

**Meeting between the new Head of Department, WCED and CHEC  
10 February 2010  
WCED Board room**

**Present** : Ms Penny Vinjevold, Profs Maureen Robinson, Zubeida Desai, Mr Rob Sieborger, Ms Sarie Berkhout, Nasima Badsha, Erica Gillard.

Apologies: Professors Yusef Waghid and Rudi Laugksch

## **1. Introduction**

Ms Badsha introduced the purpose of the meeting as being primarily to brief Ms Vinjevold on the relationship between WCED and CHEC and for her to meet CHEC colleagues.

Ms Badsha gave a brief overview of the history of the relationship between the WCED and CHEC, which predated the formal MOU. This included discussions about research priorities, the teacher supply and demand study completed under CHEC supervision, the joint seminar programme, support to the FET sector and development of admission criteria for students with the NC(V) to higher education, and finally the proposal initiated by John Samuel for UCT to provide support to clusters of schools. There were many other relationships which did not go via CHEC and these continued. She identified some frustrations, largely arising from staff turnover, changes in WCED priorities and contact people, and ad hoc requests.

Ms Vinjevold responded and gave her vision for priorities from 2010. She added to the agenda assessment in the schooling system and review of ACEs.

The topics discussed and proposed ways forward (person taking responsibility in **bold**), if agreed, follow.

## **2. Projects and contact between WCED and CHEC**

Ms Vinjevold reported that the Premier took the newly published provincial priorities extremely seriously. Within those, she emphasised that it was important for the WCED to find focus and to concentrate on a few projects that could be undertaken jointly with CHEC. She explained that the districts had flexibility in how they spent their budgets. Nonetheless, she hoped to develop greater consistency in initiatives across districts and districts would be judged against targets set. She would discourage ad hoc requests and requested colleagues to let her know of any they received.

CHEC representatives emphasised their desire for continuity in the WCED contact person/s. They emphasised that it was also important that these people be at a sufficiently senior level, with an understanding of how universities work and that there be access to heads of departments at meetings where decisions were made.

### 3. Planning for 2011

Ms Vinjevold reported that the programme for 2010 had been set, but that planning for 2011 should occur in this year. Priorities for 2011 would be finalised at a meeting in September.

A two-hour meeting would be arranged in March to start planning the review of ACEs. **Ms Vinjevold** agreed to arrange a time for this meeting, so that university colleagues could attend. Universities would have provisional enrolment data at that time.

### 4. Review of ACEs

Ms Vinjevold reported that the WCED was committed to the Principals' ACE, but that the rest of the ACEs were up for review. In this context, priorities were accounting, economics and life sciences. A meeting would be initiated by WCED to start planning for this review (see above).

### 5. Support to school clusters

There was some discussion about the John Samuel proposal, and agreement that a more prolonged series of discussions was necessary to discuss international best practice in the area, local experience, and the viability and form of a possible intervention in the Western Cape (including pilots). If anything were to be introduced, planning was likely to be for 2011.

There was agreement that a series of seminars would be arranged (CHEC would facilitate this), where suitable papers would be presented to explore the issue and the best way forward. **Ms Badsha** agreed to consult Ms Vinjevold to plan this.

### 6. Seminars

Ten had been planned for 2010, although these might be reduced. University representatives would continue to be invited. Universities were requested to inform the WCED of any of their seminars or visiting academics that might be of interest to the WCED. **Ms Vinjevold for invitation of universities and Deans for information to WCED.**

### 7. Research

There was agreement that the framing of research questions and the drafting of many tenders could benefit from the expertise of academic colleagues. Ways would have to be found to prevent conflict of interests (for example, if a person/ group were likely to submit a tender, then they should not comment on the brief beforehand).

Further work on developing a joint research agenda was probably not required at this stage. (See item 2 on finding a few joint projects for the partnership.)

## **8. Assessment in schooling system**

Given the serious concerns all the university representatives expressed about the planned assessment of grade 3, 6 and 9 pupils. CHEC was requested to outline their concerns in a document for Ms Vinjevold.

**Ms Berkhout** undertook to produce a draft for comment by colleagues by 26 February.

## **9. CTLI (Cape Teaching & Learning Institute)**

Ms Vinjevold reported that JET would be evaluating the success of CTLI. Tenders to provide teacher upgrading were unlikely to be put out this year. The WCED would proceed on the basis that full-time upgrading would continue to be provided by the universities and that ad-hoc training would be provided by staff of the WCED.