whether or not the school was in Samoa.

(2) A person is eligible for conditional registration as a teacher if the person has—
(a) the qualifications and experience that is prescribed under a regulation for conditional registration; or
(b) the education, experience, abilities, and contribution to education that show that the person meets the requirements for conditional registration under the teaching profession standards.

   Examples of a person under paragraph (b)—
   A person has a qualification at degree level or higher from a higher education institution, which is not a prescribed qualification, but has long and meritorious teaching experience in a non-school setting, such as a university.
   A person has a prescribed qualification, but does not have satisfactory recent teaching experience.

(3) A person is eligible for limited authority to teach if the person has the knowledge, skills or experience that the Registrar considers to be relevant to the teaching position that the person has been offered.

   Example—
   A person who does not have a prescribed qualification, but whose first language is English, is eligible for a limited authority to teach only English.

18. Suitability to teach

(1) A person is not suitable to teach if the person, in Samoa or overseas, has—
(a) behaved in a way that does not satisfy a standard of behaviour generally expected of a teacher; or

(b) behaved in an improper way that shows that the person is unfit—
   (i) to be registered as a teacher or to have limited authority to teach; or
   (ii) to work in a child-related field.

(2) When deciding whether a person is suitable to teach, the Registrar may have regard to any information that the Registrar considers relevant, including among other things—

(a) if the person was refused registration as a teacher overseas—the reason for the refusal; and

(b) if the person was employed in a school and the person’s employment was terminated for a reason relating to the person’s competency or suitability to teach—the reason that the person’s employment was terminated; and

(c) if the person was registered as a teacher overseas and—
   (i) the registration was affected by the imposition of a condition—the nature of the condition and the reasons for its imposition; or
   (ii) the registration was suspended or cancelled—the reason for the suspension or cancellation; or
   (iii) the registration was affected in another way—the way it was affected and the reason for it being affected; and

(d) any conviction of the person of an offence against a law of Samoa or another country, and the relevance of the offence to the duties of a teacher.

(3) The Registrar may ask the Commissioner of Police to give the Registrar the following information about the person—

(a) a written report about the person’s criminal record, in Samoa or overseas, that the Commissioner of Police has access to; and

(b) a brief description of the circumstances of a conviction or charge mentioned in the person’s criminal record.

(4) The Commissioner of Police must promptly comply with the Registrar’s request.

(5) If a person is charged with an offence under the Crimes Ordinance 1961 and the prosecutor is aware that the person is a teacher, the prosecutor must give the Registrar written notice of the following particulars—

(a) the person’s name; and

(b) if the person is convicted of the offence—
   (i) particulars of the offence; and
   (ii) the date of the conviction; and
   (iii) the court that convicted the person; and
   (iv) the sentence imposed by the court; and

(c) if the person appeals a conviction for the offence, and the appeal is decided or otherwise ends—
   (i) particulars of the offence; and
   (ii) the date on which the appeal was decided or otherwise ended; and
   (iii) if the appeal was decided—the court that decided the appeal; and
   (iv) if the appeal was decided—particulars of the decision.

(6) The prosecutor must give the information to the Registrar within 7 days after the prosecutor becomes aware of the particulars.
PART IV - REGISTRATION OR LIMITED AUTHORITY TO TEACH

19. Application for registration or limited authority to teach

(1) Every application for registration as a teacher, or for limited authority to teach, must—
   (a) be made to the Registrar in the form that is approved by the Registrar; and
   (b) be accompanied by the application fee that is prescribed under the regulations; and
   (c) be accompanied by evidence of the applicant's eligibility and suitability in accordance
       with sections 17 (Eligibility to teach) and 18 (Suitability to teach).

(2) The Registrar may—
   (a) require an applicant to provide the further information that the Registrar reasonably
       requires to consider the application; and
   (b) require any person to verify, by statutory declaration or on an oath or affirmation, any
       aspect of an application.

