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Abstract

The Department of Education has been faced with challenges regarding the improvement of quality teaching and learning in South African schools. This led to the Department of Education’s endeavours to ensure that the goals and objectives set for improving the quality of teaching and learning were achieved by putting the Developmental Appraisal and Whole School Evaluation Systems in place to address the challenges in education.

The Developmental Appraisal System and Whole School Evaluation System were, however, not successfully implemented, hence the Department of Education’s agreement with unions in the Education Labour Relations Council to integrate all the systems into an Integrated Quality Management System.

The perception of the effectiveness of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) as a tool for monitoring teacher performance is the focus of the study. Documentary sources on the evaluation of the purpose, objectives and performance of the IQMS and the role-players in the implementation process have been assessed. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with members of the School Development Teams and the School Governing Bodies of the four selected secondary schools. It was found that the teachers were not totally against the IQMS as a tool for evaluating performance and providing for development which could lead to high levels of learner achievement and broader school improvement. However, the way in which the IQMS was implemented posed a challenge to its authenticity. The fact that even ineffective teachers benefitted from the rewards received and that learners’ achievements were not considered, was cause for concern.

The School Governing Body members who were interviewed were also concerned about their partial involvement in conducting Internal Whole Evaluations, as data was not used efficiently and effectively to influence
decision making and planning towards school improvement. The minimal training provided by the Department of Education hampered the process of assisting the School Governing Body members to realize the goals of achieving quality education. There was also concern that the Department of Education should provide resources that would assist in the realization of quality education especially in no-fee paying schools.

It is clear that accountability for poor or underperformance in schools cannot be one-sided as all stakeholders must ensure that the development of teachers is effective and will maximise the potential for better learner achievement and school improvement. All the stakeholders interviewed viewed the IQMS as a step in the right direction but believed that intense advocacy should be undertaken and rigorous training provided for all stakeholders to understand the drive towards achieving quality education.

The recommendations made to the Department of Education by scholars and educators who are interested in achieving quality education for all should be welcomed and implemented and efforts towards the upliftment of education should not be a futile exercise. Engagements with all stakeholders, even at grassroots level, are vital to give those in the leadership have direction as to what the real needs are.
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Chapter 1

Introduction to the Research

1.1 Introduction

Prior to 1994, the evaluation of teachers in the Department of Education followed a summative process and rarely addressed the needs of the teachers (University of Witwatersrand 1998:2). Class visits were conducted mainly by principals and inspectors of schools who would then reach conclusions as to whether the teacher was competent or not and this would then be used as a basis for future promotions. Defiance campaigns filtered through the education system especially in the Department of Education and Training where teachers rejected the intervention of the inspectors and subject advisors in conducting class visits (University of Witwatersrand 1998:2).

The judgmental approach used by the Department of Education was considered to be “negative, fault-finding, quantitative (used measurements and marks in appraisal processes), product-oriented and did not need to include appraisees in the evaluation report. Whereas the proposed developmental approach was deemed to be positive, acknowledged the good work, found ways to improve educators’ performances, qualitative (asked subjective and personal questions about the appraisee’s work), process-oriented and obliged to involve appraisees in the evaluation report” (University of Witwatersrand 1998:33).

The key stakeholders that this study will focus on are teachers, parents and departmental officials.
1.2 Rationale and research problem

After the democratic government came into power, teacher unions insisted that the Department of Education reconsider the way evaluations were conducted as well as the development of teachers; as the new curricula, new methodologies and assessment systems were to be implemented in public schools (SADTU 2009:1). Due to policy changes, the teacher unions engaged the Department of Education in ensuring that evaluations of teachers took a formative (development) approach and not a summative (judgmental) approach (Education Labour Relations Council Resolution Number 8 of 2008). The negotiations led to the acceptance of a new system called Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) “as a state policy on teacher appraisal by parties in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) in 1998”.

In 2001, the National Department of Education proposed principles and standards that would be used to evaluate the whole school community, that is: teachers, learners, parents and the surrounding school community. Whole School Evaluation (WSE) was implemented but with much resistance as some schools rejected the external WSE and evaluators were not allowed in those schools. The rationale behind WSE was that schools should measure their performance against national criteria in order to determine whether quality learning and teaching were effectively carried out and also to judge how well they were performing (Department of Education 2000:3).

“The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is the integration of the following systems: Developmental Appraisal (DA), Performance Measurement (PM) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE). The purpose of DA is to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner with a view to determining areas of strength and weakness. PM is to evaluate individual teachers for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments and rewards and incentives. The purpose of WSE is to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a
school – including the support provided by the District, school management, infrastructure and learning resources – as well as the quality of teaching and learning” (Education Labour Relations Council Resolution Number 8 of 2008).

The complexity of the IQMS tool and the inconsistencies in implementing the IQMS prompted that a study be conducted to determine its effectiveness in monitoring performance in public secondary schools. Most schools submit their summative reports to the District Office Performance Management and Development Unit and in most cases these scores are high in terms of teacher performance but when compared to learners’ results at the end of the year, there is no correlation. Even at underperforming schools whose learner results at the end of the year are unsatisfactory, teachers qualify for either a grade or salary progression.

Performance appraisal is used to formally assess how well employees are doing their jobs, while programme performance appraisal or evaluation is used to determine how well the policy strategies perform in achieving programme goals. This research project will broadly address perspectives on staff performance management and appraisal systems.

Furthermore, although the IQMS is intended to evaluate the overall performance of all the stakeholders within the school community, departmental officials tend to limit the focus of the IQMS to the performance of teachers. This limited view leads to the neglect of other key role players who have a different bearing on the overall performance of learners.

The research will address the national policy in education which is aimed at bringing about change in learner success rates by providing quality learning and teaching in South African schools using the IQMS. It is, therefore, important to understand what the theory of change underlying this policy approach is and what policy strategies will be implemented to bring about such change. In the
case of the schools in South Africa, the IQMS as a national policy in education is used to measure performance of schools and teachers in order that the quality of teaching and learning and also processes of teacher development can be improved.

1.3 Research question

Do teachers, governing body members and parents perceive the Integrated Quality Management System to be an effective tool to measure teachers’ performances aimed at school improvement at selected secondary schools?

1.3.1 Subsidiary research questions

- What does the most recent literature on the evaluation of performance at secondary schools say?
- What is the purpose and objectives of the IQMS and what are the views of its main role players on its implementation?
- What are the views of teachers, parents and governing body members about the IQMS as a tool to measure teacher performance?
- Which recommendations could be made to improve the effectiveness of the IQMS?

1.4 Research objectives

- To review and assess the most recent literature on the evaluation of performance at secondary schools.
- To assess the purpose and objectives of the IQMS and the perceptions of its main role players on its implementation.
- To determine the views of teachers, parents and governing body members about the role of the IQMS as a performance measuring instrument for school improvement.
• To make recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the IQMS.

1.5 Description and justification of research design and methods to be employed

The study used a qualitative research design in its endeavour to determine if the IQMS is an effective tool to measure the performance of teachers in selected public secondary schools, and to establish how many teachers understand what the IQMS is and how it is being implemented. Purposive sampling was used in this study to identify schools and individual respondents. There are 66 secondary schools, 2402 teachers and 74120 learners in the Ekurhuleni South District of the Gauteng Department of Education. The study was conducted in four (4) of these public secondary schools. These schools are diverse in nature, that is, two schools were purposively selected from quintile 1-3 that are no-fee paying schools and two from quintile 4-5 that are fee paying, former model C schools. The reason for using purposive sampling is to compare how the former model C schools implement the IQMS and how it is also implemented in the disadvantaged schools that are no-fee paying schools from 2010-2012.

In each school, four (4) stakeholders were interviewed, that is, the principal or the deputy principal, a member of the School Management Team (SMT), a teacher serving on the Staff Development Team (SDT) and a parent serving on the School Governing Body including an official from the Performance Management Systems Unit in the District office who will be a resource person in providing statistics of scores that teachers achieved as well as learners’ results achieved at the end of the year. The reasons for the selection of the stakeholders are that the principal/deputy principal has the overall responsibility to ensure that the IQMS is implemented uniformly and effectively at the school. The SMT coordinates on going support and development during the two developmental cycles as well as monitors and provides support to teachers in practice. The teacher, as a member of the SDT, also manages the process of
the IQMS and gives relevant input when it comes to primary data (ELRC 2003: 2-5). The parent serving in the SGB as coordinator of the WSE provides input from parents’ perspectives.

A triangulation approach was followed, by collecting and comparing multiple data sources such as primary and secondary sources and both documentary assessments and personal interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted as this allows the researcher to "record data while adjusting the wording and order of questions, maintaining rapport, preserving focus, and assessing and following up on conversational leads that may yield unexpected information by developing new questions on the spot" (Bamberger 2006:284). The interview results supplemented the qualitative data compiled from the documentary assessments. The interviewees requested that audio recordings should not be used during interviews. The interviewer relied on the transcription of notes taken.

1.6 Structure of dissertation

Chapter 1: Introduction, rationale and research problem, and research question.
Chapter 2: In this chapter the existing literature on the evaluation of performance at secondary schools is reviewed.
Chapter 3: In chapter three the purpose and objectives of the IQMS and those responsible for its implementation are assessed.
Chapter 4: In chapter four the appropriate research design and methods to evaluate the IQMS are summarised in more detail, analysed and interpreted.
Chapter 5: In this chapter the final conclusions and recommendations in respect of the IQMS are summarised.
1.7 Ethical considerations

Written permission from the Gauteng Department of Education was obtained to conduct the study (in appendices). Permission was also obtained from the selected schools as the interviews were conducted during working hours. Confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed as the names of the schools and participants will not be revealed. Merriam (1998:201) acknowledges that research can only be valid and reliable when an investigation is conducted in an ethical manner. The Code of Academic Ethics in Research of the University of Johannesburg was taken into consideration during the research. The researcher attempted to be as impartial and objective as possible during the interviews and the analysis and assessment of the research results.
Chapter 2

International and South African views on educational performance management

2.1 Introduction

The government of South Africa established a variety of evaluation policies for schools after 1994 to address discrepancies that existed within and among the educational institutions at that time. Evaluation policies on the whole school improvement and teacher development were put in place to redress the inequity that existed in the education sector.

In order to improve the imbalances that existed, the government introduced policies in education that would involve parents, teachers, learners, private sector and the general public to jointly take responsibility for improving the quality of education, by using a Developmental Appraisal System (DAS), Whole School Evaluation (WSE) and Performance Measurement (PM) (ELRC 2003:1) as tools in monitoring and evaluating educational standards in schools. These tools were later collapsed into what is now referred to as the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). The rationale for these policies was to ensure accountability from teachers as professional custodians within public schools (Jansen 2004:4) since the experience of evaluations within the schooling system in South Africa had not been positive (Mathula 2004:1).

In this chapter, key concepts will be defined. The literature review will discuss both the international and South African views on educational performance management and appraisal systems in trying to answer the research question on evaluation of performance at secondary schools. The concept of evaluation and school improvement will be discussed in relation to the theory of change underlying how policy on teacher performance should be linked to learner
performance to bring about better quality teaching and learning in schools. The chapter concludes with a summary of the literature overview and conclusions reached.

2.2 Definition of concepts

It is crucial that concepts be defined to give clarity about the topic researched. This study will be guided by the following key concepts: performance appraisal or measurement, performance management, training and development, policy and theory of change. Performance appraisal is a continuous process used to identify measure and improve performance of employees in an organization (Rasheed, Aslam, Yousaf and Noor 2011:3736).

Rasheed et al. (2011:3736) also state that “performance management is neither a technique nor a simple step process. It can be considered as a set of processes that include evaluating knowledge of employees and what their managers expect of them, their motivation to perform well, mentoring and evaluation of their performance aimed at identifying areas of improvements”, while Junejo, Umrani and Raza (2010:313) are of the opinion that “performance management is therefore a system that ensures and maintains the proper functioning of every section and unit of organization, which is human capital (person’s knowledge, skills, experience, and abilities). Performance management does not only evaluate the employee’s performance but is an instrument to achieve organizational goals through improving employee performance, employee development, employee engagement and retention”.

Figure 1 depicts training and development as part of a system of performance management. According to Griffin (1993:345), “training refers to teaching operational or technical employees how to do the job which they were employed to carry out”, while “development empowers managers and professionals with the skills needed for both present and future jobs” (Griffin 1993:345). Teacher
performance management is “a continuous process where identification, evaluation and development of the work performance of teachers are done, so that the goals and objectives of the school are more effectively achieved. At the same time, it benefits teachers by providing recognition of performance, professional development and career guidance” (Education and Manpower Bureau 2003:1).

Figure 1: Training and Development in Performance Management


“Policy refers to a programme of action to give effect to specific goals and objectives aimed at changing (and preferably improving) an existing unsatisfactory situation” (Cloete 2009:294).

2.3 General significance and rationale of performance evaluation

It is important to regularly monitor and evaluate organizational activities in order to help achieve goals set by an organization. Schools are public organizations
and are, therefore, not immune to monitoring and evaluating performance of teachers as this creates conditions for school improvement and achievement of quality results in terms of learner performance.

Rasheed et al. (2011:3736) indicate that the core function of management in any organization is measuring the performance of employees and taking steps when it does not match the standards. Educational institutions are not excluded from this philosophy of performance evaluation where the performance of teachers should be assessed systematically as they are central to the labour force of an educational institution.

At school level, the aim of performance monitoring and evaluation of teachers is to empower schools to deliver quality education. The underlying theory of change regarding the role of teachers in trying to improve learning at school is that in addition to other variables that might influence learning success, well-performing teachers should produce well-performing learners; thus meeting learners’ needs and improving their achievement and learning outcomes. The key features of performance appraisal methods must be evaluated by an organization before the implementation of any specific approach. The performance appraisal methods afford an institution or organization an opportunity to define expectations before measuring and evaluation can take place. Feedback is also provided and performance gets recorded. Due to a variety of possible alternative approaches to performance appraisal, organizations need to assess their different situations and characteristics in order to choose a suitable method to be implemented (Jafari, Bourouni and Amiri 2009:92).

Performance monitoring and evaluation assess activities that have to be done, how these activities have to be done and the indicators outlining if the objectives set have been achieved whereas performance appraisal can be described as a
formal way in which the performance of an individual is developed, motivated and improved.

2.4 Review of literature on Staff and Programme Evaluation Performance Management Systems

There are numerous reasons why staff performance appraisal is conducted in many organizations. The first reason relates to ensuring that selection devices to be used in the performance appraisal are validated and that the training programs to be provided have an impact in improving the performance of employees. This means that there is no device that has an integrated approach in performance appraisal (Griffin 1993:348).

The second reason is mostly administrative as it affects promotions, increase in pay, and staff development. When employees are being appraised, the understanding is that there are incentives attached to the appraisal, hence the expectation of either a promotion or a salary increase. The other reason is that of giving feedback to the employees so that they can gauge their present performance and improve on it as well as plan for future careers (Griffin 1993:348).

Staff appraisal methods can be categorized into two types, namely, objective measures and judgmental measures. Objective measures relate to a number of units produced, that is, the actual output. In a school set-up, this will relate inter alia to the number or percentage of learners who have passed. The quality of the output is not considered to be of essence but what is of value is the number. For example, a school can achieve a 95% matric pass rate but only 20% of learners are able to pursue their university studies while the rest of the learners only have access to Further Education and Training (Griffin 1993:34).
Teachers who are on post level one are only measured on the creation of a positive learning environment; knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes; lesson planning, preparation and presentation; lesson achievement/assessment; professional development in the field of work/career and participation in professional development; human relations and contribution to school development; and extra-curricular and co-curricular participation (ELRC 2003: 25-38).

Teachers who are on post level two to four who form part of the School Management Team (SMT) are measured on all seven criteria that the post level one teacher is measured on including administrative and leadership responsibilities, which include administration of resources and records; personnel; decision making and accountability; leadership, communication and servicing the governing body; and strategic planning, financial planning and education management and development (ELRC 2003:39-51).

Judgmental methods use subjective ranking and rating techniques. When using rankings, the manager ranks people according to overall performance, disregarding the strengths and weaknesses of each person (Griffin 1993:349). Rating on the other hand compares an employee, not with another employee, but with a fixed standard as agreed upon in the performance contract (Griffin 1993:349). Performance dimensions used to rate employees relevant to job performance must be selected; thus the focus should be on job behaviour and results rather than on attitudes and personality traits, meaning that rating and ranking employees should be confined completely to results yielded and not the attitude displayed by the employee (Griffin 1993:349). These performance dimensions are also applicable in objective measurement approaches.

The rating or ranking happens within a duration agreed upon by the employer and employee and when the assessment is completed, performance feedback needs to be conveyed to the employee which includes meeting the employee
privately and discussing the level of performance assessed; why and how the assessment was made based on the performance standards agreed upon and what improvement can be made in future should the employee be lacking in certain aspects (Griffin 1993:349).

It is, therefore, important to understand that the performance appraisal system needs to follow certain guidelines for the process to be authentic. These include determining performance requirements where skills, outputs and accomplishments will be evaluated, thus clearly outlining the employee’s job description and clearly articulating the areas of performance to be reviewed (Grobler, Warnich, Carrel, Elbert and Hatfield 2002:267). An appropriate appraisal method must be selected to appraise performance as the “one size fits all” method cannot be applied to all organizations. Supervisors or managers who will assess performance should be adequately trained so as to avoid bias and unfairness because failure to win the trust of the employees may lead to loss of morale and productivity (Grobler et al. 2002:267).

Methods of appraisal should be discussed with employees such as which areas of performance will be assessed, how often assessment will be made, how the assessment will take place and the importance of conducting performance appraisal. Job standards should be the basis on which an employee is appraised; thus the actual performance and not the employee’s behaviour should be the focus of appraisal (Grobler et al. 2002:267-268).

Discussion of the outcome with the employee is crucial as this will give the employee an opportunity to object should a need arise. This is normally evident where merit raises or promotions are used as incentives to employees. During the discussions positive work performance, areas where expectations were not met or were exceeded, and those that need improvement, should be addressed. Discussions help determine future performance goals (Grobler et al. 2002:268).
The question of who should do the appraisal has been re-examined by employers. Traditionally, performance appraisal of employees was conducted by immediate supervisors but the latest trend is that peer-evaluations and even self-evaluations are used by the majority of organizations (Grobler et al. 2002:293). Customer or client evaluations are also becoming a valuable part of the performance appraisal process. In education, the customers or clients who are learners or parents of learners are not afforded an opportunity to rate performance of teachers but other organizations allow that a service can be rated (Grobler et al. 2002:293). In managing an organization it is important to give directions as to where the organization is at a given point and where it wants to be in future. Managers can follow four inter-related steps of monitoring to ensure that the organization achieves its goals. Figure 2 illustrates these steps:

**Figure 2: The Performance Management Process**

1 Establish standards
2 Measure performances
3 Compare performance and standards
4 Evaluate performance and take action

Maintain the status quo
Correct the deviation
Change standards

Source: adapted from Griffin, R.W. (1993:478)

The first step is the establishment of standards by an institution or organization. A school can set a target of achieving a 95% pass rate with 90% of learners achieving their bachelor/exemption passes. This can be compared to previous results and performance indicators as to how the school is going to achieve that, and should be clearly communicated and relevant to all stakeholders.
The second step is that of measuring performance. Performance refers to all activities that managers are supposed to monitor. Performance measurement is an on-going process and for monitoring to be effective, relevant performance measures must be valid and consistent. Both the quality and quantity may be measured, for example, how many class activities has a teacher given the learners over a period of four weeks and are these in line with the prescribed guidelines of that subject. In this regard, quantity is measured. Quality will be measured when a test is administered to learners and they all pass. But to say all learners have passed is also still a challenge because the quality of the test should be validated. Measuring performance is therefore not that straightforward. The third step is comparing performance against standards. Measuring performance against standards is a management decision as mitigating circumstances need to be taken into consideration. Relating to teacher-learner performance, it becomes difficult to measure performance of teachers against that of learners because mitigating factors such as poor infrastructure, insufficient supply of textbooks, teacher-learner ratio and socio-economic factors can compromise standards set for measuring performance. (Griffin 1993: 479-480).

Evaluation and action become the final step in performance management which then compels the manager to take action by applying any of these appropriate measures, namely, maintaining the status quo, correcting the deviation or changing the standard (Griffin 1993:480-481).

In a study conducted in Australia in 2004, 90% of Australian organizations viewed performance management as the most valid reason for the necessity of Human Resource Management (HRM) linked to the philosophy that effective HRM can be an important component in organizational performance (Fishwick 2007:2). Schools with effective human resources are able to use internal resources for their own development and not necessarily depend on external
assistance as they understand their organizational culture better than outsiders and that the standards set for performance measurements are understood by all the stakeholders.

It is always assumed by both managers and employees that performance can be measured and defined; that employees want to perform better and work hard and have the same objectives as the organization; which managers are able to motivate employees; and that organizational performance is the same as individual performance (Fishwick 2007:3). These assumptions must be guarded against and the following factors taken into consideration: the condition under which the work is performed becomes very critical as unbearable conditions will result in poor performance and unnecessary grievances, the expectation of employees about the management style, and how employees receive feedback on performance (Fishwick 2007:3).

Guest (2000), as cited in Fishwick (2007:3), proposed a guiding framework that can be utilized in the workplace for feedback processes. This framework includes combinations of vertical organizational objectives with horizontal participation of all people, management, policies and practices, effective implementation; and the employee response relating to policies and practices that put additional work on employees.

In a study conducted in the Sukkur Institute of Business Administration, using six educational institutions, it was found that the outdated traditional performance management system used in both public and private institutions of Sukkur Division did not provide well-defined policies and criteria. It lacked communication on performance measurement criteria to teachers, had no clear reward system, poor feedback and disorganized development plans (Junejo et al. 2010:312). Performance management that develops and enhances the teachers' profiles and new teaching methodologies, lead institutions towards sustainable development and growth (Junejo et al. 2010:312).
Therefore, it is important to understand that performance management is not a once off event at the end of the year or at a specific time but is an on-going process. As processes and activities interrelate in an organization, people’s skills and capabilities develop; these enhance organizational capability and sustainability of quality outputs and quality improvements. Without these practices, performance management will be difficult to implement, plan, act, monitor and review (Junejo et al. 2010:314). It is important to understand that performance management involves more than just assigning ratings but occurs throughout the year. The performance management cycle is not a once-off annual event.

The various stages of the performance management cycle are depicted in Figure 3.

**Figure 3: The Performance Management Cycle**

![Diagram of the Performance Management Cycle](image)

Source: adapted from Jones, J. (2001:7)
Stage 1 involves planning. It is necessary as it helps to identify the roles and standards expected by the organization. In this stage of the performance management cycle roles are defined and both management and employees know what is expected of them (Junejo et al. 2010:314). Jones (2001:19) states that during the planning stage, a self-review can prepare teachers well for the performance management process although it is not compulsory. Action relates to all personnel carrying out the work according to the plan. Stage 2 involves monitoring as it ensures that there is progress and that employees perform as according to the plan or not. However, it must be noted that evaluation and setting an agenda for development can only occur when monitoring is done which will enable that the criteria agreed upon are carried out and that the outcome is discussed (Jones 2001: 42). Stage 3 is review dealing with assessing performance and giving feedback coupled with rewards or coaching (Junejo et al. 2010:314).

Effective performance appraisal should address openness, fairness, recognize productivity through rewards, and be aware of the appraiser’s leadership abilities (Jafari et al. 2009:93). The Education and Manpower Bureau (2003:1) suggests that objectives of performance appraisal be clearly defined, which in turn will determine the criteria and procedures of performance appraisal.