20. Decision on application

(1) The Registrar must promptly consider every application and decide to—
   (a) grant—
       (i) for an application for registration—registration or conditional registration; or
       (ii) for an application for conditional registration—conditional registration; or
       (iii) for an application for limited authority to teach—a limited authority to teach; or
   (b) refuse to grant the application.

(2) The Registrar may impose conditions on the grant of conditional registration or of limited au-
    thority to teach, including for example—
   (a) a condition that requires the applicant to complete a training course; or
   (b) a condition that requires the applicant to be supervised; or
   (c) a condition that restricts the subjects that the applicant can teach.

(3) The Registrar must advise the applicant, in writing, of the Registrar's decision as soon as is
    practicable.

(4) If the Registrar decides to grant a person’s application, the Registrar must—
   (a) enter the person’s details in the appropriate register; and
   (b) issue a certificate of registration to the person.

21. Period of registration or limited authority to teach

(1) Registration, and conditional registration, as a teacher expires 3 years after the day on which it
    commences.

(2) A limited authority to teach expires on the date specified in the authority, which must be no
    more than 2 years after the day on which the authority commences.

(3) The Registrar must suspend a person’s registration as a teacher or limited authority to teach
    as soon as is practicable after the Registrar becomes aware that the person has been charged
    with a sexual crime involving a child.

(4) The Registrar must cancel a person’s registration as a teacher or limited authority to teach as
    soon as is practicable after the Registrar becomes aware that the person has been convicted of
    a sexual crime involving a child.

(5) The cancellation is not affected by any appeal from the conviction.

(6) However, if the conviction is quashed or overturned on appeal, the Registrar must immedi-
    ately re-register the person.
22. **Re-registration**

(1) Registration as a teacher, or limited authority to teach, may be renewed.

(2) However, if—

(a) the Registrar refuses a person’s application for registration or limited authority to teach; or

(b) a disciplinary committee cancels a person’s registration or limited authority to teach;

the Registrar must not consider an application for registration or limited authority to teach that is made by the person within 1 year after the refusal or cancellation.

23. **Registers**

(1) The Registrar must maintain a separate register for—

(a) persons with registration as a teacher; and

(b) persons with conditional registration as a teacher; and

(c) persons with limited authority to teach.

(2) Each register must contain at least the following information about each approved teacher in the register—

(a) the name and address of the approved teacher; and

(b) any conditions that apply to the approved teacher; and

(c) the qualifications of the approved teacher; and

(d) the courses undertaken, and grades achieved, in any formal qualification of the approved teacher; and

(e) the date on which the approved teacher was registered as a teacher or given limited authority to teach.

(3) The Registrar must—

(a) allow the registers to be inspected at the times and places decided by the Registrar, on the payment of any fee fixed from time to time by the Registrar; and

(b) provide certificates in relation to the status of approved teachers, on the payment of any fee fixed from time to time by the Registrar.

24. **Altering the registers**

(1) The Registrar may alter the details of approved teacher in a register only to—

(a) reflect any change to the approved teacher’s names and address that are notified by the approved teacher, including the noting of any matai title; and

(b) note additional relevant qualifications; and

(c) note the re-registration of the approved teacher; and

(d) record disciplinary action taken against the approved teacher, and the penalties imposed; and

(e) comply with any order of a court; and

(f) remove the name of an approved teacher, at the request of the approved teacher; and

(g) remove the name of an approved teacher, as a result of disciplinary action taken against the approved teacher; and

(h) remove the name of an approved teacher who has been convicted of an offence against subsection (2).

(2) A person commits an offence if the person—

(a) obtains registration by fraud; or

(b) makes a false entry, or causes a false entry to be made, in a register; or

(c) accesses a register without lawful authority.
(3) The maximum penalty for the offence is imprisonment for 5 years, or a fine of 100 penalty units, or both.

(4) A person commits an offence if the person—
   (a) is registered under this Act; and
   (b) fails to notify the Registrar of any change of name or address within 3 months of the change occurring.

(5) The maximum penalty for the offence is a fine of 1 penalty unit.