2.4.1 The evaluation of performance at secondary schools in other countries

Appraisal systems may differ from school to school as cultures, educational goals and needs vary. Teacher performance management is all about identifying, evaluating and developing the work performance of teachers, which will make the school realize its goals and objectives while benefitting teachers regarding recognition of performance, professional development and career guidance (Education and Manpower Bureau 2003:1).
Hence the guidelines adopted by schools in Hong Kong categorize evidence of performance for probationary and non-probationary teachers. Performance indicators that deal with curriculum planning and organization, teaching strategies and skills, knowledge and attitude, assessment planning and implementation, support for student development, links with parents and external organizations and interpersonal relationships, remain core for performance appraisal of both probationary and non-probationary teachers (Education and Manpower Bureau 2003:17).

The objectives of implementing teacher performance management entail accountability, staff motivation and professional development (Education and Manpower Bureau 2003:6). The objectives therefore indicate that performance appraisal should focus more on teacher performance and not on personality. This necessitates agreement on a job description outlining responsibilities and scope of work to be covered. These include teaching and teaching-related duties, non-teaching duties and professional and personal competence (Education and Manpower Bureau 2003:6).

The National Administrative Guidelines in New Zealand issued by the Minister of Education, legislates that school boards should develop and implement personnel and industrial policies which promote high levels of staff performance, use educational resources effectively; and that the needs of students should be recognized (New Zealand Educational Institute 2012:1).

The New Zealand Teachers’ Council expects teachers to demonstrate satisfactory teacher performance covering four dimensions, namely: professional knowledge, professional practice, professional relationships, and professional leadership, as a performance management system applies to both teachers and principals. It is, therefore, the prerogative of the school to specify the skills, understanding, behaviour and curriculum knowledge relevant to the particular teaching position and the standard that determines whether the
teacher meets the dimensions. These dimensions are left entirely to the principal or senior staff member (New Zealand Educational Institute 2012:2).

In a consultation document of the General Teaching Council for England (GTCE), the belief expressed performance management as a framework, relates to an approach of managing professional performance across the board, both for teachers who are meeting the expected standards and those who excel in performance, as well as those whose performance is causing concern (GTCE 2011:1). This Council partly agrees that when the teacher and head teacher agree on the objectives, once they are achieved, it would lead to school improvement and the progress of pupils would likewise improve (GTCE 2011:2). The argument is that objectives that are realistic and appropriate will contribute toward school improvement and learners’ progress and that there are also objectives that cannot be directly measured against school improvement and learner progress (GTCE:2011:2).

In a study conducted on the effectiveness of teacher appraisal in Botswana, it was found that teachers’ understanding of the performance appraisal system as currently practised in Botswana’s secondary schools, differed with a tendency towards positive views, but slightly so (Monyatsi, Steyn & Kamper 2006:438). The findings suggest that clarity of purpose is important in making the process more effective. There is a belief by the Botswana secondary school teachers that an effective teacher appraisal system can enable teachers to gain more knowledge and skills thus empower and enable them to gain confidence in their delivery (Monyatsi et al. 2006:438).

Suggestions such as improving procedures and mechanisms for the management and implementation of the teacher appraisal were raised, where both the appraisees and appraisers would receive training enabling the whole process to be transparent, allowing feedback to all stakeholders and reviews of the appraisal system (Monyatsi et al. 2006:438). Teachers in Botswana are still
sceptical about being held accountable for the performance of the learners as they view the component of accountability to be threatening and unacceptable but believe in the developmental aspect of the appraisal system. However, the teachers in Botswana believe that if correct measures are put in place and both managerial and training aspects are improved; the appraisal system can play a critical role in moulding the inclination of the teachers positively towards the teaching profession (Monyatsi et al. 2006:438).

A new appraisal instrument was introduced in 1992 in Botswana, entitled Teacher Performance Appraisal Form: Teaching Management System (Republic of Botswana 1994 as cited in Monyatsi et al. 2006:215). It highlighted the following points:

- “The appraisal scheme may not be used as a punitive measure against the teachers.
- The process must be accurate, candid, and above all, open to the appraised.
- All appraisers and appraisees are to receive training prior to the appraisal process.
- The appraisal system should function as a continuous support and staff development” (Monyatsi et al. 2006:215-216).

Two approaches to performance appraisal are identified by the study conducted with Botswana secondary teachers. They are professional and accountability models. “The Professional model reflects improvement of teacher performance to enhance the learning of students while the accountability model is viewed with scepticism as the belief is that it checks the on competence of teachers” (Monyatsi et al. 2006: 217). The other perspective is that it is judgmental; hence teachers question those making judgments and also how valid and reliable instruments used are (Monyatsi et al. 2006:217). Teachers are keen to know what the relationship is between pay, responsibilities and performance. Hence
they strive more towards serving their own interests rather than those of the students. The accountability model has opened a platform for disciplinary procedures in that if teachers do not perform as expected, disciplinary action will be taken against such teachers (Monyatsi et al. 2006:217-218). The empirical findings of the study about the teacher appraisal in Botswana reflected mixed feelings.

2.4.2 International practices of performance management in schools

In this section, the focus is on what the school does to ensure that there is a culture of teaching and learning, in an effort to develop staff members, improve learner performance and improve the school in general. This then leads to the question whether the school is dependent on an external evaluator or whether the school undertakes its own self-evaluation in order to identify problems and bring about school improvement.

It is important to understand what educational evaluation is as schools need to conduct self-evaluation to bring about school improvement. “Educational evaluation is defined as an act of collecting systematic information regarding the nature and quality of educational objects” (Nevo 1995:11).

Before any evaluation can be conducted, the motive for conducting an evaluation should be determined and evaluation guidelines and expectations set (Nevo 1995:24-25). Furthermore, the evaluation objects should be determined, that is, the answer to the question whether evaluation is based on the personnel (teachers, administrators and support staff), student assessment/performance, school, curriculum or program (Nevo 1995:27).

Habangaan (1998:8) mentions that the head teachers’ association in Botswana considered the appraisal system to be a means of assisting them to deal with the negative attitudes of newly appointed teachers towards their work. The
perception was that maybe the teachers’ attitudes towards teaching would change should they be subjected to the appraisal process.

This process is referred to by Hopkins (1997:181) as “the ‘school culture’ which is a vital yet neglected dimension in the improvement process...The types of school culture most supportive of school improvement efforts...are those that are collaborative, have high expectations for both students and staff, exhibit an agreement on values to be observed, support an orderly and secure environment, and encourage teachers to take responsibility on a variety of leadership roles”.

The school culture is where all stakeholders constantly evaluate their own actions and those of others without relying on external forces to provide guidelines. Therefore, it is important that internal evaluation and review take precedence as these lead to the notions of accountability and school development (Hopkins 1997:184). According to Hopkins (1997: 184), the climate for evaluation should be created in order to promote the qualities of interdependence, respect, trust, consistency and fairness. The key function of all leaders in schools is that of creating and nurturing the climate for evaluation by providing foundations and working context for evaluation. The School leaders embrace evaluation as a form of development and growth for all stakeholders (Hopkins 1997: 184, and Russell 1996: 153-155, as cited in Hopkins, 1997: pp184-185).

Durrant and Holden (2006:16) emphasize the importance of self-evaluation in bringing about the culture of change and improving school performance, as having two functions:

- “to stimulate dialogue on objectives, priorities and quality criteria at school and classroom level
- “to achieve objectives through the use of appropriate and easily accessible tools”.
Therefore, it is important that the purpose and aim of evaluation be articulated to all stakeholders and the functions of evaluation which are to improve, to prove and to learn be considered in the strategic phase (Hopkins 1997:187). Furthermore, the criteria for selecting the standards in evaluation should be clearly expressed to all the stakeholders, should be relevant to the focus and capable of being investigated, should be few in number, be specific, and should include measures of pupils’ achievements (Hopkins 1997:188).

Nevo (1995:2) advocates that “internal evaluation has an advantage over external evaluation for the purpose of formative evaluation, but not for the purpose of summative evaluation”. It is important that a combination of the internal and external evaluations be used to achieve a more constructive evaluation (Nevo 1995:2). Therefore, internal and external evaluations not only set a platform for “planning and improvement but also for certification and accountability” (Nevo 1995:55).

It is also important that schools should not only rely on their own internal evaluations, but that external evaluations or standards should help benchmark what the school is doing right and what can be improved (Hopkins 2001:92). It is important to set conditions for school improvement which Hopkins (2001:93) describes as follows:

- “The reasons why the school needs to be improved, that is, are we improving learners’ achievements or the innovations in teaching and learning which will enhance learner achievement?”
- Is the leadership at school able to plan and give direction in ensuring that school activities are coordinated throughout the school?
- What kind of support do teachers give to learners to promote learners’ progress, that is, teaching style used, resources available for teachers to prepare thoroughly?
The evidence on the conditions profile of improving the quality of education for all relating to staff involvement and development, leadership practices, coordination strategy and collaborative planning.

A strategy for authentic school improvement based on the conditions approach is described as the school’s capacity to engage in the improvement activities as well as priorities that the school sets based on curriculum needs”.

It has been observed that school and classroom effectiveness characteristics always lead to high levels of student achievement and the opposite is also true of schools that are ineffective. The correlation that exists between the characteristics of effectiveness on the one hand and enhanced levels of student achievement on the other suggests that the full impact of this teaching strategy will not be achieved without a degree of school and classroom based staff development, some enquiry and reflection on progress made, and the involvement of students in the teaching and learning process (Hopkins 2001: 94-96).

Hence performance management and appraisal of teachers cannot be isolated functions that do not address the achievement of learners. Programmes on teacher development whether school-based or organized by an external organization, should focus on improvements in teaching and better learning outcomes for learners. Effective communication is important during school improvement initiatives (Hopkins 2001: 113).

It is a fact that when change occurs, people will always misinterpret and misunderstand some aspect of the purpose or practice of something that is new. Therefore, the theory of change indicates the importance of frequent, personal interactions as the key to success (Hopkins 2001:113). It involves all the building blocks necessary to bring about a desired goal. The goal of the Department of Education is to ensure quality education for all; therefore the
involvement of all the stakeholders in ensuring that the goal is achieved becomes important. In this regard, Trethowan (1991:81) “supports the human relations approach according to which the major purpose of appraisal is to help teachers improve their day-to-day duties of teaching and facilitation of students’ learning, thus empowering them towards professional competence and confidence”.

Performance management and appraisal are perceived by most teachers, both internationally and locally, as some form of “inspection”, but when its purpose and use is effectively communicated and adequate training is provided to all stakeholders, the misconceptions can be cleared and energy redirected to the goals and objectives that individual schools set for themselves (Hopkins 2001:113).

Jones (2001:2) indicates that “performance management has benefits for the school as a whole in that it adds clarification to the school’s aims and objectives; coordinates teachers’ development priorities with those of the school and its subject areas; contributes an injection of energy into the school through the formulation of improvement objectives; brings about a closer match between individuals’ capabilities and the school’s role specifications; ensures greater clarity regarding staff responsibilities; encourages team building and a wider exchange of ideas; encourages more effective communication; enhances school ethos; and promotes better focused professional development opportunities”.

Another misconception about school improvement is that schools that are adequately resourced perform better than those that are less well resourced (Hopkins 2001:113). This may be true to a lesser extent, as resources only help to improve what can be achieved with the basic available resources. The issue of accountability and clear focus on school development planning is, however, important. Hopkins (2001:113-114) indicates that schools should prioritize the value of learning, have stability in their teaching practices, hold educational
values in high esteem, have high levels of expectation that they maintain, and tolerate a low level of failure. Pupils in highly effective schools are clear about what is required of them, feel secure in their learning and school environment, and respond positively to the academic and social demands placed on them.

Schools that are self-managed are able to deal with both internal and external evaluation processes and can measure their effectiveness and efficiency through regular surveys by parents, regular surveys of teachers’ views, regular formal surveys of pupils’ views as they need to understand their strengths and weaknesses (Hopkins 1997:179).

Performance that is good should always be rewarded but the motivation should not be based on receiving the reward but of ensuring that the output is achieved and that the goals and objectives as set out by the school are achieved (GTCE 2011:5). More often than not, the perception is that if an individual puts more effort into a task, there should be a reward. It is important that when rewards are to be awarded to employees whether in the form of an incentive system, or a merit system, both the formative and summative approaches should be used and a wide range of means of collecting data should be employed to avoid individual and collective bias in performance evaluation (Hopkins 1997:181).

A study conducted by Mapesela and Strydom (2004:6) in higher education in South Africa, revealed that participants in the three institutions researched supported the idea that performance should be linked to pay. Several participants believed in a diverse range of incentives like development opportunities and not just pay (Mapesela and Strydom 2004:6).

Performance measurement in secondary schools in South Africa is based on matriculation results. However, teachers in schools that underperform also qualify for pay progression or salary progression as learner performance is by no means linked to teacher performance. Teacher unions on the other hand
believe that learner performance is not only determined or influenced by teacher performance but also by contextual factors such as overcrowding, late delivery of textbooks, lack of physical infrastructure, and lack of leadership guidance from both school management and district officials (South African Democratic Teachers Union 2009:1).

The South African Democratic Teachers Union (2011:1) took a resolution during its 2011 annual National General Council to empower its members through professional development, trade union and political education: professional development to train quality teachers to deliver free quality public education. It will engage the Minister of the Department of Basic Education to speedily implement the agreed upon national strategy for teacher development. In addition, the union has recommitted itself to operate its own institute for professional development to provide quality training programmes for teachers and education workers thus fulfilling its historic mission, in an effort to create a new teacher and a new education worker and to promote socialism.

2.5 Education Performance Management and Evaluation in South Africa

Minimum effort was made to control and supervise the teaching profession during the first five years after the democratic government assumed political control of the South African government in 1994. Efforts to improve the performance of teachers and development of schools were based on the regulation of the teaching profession whereby the South African Council on Education was launched; and also on the suite of policies such as the Whole School Evaluation and Developmental Appraisal System intended to improve teachers and schools performance. However, efforts such as the Education Action Zone (EAZ), were not incorporated into the formal designs and implementation strategies for the recognition of the historical socialization of teachers and teacher organizations against forms of intervention that offer to improve the profession and its institutions (Jansen 2004:1-4).
Administrative and political activities were launched with the goal of addressing broad public concerns about the status of the teaching profession and the poor image of teaching in South Africa. This resulted in public attacks by senior politicians on teachers and teaching as a profession, with the intention of making teachers accountable as professional actors within public schools (Jansen 2004:4).

Teacher development initiatives introduced by government were intended to improve the quality of teaching, especially in township/black schools. The National Policy on Whole School Evaluation announced by the Minister of Education states that “the national policy on Whole School Evaluation is aimed at introducing an effective monitoring and evaluation process that is important to the improvement of quality and standards of performance in schools” (Department of Education 2000:7). The findings when conducting Internal Whole School Evaluation must be used to redirect efforts towards improving the quality and performance standards of individual and other stakeholders (Department of Education, 2000:71). This national policy was soon “met with suspicion at best and often outright resistance” (SADTU 2009:1). This made SADTU, in its National General Council held in November 2011 “reject the teacher performance appraisal in its current form and also outwardly state that learner performance should not be part of appraising Educators” (SADTU 2011:3).

At the 2008 Commonwealth Councillor Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM) Conference held in Durban, South Africa, which focused mainly on performance management at schools and the education system, some of the delegates at the conference indicated the need for an inspection (monitoring) and evaluation system which will ensure that inefficient and ineffective teachers work, or they leave the teaching profession (Bisschoff and Mathye 2009:1).
This also indicates that the appraisal system, or the inspection system as it was previously known, is viewed differently by different people. While some delegates see the process from a developmental point of view, others see it as punitive and having a negative connotation as is the case in South Africa (Bisschoff and Mathye 2009:2). In terms of the goals of the ELRC Resolution 8 of 2003, the appraisal system is developmental in nature, but any system can be manipulated, especially during the summative evaluation when scores are supposed to be submitted for either grade or salary progression. The fact that the School Developmental Team (SDT) manages the whole process can lend itself to manipulation (Department of Education 2009:26).

Engela and Ajam (2010:1) note that “monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is an extremely complex, multidisciplinary and skill-intensive endeavour”. The government has since recognised the value of evaluating policies within various government institutions, and developed a Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (GWM&E) which is applied to all governmental levels (Cloete 2009:293). “The overarching GWM&E system aims to provide an integrated, encompassing framework from M&E principles, practices and standards to be used throughout Government ‘to increase effectiveness’ and ‘developmental impact’” (Presidency 2007:9). According to Engela and Ajam (2010:29), the “GWM&E policy framework seeks to embed within public sector organizations, a performance management system that is clearly defined, along with internal management systems (such as planning and budgeting)”. This policy framework would be ideal for South Africa because according to Cloete (2009:293), the South African Public Service lacks a logical and consistent system of policy M&E and that there is a need for a framework that will uniformly monitor and evaluate all spheres of government, including the business and voluntary sectors, across South African society.

The Ministry of Education as a government institution provides specific development indicators which will pave the way in ensuring that the goals and
objectives set are realized as it is the goal of the Ministry to provide quality teaching and learning. Therefore, development indicators need to lead towards that and there should be evidence as to how these goals need to be achieved which then leads to the policy being evaluated and as Cloete (2009:295) describes it, policy evaluation is “a systematic judgment or assessment of policy programmes”.

Organizations or institutions must perceive M&E as a fundamental activity of management and not as an add-on activity (Cloete 2009:297). It is in this regard that the IQMS should not be regarded as an event but a process of M&E that will assist the Department of Education to assess whether the goal of providing quality teaching and learning is achieved.

Engela and Ajam (2010:31) indicate that “at present there is a need for a common understanding of policy performance in the South African Public Service to transcend the traditional dichotomy between financial and service delivery (nonfinancial) information and that line managers are increasingly being required to account for value-for-money”. It is therefore imperative that the Department of Education assess the IQMS policy which is intended to develop teachers who will in turn offer better service delivery by providing quality teaching and learning, thus improving learner performance.

A programme theory or logic model when applied correctly in the policy programme monitoring and evaluation system, will ensure that governmental activities in South Africa are better managed (Cloete 2009:298). This is depicted in Figure 4. “Thus the creation of a dedicated Ministry of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) within the President’s Office in 2009 which signalled a new phase in the development trajectory of M&E systems in the South African public sector” (Engela & Ajam 2010:13).
It is important that the Ministry of Education constantly monitor and evaluate the IQMS as a government policy to ensure that all the key steps of the programme theory or logic model are understood in order to measure whether the outcome envisaged is achievable or not. The results-based management pyramid explains the plan of the theory of change by outlining thoroughly the processes of planning. The activities and outputs should be appropriately planned so that the outcomes and impact could be achieved. Good quality measurable indicators should be embedded in the plan.

**Figure 4: The results-based management pyramid**

Source adapted from The Presidency (2011:8)

The Department of Basic Education has for 2007 focused on the impact evaluation of the Continuing Professional Teacher Development (CPTD) system and the Initial Professional Education of Teachers (IPET) Bin ensuring
that teachers continually enhance their professional competence and performance through the IQMS as well as providing education of high quality where levels of performance will be high and activities well co-ordinated by the management of the schools thus providing sustained leadership and support.

It is imperative that impact evaluation on teacher development be conducted because if the IQMS is not reviewed simultaneously with other programmes of the Department of Basic Education, Outcome 1 will still not be realized. The unit of analysis or objectives of evaluation as outlined in the National Evaluation Policy Framework (2011:6) includes policies, programmes, projects, and plans carried out by institutions or organizations. Therefore, the IQMS as a government policy also needs to be evaluated to ensure that the objectives as set out therein are achieved.

In the South African context, performance appraisal in the Education sector takes place in the form of an Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) which will be elaborated upon in Chapter 3. The IQMS is the policy framework used to make sure that each teacher puts efforts into making the whole system effective.

2.6 Conclusion

From the literature review discussed in this chapter, it is evident that performance management and appraisal are important aspects of any organization. Without performing these managerial tasks, organizations will not be able to assess whether goals and objectives set are being achieved. It is also true that schools are organizations that need to evaluate and review the performance of both teachers and learners in order for quality of teaching and learning to be realized.
Performance management and appraisal are coupled with accountability. It is interesting to note that contextual factors such as overcrowding, under resourced schools, under qualified and unqualified teachers also impact upon learner performance. However, these factors should not paralyse the schools when striving for excellence. The teacher is accountable for the performance of the learners in the subject he/she teaches as the expectation is that the teacher should be innovative and adapt his/her teaching styles to suit the level of development of his/her learners. The literature emphasizes performance in relation to output and that rewards should be linked to performance standards as agreed upon by the management and employees.

It is interesting that both internationally and locally, teachers have mixed perceptions about whether teacher performance should be linked to learner performance and school improvement or not. In South Africa, the practice of using the matriculation examination as the main determinant remains a challenging instrument for holding schools and teachers accountable for the performance of their learners.

The following chapter discusses the purpose and objectives of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) as an instrument used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a school, to evaluate an individual teacher’s performance and to determine strengths and weaknesses of a teacher for developmental programmes.
Chapter 3

The Integrated Quality Management System and school performance in South African schools

3.1 Introduction

When the current democratic government came into power in South Africa in 1994, there was a need to prioritize legislative and policy reforms to change the nature of education which was discriminatory and fragmented under apartheid (Department of Education 2009:18). A non-racial system of education and training had to be established and unified. This led to a number of changes pertaining to curriculum and assessment systems, professional growth and development, teaching and learning as well as management and administration of schools (Department of Education 2009:18). The teacher organizations insisted that a national strategy be put in place to ensure that unqualified and under qualified teachers benefit from teacher development programmes (South African Democratic Teachers Union 2009:1).

The above changes ensued, and the teacher organisations also insisted that the evaluation of teachers be more formative (developmental) rather than summative (judgmental) so that teaching and learning could be improved (Mestry, Hendricks and Bisschoff 2009:476). In July 1998 the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC), a statutory body providing for bargaining and negotiation mechanisms on education matters, adopted agreements and legislation on teachers and teaching as national policies which would guide the Department of Education over issues such as terms and conditions of service of teachers as promulgated in the “Employment of Educators Act (Act 76 of 1998). ELRC Resolution 7 and 8 of 1998 stipulated the workloads, duties and responsibilities of school-based educators as well as establishment of the South
African Council of Educators (SACE) which was to regulate the teaching profession” (Department of Education 2009:18-19).

In consultation with all teacher unions and organizations including officials from all the ex-departments, negotiations were held to try to address principles, procedures and processes of the new appraisal system for evaluating teachers (Mathula 2004:1). Foskett and Lumby (2003:74) believe that appraisal systems improve teachers’ performance. A document describing constructively the two approaches was outlined, and a Development Appraisal System (DAS) was proposed as an alternative system and accepted as a state policy on teacher appraisal (Department of Education 1998:9).

3.2 The Objectives and purpose of the Integrated Quality Management System

“When the Democratic Government came into power in 1994, the teacher unions insisted that a national strategy and plan for teacher development be put in place after realising that a substantial number of teachers were unqualified”, meaning no teaching qualifications at all or under qualified in that they had minimum teaching qualifications. (SADTU 2009:1). “Over and above the fact that there were under qualified and unqualified teachers, it was also discovered that qualified teachers did not receive quality pre-service training as there were curriculum and policy changes after 1994” (SADTU 2009:1). “The new curricula, new methodologies and assessment systems required that teachers should be retrained or acquire skills to deliver the curriculum and hence it was discovered that these qualified teachers lacked essential content knowledge” (Jansen 2004:4-5).

The unions compelled the Department to ensure that evaluation of teachers is not a summative (judgmental) approach but a formative (developmental)
approach as they believed that the latter will lead to improvement of teaching and learning (Chetty, Chisholm, Gardiner, Magau and Vinjevold 1993:2).