(6) However, it is not compulsory for an approved teacher to notify the Registrar of any matai title taken by the approved teacher.

PART V - MONITORING PERFORMANCE OF APPROVED TEACHERS

25. Purpose of this part

(1) The purpose of this part is to provide a system for monitoring the performance of approved teachers to ensure that the teaching profession standards are maintained.

(2) To remove any doubt—
   (a) if a matter may be dealt with under this part or under the Public Service Act 2004, the matter is to be dealt with under this part; and
   (b) an approved teacher may be dealt with under this part, and also dealt with for the commission of an offence, for the same act or omission.

26. Complaints about teacher performance

(1) Action may be taken under this part against an approved teacher who—
   (a) fails to comply with the teaching profession standards; or
   (b) fails to comply with a condition that applies to the approved teacher's registration or limited authority to teach; or
   (c) commits an offence that is in any way associated with the duties of the approved teacher.

(2) Action may be started on the basis of a complaint to the Registrar by—
   (a) a student of the approved teacher; or
   (b) the parent or guardian of a student of the approved teacher; or
   (c) another approved teacher; or
   (d) the principal of the school where the approved teacher is teaching.

(3) Also, action may be started by the Registrar on his or her own initiative.

(4) If the person who made a complaint informs the Registrar that they intend to withdraw their complaint, the Registrar, at his or her discretion, may continue to consider the complaint.

27. Order to appear before a disciplinary committee

(1) The Registrar may order an approved teacher, against whom a complaint has been made, to appear before a disciplinary committee which will hear and decide proceedings in relation to the complaint.

(2) The order must be in writing and state—
   (a) the act or omission that is alleged to have been committed by the approved teacher; and
   (b) the facts on which the complaint is based; and
   (c) the time, date and place of the disciplinary committee hearing.
(3) The order must be given to the approved teacher at least 7 days before the disciplinary committee hearing is to begin.

(4) If all reasonable attempts to give the order to the approved teacher have failed, the order may instead be published in a newspaper at least 7 days before the disciplinary committee hearing is to begin.

(5) The newspaper must be one that is circulating in the area where the approved teacher was last known to live.

28. Establishing a disciplinary committee

(1) A disciplinary committee is established by a written order of the Registrar.

(2) A disciplinary committee may be—

(a) a summary committee, which may only—
   (i) reprimand the approved teacher; or
   (ii) impose a fine of not more than 10 penalty units on the approved teacher; or
(b) a non-summary committee, which may—
   (i) reprimand the approved teacher; or
   (ii) impose a fine of not more than 10 penalty units on the approved teacher; or
   (iii) order the registration of the approved teacher be made subject to the conditions that the disciplinary committee considers appropriate; or
   (iv) order the registration of the approved teacher be suspended for the period that the disciplinary committee considers appropriate; or
   (v) order the registration of the approved teacher be cancelled.

(3) A disciplinary committee consists of—

(a) in the case of a summary committee—1 member of the advisory committee nominated by the advisory committee; or
(b) in the case of a non-summary committee—3 members of the advisory committee nominated by the advisory committee.

(4) However, none of the following persons can be appointed as a member of a disciplinary committee—

(a) the complainant; or
(b) any of the witnesses to be called in the hearing; or
(c) any other person who has any interest that may conflict with a fair and impartial hearing of the charges made against the approved teacher.

(5) The order that establishes a non-summary committee must specify which member of the disciplinary committee is to be the Chairman of the committee.

29. Proceedings before a disciplinary committee

(1) The proceedings before a disciplinary committee must be heard in the presence of the approved teacher unless, in spite of being given written notice of the proceedings, the approved teacher fails to attend before the disciplinary committee.

(2) However, if the approved teacher shows sufficient cause that prevented the approved teacher from attending before the disciplinary committee, the approved teacher is entitled to a rehearing.

(3) The proceedings before the disciplinary committee are to be conducted with as little formality and technicality as possible, given the need to properly and fairly consider the complaint made against the approved teacher.