Briefly, the University of Witwatersrand document on The Development Appraisal of Educators: A Facilitator’s Manual (1998:33), described the two approaches constructively: Judgmental approach is negative fault-finding, blames the educators, excludes the educator, leads to forms of failure, policing, summative, quantitative (uses measurements and marks in appraisal process), product-oriented and does not need to include appraisees in the evaluation report. Developmental approach is positive, acknowledges good work, finds ways to improve educators’ performances, includes the teacher, leads to ways of improvement, supportive, formative, qualitative (asks subjective and personal questions about the appraisees’ work), process-orientated and obliged to involve appraisees in the evaluation report.

The Directorate: Quality Assurance, within the national Department of Basic Education, is responsible for all the monitoring and evaluation aspects. The IQMS is a sub-directorate within the Quality Assurance Directorate. The vision of the Quality Assurance Directorate nationally is to ensure quality public education through monitoring and enhancing the quality of learning and teaching and also improving on the processes of educator development throughout all the provinces (Department of Education 2003:3)

The mission of the Quality Assurance Directorate nationally is “to align different Quality Management Programmes, namely, the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) which intends to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner with a view to determining areas of strength and weakness, and to draw up programmes for individual development; the Whole School Evaluation (WSE) has as its intention the evaluation of the overall effectiveness of a school as well as the quality of teaching and learning; and Performance Management (PM) has as its purpose the evaluation of individual teachers for salary progression, grade
progression, affirmation of appointments and rewards and incentives” (Department of Education 2003:3).

Figure 5: Integrated Quality Management System

“These three programmes are therefore supposed to complement one another, without duplication of structures and procedures” (Weber 2005:67). The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) has the following objectives: “to assess strengths and areas of development, to ensure continued growth, to promote accountability and to monitor overall effectiveness of an institution, to evaluate an educator’s performance, to identify specific needs of schools, teachers and district offices for support and development” (Department of Education 2003:1). Figures 5 and 6 best explain the Integrated Quality Management System and its implementation process.

Source: adapted from the Western Cape Department of Education (2011:2)
The importance of the IQMS is to ensure that facilities and resources provided by the Department of Basic Education support teaching and learning (Mathula 2004:15). There is also a strong belief by the Directorate that successful educational outcomes depend upon empowering, motivating and training educators and therefore Quality Management seeks to monitor and support these processes (Mathula 2004:15).

The targets in this regard are the teachers as well as the schools. The teachers are supposed to go through all the processes of being appraised; either for salary or grade progression as well as for development. The schools also need to be evaluated based on the nine focus areas to determine their strengths and weaknesses, and also to determine their level of excellence when it comes to
learner achievement, quality of teaching, systems and procedures, as well as factors that create effective schools (Weber 2005:65).

### 3.2.1 The Developmental Appraisal System

The fundamental reason for the adoption of this system by the ELRC (Resolution 4 of 1998) that teachers must present themselves for regular appraisal which contributes to the principle of life-long learning and development, and be accountable for the quality of their work (Mathula 2004:6). This process was therefore deemed to be developmental in nature as a teacher’s strengths and weaknesses would be identified and addressed through mentoring and training. The teacher would first do self-analysis and introspection in terms of his/her own performance leading the teacher to determine priorities for personal and professional growth (Department of Education 1998). Figure 7 illustrates the implementation process of the Developmental Appraisal, see page 42.

![Figure 7: The implementation process](source: adapted from Department of Education (2004:35))
The implementation process starts with the teacher conducting a self-evaluation and in this process peers would be involved to review the teacher’s performance with the view to prioritize professional development needs. The panel that the teacher himself/herself chooses, would then work collectively to assist the appraisee to identify needs, formulate objectives, select professional development activities, implement such activities within the timeframes and to provide timeous feedback. A Professional Growth Plan (PGP) form would then be completed by the appraisee for each cycle, where the teacher formulates objectives and identifies specific activities that will be necessary to achieve these objectives, states resources needed to achieve these objectives and also the key performance indicators (Department of Education 1998).

The appraisee would then complete another discussion paper with the panel after the classroom observation has taken place. The questions include: were your objectives for the period under review realistic; given your programme, what has not been completed; what are the reasons for the backlog or shortfall if any; what have been the most difficult problems you have had to cope with during this period; to what extent have you managed to improve your skills; is there anything you need which could help you develop your job and become more effective; do you receive sufficient support from your colleagues/senior staff/principal/governing body/departmental officials; and lastly are there any other general matters you would like to discuss, i.e. factors affecting your work? These questions are deemed important to help assess the level of need of a teacher/manager (University of Witwatersrand 1998:15).

The appraisee also has to fill in a prioritization form. This form lists thirteen criteria and provides three columns for ratings, as follows: the appraisee will fill in the first column before classroom observation, indicating development needs as well as areas of good performance. After the class observation, the appraisee can then go through the form again to make changes to the earlier ratings. The second column provides space for the other panel members’
ratings after the class visits. The last column will then be filled in at the end of
the appraisal process by the panel, as well as the appraisee, and then a final
rating will be agreed upon and awarded (University of Witwatersrand 1998:10).

The prioritization form has thirteen criteria for teachers, fifteen for heads of
departments and twenty three for principals and deputy principals. The criteria
include: curriculum development, creation of a learning environment, lesson
presentation and methodology, classroom management, learner assessment,
recording and analysing data, development of learning field competency,
professional development in the field of work/career and participation in
professional bodies, human relations, leadership, community, extra-curricular
work, and contribution to school development. The additional two criteria for
heads of departments include generation of departmental policy and
professional support to colleagues. The eight for principals and deputy principals
include communication, decision-making and accountability procedures,
establishment and servicing of representative bodies, servicing the governing
body, establishing and maintaining a learning environment, record keeping,
strategic planning and transformation, financial planning and management,
educational management development and programmes for appraisal
(University of Witwatersrand 1998:10-13).

The Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) affords teachers an opportunity to
do self-evaluation which would assist managers to use the strengths and
weaknesses identified by an individual teacher to plan the support and
mentoring to be given in assisting the teacher to grow professionally. Teachers
are to be open and honest in their PGPs about their needs for development as
this will help in the SIP. However, most teachers will not use that opportunity
and would indicate that they do not need any development and avoid conducting
self-evaluation. In some instances, self-evaluation will be conducted but
development will not take place because of lack of capacity by the managers or
lack of confidence in developing teachers within a particular topic or subject.
The fact that teachers have to choose their own panel members opens the system to manipulation as peers will not be honest about the performance of the appraisee. Most teachers will thoroughly prepare for the lesson observation and the date, time and the lesson period to be observed will be communicated well in advance instead of the panel making a choice of when and where they will wish to visit the teacher. If well applied, the implementation process will yield good results in the professional development of teachers and lead to the achievement of good school results.

3.2.2 Whole School Evaluation

“The National Policy on Whole School Evaluation is introduced to ensure an effective monitoring and evaluation process that is vital to the improvement of quality and standards of performance in schools… The findings must be used to re-orientate efforts towards improving the quality and standards of individual and collective performance” (Department of Education 2000:7).

This system is intended to be used by the school when conducting Internal Whole School Evaluation (IWSE) and by supervisors/departmental officials when conducting External Whole School Evaluation (EWSE) (Department of Education 2000:11-13). In June 2004, the National Department of Education proposed guidelines and the criteria that are to be used when a school is being evaluated according to the National Education Policy (Act 27 of 1996). The guidelines enable schools to measure their performance against national criteria and by so doing judge how well they are performing. The process of Whole School Evaluation will lead to a fair national evaluation system for public and independent schools (Department of Education 2004:3).

The Guidelines serve as an important resource to schools as they carry out self-evaluation. They help schools prepare themselves effectively for both internal
and external evaluations. Access is also given to other stakeholders to judge how well a school is providing for its learners (Department of Education 2004:5). Figure 8 reflects the External Whole School Evaluation process.

Figure 8: External Whole School Evaluation Processes

Source: adapted from the Western Cape Department of Education (2011:8)

There are also evaluation criteria that supervisors/department officials can use to make sound judgments and measure success by how well learners do. In this instance the emphasis is on learner progress as the success of the school is not measured by how efficient its management systems are or how well resourced a school is but by the impact of learners’ progress and the standards they attain. The use of nationally agreed criteria, with the emphasis on learners’ progress, is important in ensuring a common approach to evaluation (Department of Education 2004:3). Descriptors inform the supervisors and schools on how to interpret the criteria. The five performance rating scales describe “outstanding”, “good”, “acceptable”, “needs improvement”, and “needs urgent support” judgments.
There are also nine areas of evaluation that are deemed to be crucial to the future development of education in South Africa. Therefore when conducting an evaluation, the supervisors are to report on the quality of tuition in these areas and any others that the school may consider relevant, and make recommendations on how it might be improved. The recommendations of the supervisors must be carried out by the District professional support teams to ensure that those schools get support and improve in the area of need. These nine focus areas are: basic functionality of the school; leadership, management and communication; governance and relationships; quality of teaching and learning and educator development; curriculum provision and resources; learner achievement; school safety, security and discipline; school infrastructure; and parents and the community (Department of Education 2004:4).

“The evaluation will be based on three types of indicators, namely, input indicators (such as learner characteristics, funding levels and number of staff), process indicators (such as quality of teaching) and output indicators (such as standards of achievement and attendance rates)” (Jansen 2004:7).

The sampling of schools to be evaluated is the decision of the National Department of Education which will inform the Provinces of the number and names of those schools. The supervisory teams will then make the necessary pre-evaluation by alerting schools of the necessary documentation required (Department of Education 2000:3).

The evaluation process, see figure 8, starts with the school conducting self-evaluation. The reason for this is that schools must realize that they are accountable for their own performance; therefore, school improvement is also the responsibility of the school as much as it is of the national and provincial departments of education (Department of Education 2000:11). It is of paramount importance that schools should come up with appropriate strategies for monitoring and evaluating their own work. Central to all school self-evaluation is
to ensure that there is a common understanding and acceptance of inclusivity and human rights as underlying principles of school improvement and quality education (Department of Education 2004:5).

The onsite evaluation activities will include scrutiny of relevant school records; observing educators in practice; observing learners outside the classrooms; evaluating the school’s premises and resources available for teaching and learning; making use of interviews and questions; and making findings available to all the stakeholders (Department of Education 2000:12). There will be post-evaluation activities that include an oral report to the school; a written report and dissemination of findings; school improvement plans to be produced and implemented; and support from the district in ensuring implementation of the plans; levels of performance acknowledged and schools that are underperforming being given special programmes like the Secondary School Intervention Programme (SSIP) for grades 10-12 (Department of Education 2000:16).

WSE is meant to be supportive and developmental rather than punitive and judgmental. It will not be used as a coercive measure, but will ensure that policies are complied with. It will also facilitate support and improvement of school performance using approaches of partnership, collaboration, mentoring and guidance. The new policy is aimed at increasing the level of accountability within the system; ensuring that policies are complied with; and the extent to which schools satisfy the expectations of the government and all stakeholders and how well they respond to their accountability for the outcomes of schooling (Department 2000:8-11).

The WSE instrument is ideal in that it assists schools to conduct internal evaluation and be realistic about the good practices that exist and also the challenges that they face. It is crucial that schools undergo self-evaluation before the external evaluation takes place as they will know what works for them
and what does not. The nine focus areas in the WSE are important as they are inclusive of all aspects that assist in the development of schools to offer quality teaching and learning if they are applied as prescribed in the guidelines. What is important about the IWSE is that all stakeholders need to be engaged from the beginning of the process in all nine focus areas. But reality has shown that schools do not conduct self-evaluation and if they do, parents and learners in secondary schools are mostly excluded. In this instance, the whole purpose of the evaluation becomes a futile exercise.

Regarding EWSE, the instrument above explains the processes to be followed as the Quality Assurance unit will not impose itself on a school without notification firstly to the District Office and then the school, well in advance. The involvement of the supervisor of the school is critical as the team will not go to the school without the supervisor being present because the latter must introduce the team to the whole school. The process then becomes transparent and the team prepares the school regarding all documents to be checked and all the stakeholders to be interviewed.

The most critical aspects of the EWSE are feedback sessions given to all the stakeholders. Recommendations are not only made for the school to implement but both the District Office and Head Office officials of the Department of Education are expected to play a role in ensuring that aspects that concern them are addressed in ensuring delivery of quality learning and teaching. For example, if the school has serious infrastructure problems, the team in its report would indicate that Head Office should intervene to remedy the situation. Not only is oral feedback given but written reports are made available to all stakeholders and follow-up processes put in place to ensure implementation of the recommendations. It is critical that schools should involve all the stakeholders in the IWSE because failure to do so will render the School
Development Plan null and void as all stakeholders should be involved in the plenary, implementation and evaluation processes.

3.2.3 Performance Measurement

Performance Measurement on the other hand focuses on teachers who are to be evaluated for salary or grade progression as well as affirmations of appointments, rewards and incentives. Again parties to the ELRC signed a Collective Agreement (Number 8 of 2003) to effect incentives paid to teachers. A teacher will choose his Development Support Group (DSG) consisting of his/her peer and senior, in this case the latter is the head of department of the learning area in which the teacher teaches (Department of Education 2003:2-5).

Figure 9: Performance Measurement Processes

Source: adapted from the Western Cape Department of Education (2011:4)

The teacher is observed in a once-off class visit by his/her DSG using the prescribed instrument that is similar to that of DAS. The DSG then discusses the outcomes of the lesson observation with the teacher. The teacher, with the
assistance of the DSG, will then come up with a PGP that will inform the SIP. It must be noted that SIP is informed by all the teachers’ PGPs, the Performance Management Development System of the administrative and supportive school and outcomes of the WSE. The purpose of SIP is to identify areas of development; training and mentoring; that are needed to address the needs of the school (Department of Education 2003:5).

When schools have compiled their SIPS, these inform the District Office to formulate the District Improvement Plan (DIP) which will indicate areas of improvement where the District can support schools. In most cases the resources of ensuring that SIPS are implemented, are/should be provided by the Department (Department of Education 2003:5).

Teacher performance measurement is not influenced by how well or how poorly learners perform. When the DSGs have submitted the prescribed observation instrument, the School Development Team (SDT) together with the WSE supervisor must verify and moderate the scores/data given by each DSG, and submit documents to Persal if there are no disputes or grievances, in order to effect grade or salary progression (Department of Education 2003:5). On the basis of the above, it can be safely assumed that the IQMS is based on existing and credible performance management systems.

The performance measurement instrument is not different from the developmental appraisal instrument as it requires self-evaluation by individual teachers and in essence it is the willingness of the teacher to be open and honest about areas of development, if it is on a topic that he/she is not comfortable with or finds difficult to teach. It is important that during the pre-evaluation session, the teacher should indicate to the DSG his/her needs analysis so as that the DSG can formulate a development programme.
The critical role of the DSG is a willingness to assist the teacher being evaluated as failure to give proper feedback to the appraisee will render the whole exercise null and void. The openness of the DSG when observing the lesson will assist the appraisee to know where he needs development and areas where the appraisee excels. In most instances, DSGs complain about their inability to honour lesson observations because of too many administrative duties.

3.3 Roles and Responsibilities of Individuals and Structures in the Implementation of Integrated Quality Management Systems

“In implementing the IQMS, there are certain protocols to be followed. The school principal has to first ensure that the SDT is democratically elected in order to facilitate the process of IQMS and also to see to it that the IQMS is uniformly and effectively implemented” (Department of Education 2003:2). This function also involves ensuring that all documentation sent to the District office is correct and timeously delivered. Before the documentation can be sent, the principal has a responsibility for conducting internal moderation of the evaluation results in a fair and consistent manner (Department of Education 2003:2).

The SDT, made up of the principal, the WSE coordinator, all members of the SMT together with a democratically elected member of the staff, liaise with the department officials on short courses, learnerships and skills development programmes and deal with differences that may arise between the appraisees and their DSGs with the intention of resolving such grievances. They also liaise with the EWSE team by coordinating and managing cyclical EWSE processes (Department of Education 2003:3).

The District Officials are responsible for training and proper implementation of the IQMS and all development and arrangement of professional development programmes as outlined in the SIP. The District Official will ensure that the implementation process in schools is monitored on an on-going basis and that
those results are captured and processed on time (Department of Education 2003:5).

Having concluded self-evaluation; the Principal, the SMT and the SDT, in consultation with all staff members, develop an implementation plan that will clearly indicate who will be evaluated by whom and when, but informed by DSGs. This plan is then made available to all staff members for implementation. During the lesson observation, the DSGs use the prescribed instrument and discuss the outcomes of the lesson observation with the teacher observed. Then the DSG will inform the SDT about the outcome of the lesson, and the SDT will then inform the SIP (Department of Education 2003:7).

According to Bisschoff and Mathye (2009:2), “the education department thought that for quality to exist in the system, different structures needed to be in place as a way of ensuring continuous improvement. For the IQMS to be successfully implemented there are structures that should be introduced in schools, like the SDT and DSG”.

The SDT have to ensure that all teachers are trained in terms of the procedures and processes of the IQMS. They coordinate all activities regarding staff development. They prepare a final schedule of DSG members and ensure that all records and documentation on IQMS are maintained. They complete the necessary documentation for Performance Measurement, either for pay or salary progression; sign off on the documentation to assure fairness and accuracy and submit the necessary documentation in good time to the Principal. It must be emphasized here that the Principal is also a member of the SDT. They then also deal with discrepancies and disputes between the appraisees and their DSGs (Department of Education 2003:3).

The DSGs' purpose is to provide mentoring and support. They are also responsible for assisting the teacher to develop his/her personal growth plan
and help SDT in incorporating all plans for development purposes into the SIP. The DSG does baseline evaluation of the teacher and the immediate senior concludes that by doing the summative evaluation at the end of the year, for pay or salary progression (Department of Education 2003:7).

During the implementation process, the DSG will observe performance standards 1-4 which are classroom based. These performance standards are: “creation of a positive learning environment, knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes, lesson planning preparation and presentation, and learner assessment/achievement”. The other remaining performance standards which are outside the classroom will be continuously observed. It must be indicated that performance standards differ from one post level to the other. For all post level one educators, there are seven performance standards. Post level two educators who are heads of departments, have ten performance standards. For post level three and four educators who are deputy principals and principals, there are twelve performance standards (Department of Education 2003:7).

The purpose of the evaluation is to confirm the self-evaluation tool that the educator completed which articulates his/her strengths in a particular learning area, the weaknesses and areas of development. Having observed the educator, the DSG will constructively engage with the educator and give feedback which should focus on performance and not personality, and on observations and not assumptions (Department of Education 2003:8).

The EWSE on the other hand is responsible for ensuring that the IQMS structure is in place and it is implemented. If this is not done, then the District Manager will be requested to ensure that advocacy and training are provided. Before the visit by the EWSE, the school should have performed the process of self-evaluation that determines the extent to which the school is succeeding in attaining its vision and mission statements as stated in its aims and objectives. The EWSE will then inform the Principal during the visit, which documents need
to be readily available which include assessment reports; learner profiles; learning programmes; all timetables for curricular, extra-curricular and co-curricular activities; school policies; development appraisals and performance management documentation. It is therefore the responsibility of the school to inform parents, teachers and learners about the proposed evaluation and its purpose (Department of Education 2003:10).

For the pre-evaluation visit by the EWSE, arrangements have to be made which include the collection of documentation, finalization for the onsite visit, confirmation of the teachers who will be observed during lessons and finalization of the procedures to be followed during the visit. The EWSE team will, on the day of the visit, meet with the staff and the SDT will again outline the purpose of the visit. The timetables for the teachers to be observed will then be finalized. Mention must be made that the EWSE team focuses on nine areas including quality of teaching and learning and learner achievement. During the process of lesson observations, all other remaining areas of focus will also be evaluated (Department of Education 2003:10).

A member of the DSG with appropriate knowledge will accompany the EWSE team during lesson observations and the same instrument that was used by the DSG will be used by the EWSE team. The purpose of this is to compare findings for discussion with the teacher. The EWSE will then write an evaluation report on the quality of learning and teaching as well as on the quality of Developmental Appraisal and Performance Management processes, refer to Figure 8 (Department of Education 2003:10).

The stakeholders that are involved in the whole process of the IQMS are the National Department of Education, Provincial Department of Education, District Officials, SMT, Educators’ unions and organizations, Teachers, Learners and Parents, although the latter do not engage in lesson observations. Most schools engage members of the SGB in the IWSE but in some instances, most of these
members do not even know what IWSE is. Each of these stakeholders has important roles to fulfil for the aims and objectives of IQMS to be achieved (Mathula 2004:21).

It is important to note that the process of M&E does not depend on individual stakeholders but is a collective effort and if the “buy-in” is not reached by all stakeholders, then challenges will crop up. The argument forwarded is that during the signing of the IQMS document, one party i.e. the Suid Afrikaanse Onderwysers Unie (SAOU) did not sign on behalf of employee parties and this can have a negative impact on the implementation of the process of M&E. The majority of the parties with huge memberships signed the document and the IQMS is implemented across the board (Department of Education 2003:1).

The IQMS as a tool to be used in developing not only teachers but to ensure that there is quality teaching and learning in order to improve performance at schools, has not been well implemented in most schools, and therefore has been manipulated to a great extent. Advocacy has been made but there is subtle resistance in the implementation of the IQMS as most schools only comply with the submissions of summative evaluation not having thoroughly engaged with the implementation processes. It must be noted that IQMS is not an event but a process where teachers need to be continuously assessed and developed in order to achieve the goal of quality teaching and learning.

The fact that the IQMS is silent about linking teacher performance to learner achievement shows that the performance management principles used globally are not taken into consideration in the IQMS model. For every input, there must be an output. Measuring teacher performance therefore becomes difficult as learners’ results are not considered in the finalization stage of the teacher’s performance. Instead teachers’ scores are submitted before the release of learners’ results.
3.4 Conclusion

From the discussion, it is evident that the National Department of Education needs to firstly address the issue of personnel that are currently involved in the M&E strategies. Knowledgeable people should be employed who will then inform “what” has to be monitored and evaluated, not “how”. Over and above these, develop a well coordinated developmental plan that will make the system productive across all grades.

It is critical that emphasis should be more on assisting teachers to deal with the dynamics that they find themselves in. Nowadays the learners in schools have challenging social and behavioural problems which makes it difficult for teachers to transfer skills and knowledge that will eventually change the attitudes of these learners, hence making it difficult to really achieve quality learning and teaching. The focus should be on monitoring and evaluating what is happening in the classroom not how the policy has been implemented.

It is justifiable to reward teachers for the excellent performance they display but if the Department will overburden them to become DSGs, then the whole exercise becomes futile especially with the involvement of the peers.

Consultation of all stakeholders should be a pre-requisite before any policy implementation. Unions have been signing documentations and resolutions without seriously engaging teachers at grassroots level. That is the main reason why some of the resolutions are aborted by teachers because there is no “buy-in” and then teachers feel that they are not consulted. The Developmental Appraisal System was agreed upon and signed for in the ELRC but “it holds no water now”. Less than ten years ago, the IQMS was accepted as a monitoring and evaluation tool but the same union that signed for it, identifies loopholes. It is therefore important to seek every teacher’s input before policy that concerns development can be adopted.
Mention was made earlier of the alignment of teacher scores and learner performance. It is suggested that learner performance should influence the teachers’ incentives as early in some schools learner performance is very bad but all the teachers qualify for grade progression.

The following chapter will describe the research design and methodology employed in answering the research questions by way of empirical data collected through interviews with a range of educational stakeholders in the IQMS.
Chapter 4

Empirical Research Design, Data Collection and Assessment

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter the research design and methods used to collect empirical data to assist in answering the research questions will be summarised as well as the results of the data analysis and assessment.

4.2 Research Paradigm

According to Auriacombe (2010: 29), “Research is defined as a systematic process of enquiry aimed at obtaining accurate answers to significant and pertinent questions in order to increase the sum of human knowledge.”