(4) The approved teacher may—

(a) be represented by a person who is not a legal practitioner; and
(b) cross-examine witnesses; and
(c) make a statement in his or her defense, either orally or in writing.

(5) The disciplinary committee is not bound by the rules of evidence, but may inform itself in any way it considers appropriate.

(6) The standard of proof in the proceedings is on balance of probabilities.

(7) The disciplinary committee must keep a written record of the proceedings, in which it records—
(a) the statements of the approved teacher and all witnesses; and
(b) any reports relating to the approved teacher that are tendered at the proceedings.

(8) If the disciplinary committee finds the approved teacher guilty, the disciplinary committee may consider any conduct of the approved teacher in the past when deciding what penalty to impose on the approved teacher.

(9) At the end of the proceedings, the disciplinary committee must inform the approved teacher—
(a) of its decision; and
(b) that the approved teacher may appeal the decision in accordance with section 30 (Appeal against decisions).

30. Appeal against decisions

(1) An approved teacher may appeal to the District Court against a decision—
(a) to refuse an application for registration or limited authority to teach; or
(b) to impose conditions on a registration or limited authority to teach; or
(c) of a disciplinary committee.

(2) The appeal must be made—
(a) within 28 days after the decision is made; and
(b) in accordance with the rules of the District Court.

(3) The approved teacher must give a copy of the filed notice of appeal to the Registrar.

(4) The judge who hears the appeal may confirm or modify the decision.

(5) The judge’s decision is final.

(6) Each party to the appeal must bear their own legal costs in relation to the appeal, unless the judge considers that exceptional circumstances exist that justify the making of an award of costs (including because the appeal was frivolous or vexatious, for example).

PART VI - OFFENCES

31. Wrongfully procuring registration or limited authority to teach

(1) A person commits an offence if the person makes a false or misleading statement—
(a) in an application for registration or limited authority to teach; or
(b) in support of an application for registration or limited authority to teach.

(2) The maximum penalty for the offence is imprisonment for 5 years, or a fine of 100 penalty units, or both.

32. Wrongfully purporting to be an approved teacher

(1) A person commits an offence if—
(a) the person holds himself or herself out to be an approved teacher (including by describing himself or herself as an approved teacher, for example); and
(b) the person is not registered under this Act.
(2) The maximum penalty for the offence is imprisonment for 2 years, or a fine of 40 penalty units, or both.

33. **Wrongfully employing person without registration or limited authority to teach**

(1) A person commits an offence if the person—
   (a) employs, or offers employment to, another person as an approved teacher; and
   (b) knows that the other person is not registered under this Act.

(2) The maximum penalty for the offence is imprisonment for 1 year, or a fine of 20 penalty units, or both.

**PART VII - MISCELLANEOUS**

34. **Evidentiary certificates**

A certificate that purports to be signed by the Registrar and is to the effect that—
   (a) a specified person is an approved teacher; or
   (b) a specified person is not an approved teacher; or
   (c) specified conditions apply to an approved teacher; or
   (d) there is a specific entry in a register in relation to an approved teacher; or
   (e) the Registrar made a specific decision in relation to an approved teacher;

is, until the contrary is proven, sufficient evidence of those matters.

35. **No action may lie against the Registrar or advisory committee**

(1) The Registrar and members of the advisory committee are not liable for any loss or damage suffered by a person because of an act or omission that relates to the registration or discipline of approved teachers under this Act.

(2) However, if subsection (1) prevents liability attaching to a person, liability attaches instead to the State.

36. **Regulations**

(1) The Head of State, acting on the advice of Cabinet, may make regulations prescribing matters—
   (a) required or permitted by this Act to be prescribed; or
   (b) necessary or convenient for giving effect to this Act.

(2) Without limiting the generality of subsection (1), regulations may be made—
   (a) to clarify any aspect of the procedures for monitoring the performance of approved teachers; and
   (b) to prescribe fees payable under this Act; and
   (c) to prescribe offences, and the penalties (of not more than 20 penalty units) for those offences.