An implementation (process) evaluation research design was used in this study. The logic for using the evaluation research design was that the research aimed to answer the question whether an intervention (programme, therapy, policy or strategy) had been properly implemented (process evaluation studies) in the case of the IQMS as a national education policy; whether the target group/s had been adequately covered, referring to teachers, learners, parents and all the stakeholders in the Department of Basic Education and whether the intervention was implemented as designed (Mouton 2001:158).

The reason for employing the implementation evaluation was to assess whether the application of the IQMS, a national policy on performance measurement, had assisted in improving the quality of teaching and learning in the four secondary schools sampled according to the perceptions of the teachers involved. According to Mouton (2001: 159), “implementation evaluation research
is a form of applied research aimed at assessing whether interventions have been well conceptualised and properly implemented”.

Through the use of implementation evaluation, multiple methods of data collection were undertaken through both structured and less structured interview results and an assessment of existing documentary sources was undertaken.

According to Bamberger, Rugh and Mabry (2006: 3) “the purpose of an evaluation is to produce valid conclusions and recommendations based on research methods that conform to accepted professional standards”.

4.3 Research Design

This study used a qualitative research design in its endeavour to determine the teachers’ perceptions of the effective implementation of the IQMS as a tool for measuring performance of teachers leading to school improvement. The reason for using a qualitative research design was that “it is an exploration of what is assumed to be a dynamic reality. It does not claim that what is discovered in the process is universal and, thus replicable” (Auriacombe 2010:45).

A narrative approach was used for the analysis of interviews and documents (Auriacombe 2010:54). Narrative accounts “promote deep understanding through vicarious experience so that understanding is not merely abstract but deeply, personally felt” (Bamberger et al. 2006: 270).

Data collection was done through semi-structured and open interviews, supplemented by secondary documentary information sources, namely, the IQMS performance scores of all educators in the selected schools. Questions were categorised according to school based educators, office based officials and SGB members. The same questionnaire was used during the interviews to
gather standardized information and to validate the study (Gay & Airasian 2003:277).

The advantages of using personal interviews were that they “increase the chance of successful data collection; increase accuracy and completeness of data; data enrichment is possible; representativeness can be controlled; immediate calibration and validation of response is possible; and media other than paper questionnaires can be used" (Auriacombe 2010: 110).

The main purpose of conducting personal interviews with all the stakeholders was to establish their level of understanding of the IQMS and its implementation and how it promoted teacher development which was supposed to impact on learner achievement. Interviews allow accurate and honest responses in that clarity seeking questions can be explained by the interviewer to any participant (Creswell 2003: 290).

4.4 Research Methods

The research methods used in this study included sampling to be discussed in section 4.4.1, data collection in 4.4.2, research procedures in 4.4.3, methodological norms in 4.4.4, ethical considerations in 4.4.5, data analysis in 4.4.6, findings in 4.4.7 and conclusion.

4.4.1 Sample

The study sampled four secondary schools in the Ekurhuleni South District, Gauteng Province. Two of these secondary schools are located in the township and are quintile 1, no-fee paying and section 20; and two in urban settlements which are quintile 5, fee-paying and section 21. Section 20 schools’ resource allocation is administered by the department of education while section 21 schools self-administer their resource allocation. The rationale for selecting
these schools was to assess the perceptions of teachers and parents in relation to their understanding regarding learner performance and how they viewed school improvement in general (Gauteng Department of Education 2006: 2-6).

In each school, four staff members, namely, the principal, a member of the school management team, a teacher who was a democratically elected member of the Staff Development Team and a parent serving in the School Governing Body (SGB) as well as a District official, purposefully participated in the study. Purposive sampling is the appropriate selection of people to ensure that the interview includes relevant participants who can inform the program and its impact. The rationale for using purposive sampling was that “appropriate selection of persons to observe and interview helps to ensure the richest and most meaningful information and understanding of the program and its impact” (Bamberger et al. 2006: 325).

The identified personnel were to ensure that the IQMS was implemented and that processes and procedures were followed. According to Merriam (1998: 61) “purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned.”

These samples were as follows:

a. Principals of the selected schools

In terms of the roles and responsibilities as manifested in the ELRC (Resolution 8 of 2003:2), principals had the overall responsibility to ensure that the IQMS was effectively and uniformly implemented at the schools.
b. School Management Teams (SMTs)

They were to assist with broad planning and implementation of the IQMS and ensure that it was applied consistently and together with the Staff Development Team (SDT) work together on all matters relating to the IQMS and were mutually supporting one another.

c. Teachers serving on SDT

They were to ensure training of all staff members on the processes and procedures of the IQMS and that they cooperated with the Development Support Group and External Whole School Evaluation Team.

d. Parents serving on the SGB

Whole School Evaluation must be conducted by the stakeholders within that school community in terms of the National Policy on Whole School Evaluation, (Government Gazette 22512 vol. 433 of 2001), which stipulates that the executive authority of the professional management of schools is vested in the Principal supported by the SGB (Department of Education 2001: 12). One of the focus areas for evaluation was learner achievement so it was important that SGB members were involved in the analysis of results on a team basis. The principal should produce, in collaboration with the support services and the SGB, an improvement plan in response to recommendations made in the evaluation report within four weeks of receipt of the written evaluation report. Full consultation with all stakeholders must be part of this process (Department of Education 2001:12).
4.4.2 Data Collection

The study used semi-structured interviews in order to allow the participants flexibility in answering the questions. In some cases, participants would just give a closed answer and that allowed the researcher to probe and lead the conversation to get more input from the participants. Bamberger et al. (2006: 284) states that “the semi-structured interviewer must record data while adjusting the wording and other questions, maintain rapport, preserving focus, and assessing and following up on conversational leads that may yield unexpected information by developing new questions on the spot”.

Documents on the teachers’ performance in 2010 to 2012, and Grade 12 results from 2010 to 2012, were obtained with permission from the Department of Education for the purpose of this study to assess if there was a correlation between teacher performance and learner achievement. “Analysis of these documents assists in providing existing information and improving the efficiency of the evaluation and reducing cost and effort” (Bamberger et al. 2006: 286). It must, however, be noted that the teachers’ performance scores contain personal and confidential information, therefore they were treated with special sensitivity although the Grade 12 results were in the public domain and accessible to any member of the public.

The data were collected in August 2012 and the researcher used two weeks to visit the four schools and spent two days after school hours, in each, to conduct interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with all the participants, except in one school where the SGB parents felt that they had not been fully exposed to any processes of Internal Whole School Evaluation due to conflicts at the school in 2009 and 2010.

All participants interviewed in the category of teachers were members of the Staff Development Teams who were also involved in dealing with grievances
should they arise and they also coordinated all activities regarding staff development. All the interviewees requested not to be audio-taped. Their requests were respected and as Bamberger et al. (2006: 286) point out “for ethical reasons, interviewees should be offered the opportunity to decline audio-taping”. This, however, was not a hindrance as interviewees allowed the interviewer to request that answers be given slowly so as to accurately capture the data and to confirm with the interviewees if the answers were correctly captured. Detailed field notes were captured.

4.4.3 Research Procedures

Firstly, the researcher obtained permission to do the research and to access the data needed from the Gauteng Department of Education. The Ekurhuleni District Director also approved the research project because documents from the District were to be used as part of the research. One official from the Performance Management System Unit was also interviewed who provided information on how the unit administered performance management in the Ekurhuleni South Schools.

Principals of the purposively selected schools assisted in identifying members of the Staff Development Teams who were willing to provide information needed by the researcher (Gay and Airasian 2003: 283).

4.4.4 Methodological Norms

The quality of an evaluation depends on how valid the findings are. Bamberger et al. (2006:290) indicate that “quality in qualitative evaluation is primarily about whether findings are empirically warranted, not about whether the evaluator has strictly adhered to prescribed procedures”. Therefore, validity and credibility are important in promoting the use of findings.
The researcher validated the research by summarizing what each interviewee said at the end of the sessions and checking if the notes as captured were correct. The same questions were asked in each category of participants and as Bamberger et al. (2006:292) put it “validation involves checking with informants about the accuracy of the recorded data and the reasonableness of the interpretations drawn from it”.

4.4.5 Ethical considerations

Merriam (1998:201) acknowledges that research can only be valid and reliable when an investigation is conducted in an ethical manner. As stated above, the researcher was granted permission to conduct the study in the Ekurhuleni South District by the Gauteng Department of Education. The District Director of Ekurhuleni South District as well as the principals of the four secondary schools gave the researcher permission to interview the participants and to also get the scores of the teachers’ summative evaluations from the Performance Management Systems unit (PMS).

It was initially envisaged that a tape-recorder would be used to record the interviews but the participants requested that the tape-recorder not be used. Confidentiality and anonymity of the participants and the names of the schools were guaranteed and schools were referred to as urban and township schools. According to Mouton (2001:243), there are basic rights that need to be observed by the researcher, “the right to privacy (including the right to refuse to participate in research); the right to anonymity and confidentiality; the right to full disclosure about the research (informed consent); and the right not to be harmed in any manner (physically, psychologically or emotionally)”.

The data collected about the teachers’ scores from the PMS unit remain strictly confidential. Upon conclusion of the study, the schools, the Ekurhuleni South
District and the Gauteng Department of Education will be provided with general, anonymous feedback about the results.

4.4.6 Data Analysis

The data are presented in the form of a table that summarizes the responses from the interviews conducted with all the participants. The responses from the Principals, SMTs and Teachers to the questions posed to them during the interviews, are captured in the table below.

**Table 1: School Development Teams’ Interviews Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the IQMS emphasis on the school to the detriment of the teacher?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No. The IQMS was supposed to develop teachers although it had no value. All the teachers were expected to conduct self-evaluation in order to determine their areas of strengths and weaknesses so as to allow the Development Support Groups to draw up strategic plans that would inform the School Development Plans outlining areas that teachers needed to be developed in. The development and support of teachers must not be left to the District officials only but schools must draw up their own processes of development to assist teachers in trying to improve the school performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes. The administration was too much and already teachers were overwhelmed with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
paperwork. It therefore took up time that could have been spent on teaching and learning activities that would eventually enhance learners’ performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the generic nature of the IQMS negatively affect the implementation at operational level rather than using a different model?</td>
<td>Yes, it did. There were different school cultures that existed and when performances of teachers and learners’ achievements were compared, no difference could be identified between performing, underperforming or dysfunctional schools as all teachers received the performance bonus irrespective of whether the learners performed well or not. It was therefore questionable to ascertain the implementation of the IQMS. The rationale was also that there were teachers who were dedicated and worked effectively and efficiently but only receive 1%, the same as everybody else. The IQMS format was not user-friendly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. The IQMS needed to be streamlined so that the negative connotation attached to the implementation process could be addressed. The Development Support Groups (DSGs) should be fully involved in mentoring and supporting the teachers based on the self-evaluations conducted and these should be teachers chosen based on extensive experience coupled with records of excellence in their various subjects and not chosen on the basis of friendship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Question 3 | 7 |
| How can the IQMS be used to identify the | Participants believed that the tool could be used to identify qualities of effective teachers by ensuring that teachers with expertise and excellent |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>How does the IQMS contribute to the accountability of teachers, that is, results of their actions as public servants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Participants indicated that the qualities of effective teachers were seen in their classrooms and results and that it depended on what the teacher believed to be of benefit. Performance Standards 1 to 4 focused on the lesson planning, preparations and presentation, creation of a positive learning environment, knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes, and learner assessment/achievement which when well implemented, would reveal qualities of effective teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5</th>
<th>What are the strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Participants stated that the IQMS added no value to their development. It was clear from the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and limitations of the IQMS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>How objective and specific is the IQMS tool or is it just a simple checklist?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participants identified the strength of the enforcement of accountability at all levels. The Staff Development Teams and the School Management Teams were the driving force for ensuring that the IQMS was implemented and that mentoring and support were given to teachers who needed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participants viewed the IQMS tool as objective which can help with teacher development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Participants indicated that the tool was not objective as it could be easily manipulated by the DSG by not conducting the lesson observations and just filling in the scores. There is also no teacher development carried out by the DSGs. Some teachers did not allow that class visit/observation should be conducted but they were awarded scores as nil/0 mark could not be awarded on the score sheet. The easy manipulation of the tool made it viewed as a formal checklist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Are managers experts in the fields/subjects in which they evaluate teachers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, the DSG members comprised of the immediate senior and a peer in the subject that the appraisee taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Participants indicated that this was so in some instances but not for all performance standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some managers were not conversant with other subjects hence it became difficult to observe and evaluate teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Are managers completely honest in the evaluation of teachers?</th>
<th></th>
<th>No. Not always because it did not link to learner performance. Managers tended to settle differences or punished educators while some secured friendship.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, but to a certain degree only. In many cases they do not want to be judgmental.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>Does the IQMS differentiate between a novice and an experienced teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, to a certain extent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No, it accommodated all levels and needed to be refined as the development gap was wider compared to those with experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>To what extent has the implementation of the IQMS met the developmental needs of the teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>There had been minimal development done by the senior managers but time constraints and too much administrative duties render the support to be given to teachers to be less.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental needs were not met as some teachers were not honest and open in the completion of the Personal Growth Plans and the self-evaluations if ever completed. The School Development Plans submitted were just a formality as development by both the schools and the district never occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td>What comparison can be made between the IQMS and the old system of inspection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>They felt that IQMS was developmental in nature although it did not render the objective it was supposed to while the old system of inspection was judgmental only.</td>
<td></td>
<td>IQMS wasted time as you had to leave your class for peer evaluation instead of subject advisers in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What impact does the IQMS have on learner performance?</strong></td>
<td>There was no impact evident as long as some teachers were not teaching. There was no honesty in some managers in terms of awarding scores to teachers. Teachers were fully aware that learner performance was not linked to their performance hence some could easily get scores without being appraised. Some of the teachers were highly scored whereas performance of learners in the subjects they taught was disastrous. All the teachers performed exceptionally well yet results of the learners in both the internal and external examinations were not satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 13</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What challenges do the school encounter in implementing the</strong></td>
<td>They believed that the IQMS required proper monitoring systems so as not to become a time-consuming exercise and subject the DSG to a lot of paperwork. Managers needed to be honest in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IQMS?

ensuring that scores were proportional to performance. Lack of expertise by the evaluators in the evaluation processes. Peers could be lacking evaluation skills. New educators needed to be taken through the processes of the IQMS which posed a challenge because the SDTs needed refresher courses to fully understand how to implement the IQMS.

Source: Results from empirical data collection

The responses from the various schools showed that there were teachers in all four schools who believed that the IQMS processes could benefit the schools if correctly implemented and manipulation of scores prevented. However, from the same schools some educators simply saw the IQMS process as time-consuming. They were unable to connect it to the improvement of quality teaching and learning.

The District official was asked the following questions:

- As an official in the Performance Management Systems unit, do you think that managers of schools and SGB members are adequately trained to conduct the IQMS?
  - The Official from the District responded by indicating that adequate training and support were given to the SMT, SDT and educators through workshops, seminars, memoranda, circulars, on site visits and on-job trainings. However, the SGBs were not taken through the IQMS training as there was no structured training for the parent component.
- What support does the District Office offer to schools to ensure that the process becomes objective and those goals for the implementation of the IQMS is realized?
The support and training given were to ensure that the IQMS process was objective and that goals for the implementation of the IQMS were realized.

- When the summative results are submitted at the end of the year, does the unit check with the Curriculum sub-directorate to establish if there is correlation between teachers’ scores and learners’ results?

The District Moderation Team collected all the IQMS scores from the schools and all the unit heads of the Curriculum sub-directorate and the Institutional Development and Support sub-directorate to discuss the scores before they were finalized. Although correlation could not be established, the District Moderation Team accepted results as they were.

- If yes, what have the findings been like?

The findings are mixed in that some reflect the correctness and fairness of the process while others reflect discrepancies in terms of the high scores of teachers as compared to the low or poor performance of learners.

- How has the unit influenced the implementation of the IQMS to be regarded as a policy matter and not as a compliance subject?

There are general perceptions that there is no correlation between teachers’ performances and learners’ achievements.

The Performance Management Systems Unit interacted with the schools through formal departmental circulars, formal workshops involving unit directors from the Head Office, involvement of District unit heads and subject facilitators, quality assurance in all submissions, and constant monitoring, support and development to ensure that the IQMS was not a compliance process but a policy matter.
The following were responses from the SGB parent component interviewed.

### Table 2: School Governing Bodies’ Interview Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How involved are SGB members in the Internal Whole School Evaluation?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have the findings of the evaluation assisted the school in improving the overall performance of the school?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What training has been given to the SGB to assist in carrying out the IWSE?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the school undergone any</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>How involved are SGB members in the analysis of learners’ results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Management of the schools discussed results with the SGB and they were fully involved in the analysis of results in order to influence the support and programmes which would render schools effective and functional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Does the SGB use learners’ results to influence programmes that will benefit improvement of results and the school in general?</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. The SGBs authorize that developmental programmes be put in place, like extra classes where they would remunerate teachers for conducting those lessons and also provide for teachers to attend developmental programmes that would enhance learner performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>As a member of the SGB, do you think schools become objective when conducting self-evaluation or do you think only the Internal Whole School Evaluation was found to be slightly subjective but the External Whole School Evaluation was constructive and encouraged general improvement of the school.</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectivity of self-evaluation depended on individual schools but as a school the SGB used the evaluation to objectively determine their performance and put measures in place to improve.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the responses of parents, it was clear that parents were minimally engaged especially in internal whole school evaluations. In some schools it was evident that although results were discussed and analysed, they were not used to plan for future interventions. It must be emphasized that all nine focus areas needed the involvement of all stakeholders. Intensive involvement of all stakeholders was crucial in that 'buy-in' and shared values should be emphasized as school improvement could only be evident when all the stakeholders understood their roles and responsibilities and how they complement one another.

4.4.7 Findings

From the interviews conducted with all the participants, it was found that they viewed the purpose of the IQMS as a valid national policy as it could help not only in the development of teachers but also in the improvement of schools. However, its advocacy and administration had rendered the IQMS processes flawed. The template used in the Performance Management, according to the teachers, was too cumbersome and time-consuming hence the overwhelming paperwork that had to be completed by both the teachers and the Development Support Groups and in most cases, development seemed not to be carried out.

Another contributing factor to the IQMS being flawed was the issue of accountability because most teachers believed that effective and non-effective teachers benefitted from the 1% received by all after the summative evaluation had been done. Cognizance of the performance of teachers throughout the year
and learners’ achievements were not considered. Manipulation of results easily occurred as some DSGs were dishonest in awarding scores and often during lesson observations most teachers would “window-dress”. Other participants believed that managers tended to use the IQMS processes to settle differences either by favouring or punishing teachers. The issue of honesty in carrying out the policy needed to be proportional to performance.

From the interviews conducted, the findings indicated that the focus was mostly on the performance management of teachers and there was no evidence of training parents to analyse results and use the data to improve and influence school performance. Monitoring of the IQMS was purely one-sided and the Whole School Evaluation that focused on all nine focus areas was neglected by officials of the Department.

Earlier in the study, the IQMS was defined as an integration of three processes that included the Whole School Evaluation. From the SGB parent participants, it was found that they were not fully involved in the Internal Whole School Evaluation but would only discuss results. The analysis of results was not properly done as data was not used to inform the school’s plans. In terms of the nine focus areas of the WSE, the SGB parent component only got involved in issues of governance and community involvement.

4.5 Conclusion

The main research question that sought to evaluate the perceptions of the effectiveness of the IQMS as a tool to measure teachers and the SGBs performance at the selected secondary schools can now be answered. The general perception is that the focus of the IQMS was purely on individual teacher performance management and that both the Development Appraisal and the Whole School Evaluation were neglected. The respondents were generally of the opinion that the IQMS could improve not only learners’ results
but create well managed schools if correctly implemented by all stakeholders. Stakeholders in this regard also meant all levels of the Department of Education. In order for this to happen, the involvement of all stakeholders is important and the focus should not be on teacher performance only but on whole school improvement as learning achievement is very important. Quality teaching and learning can be achieved when all stakeholders understand what is expected of them as teachers will profitably use the time teaching while learners will focus on acquiring knowledge and skills, with parents supporting the whole process of teaching and learning.
Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Introduction

The research focused on the perceptions of teachers, parents and school governing body members about the effectiveness of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) as a tool used for measuring overall performance of teachers and the SGBs at the selected secondary schools. The rationale for selecting secondary schools was that performance of schools in South Africa was measured using Grade 12 results and the classification would then be made around results that schools were performing or underperforming.

The IQMS integrated the Development Appraisal (DA), Performance Management (PM) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE), the Department of Education (in the National Education Policy Act 27 of 1996 Section 8(1-7)), and provided standards for monitoring and evaluation to determine improvements in quality education. The focus of the IQMS is therefore supposed to be not only on teachers but on all the stakeholders in ensuring that the aims and objectives of the Department of Education on quality education are achieved.

Chapter 2 of this dissertation summarised an international and local review of performance management generally, as well as educational performance management. The focus on teacher performance was based on identifying, evaluating and developing the performance of teachers’ work in assisting schools to realize their goals and objectives. Accountability from all stakeholders was therefore an important aspect of school improvement.

The purpose and objectives of the IQMS and the main role players were explained in Chapter 3. The focus was on the role played by the School
Development Teams and the Development Support Groups as the main force for implementing the process because the success and failure of the process relied heavily on those two important groups.

Chapter 4 dealt with the research design and methods. Four secondary schools in the Ekurhuleni South District in the Gauteng Department of Education were selected for the purpose of the study. Interviews were conducted with the Principals, School Development Team members, parents serving on the School Governing Bodies and an official from the Ekurhuleni South District who also provided data on teachers’ summative results and Grade 12 results.

5.2 Summary of the main findings of the research

In relation to the problem statement and the rationale outlined in Chapter 1, the study identified findings which answered the main research question and the subsidiary questions. Monitoring and evaluation of performance in all organizations and institutions are important. Goals set by these institutions needed to be achieved to measure if employees’ performance was improving or deteriorating.

Performance management would assist to identify, evaluate and develop the work performance of employees and processes would be put in place for continuous development. Authenticity of the performance appraisal system could only be ascertained when correct guidelines were followed. An in-depth study should be conducted on whether the use of peer-evaluations or self-evaluations was ideal for bigger organizations, or if the traditional way of performance evaluation where the supervisors would conduct performance management, was ideal. The case with the IQMS advocating for peer evaluations with the belief that peers would be able to develop one another. The recommendation is that monitoring should be done by the principal and deputy
principals and evaluation done by the Institutional Development and Support Official (IDSO).

Teacher performance also needed to follow guidelines as in other organizations because the main aim was to ensure that goals set were achieved and that there was improvement of performance for all stakeholders. Both internal and external evaluations at schools were needed to help benchmark what schools do right and what had to be improved. The internal and external evaluations would also assist in determining school and classroom effectiveness because the higher the level of learner achievement, the higher the school and classroom effectiveness based on staff development and the teaching and learning process. It was critical that the purposes of both internal and external evaluations be effectively communicated to clear misconceptions and misunderstanding.

The strengths of the IQMS therefore were to ensure that there was accountability from all stakeholders in terms of service delivery, as mentioned in Chapter 2 of the study (Weber 2005:67). It also tracked the progress of all components within and outside of the school community. It helped identify gaps and weaknesses in terms of service delivery. It determined levels by which planning, prioritization, allocation and management of resources were monitored and evaluated leading to quality teaching and learning (Mestry, Hendricks and Bisschoff 2009:477).

With the assistance of the DSGs, teachers are supposed to identify their strengths and weaknesses which are supposed to lead to development specifically designed to meet the needs of an individual teacher. The process of development in IQMS is not a “one size fits all” kind of approach but describes how the teacher can develop to be accountable for the quality of work he/she delivers. It affords teachers an opportunity to create skills, knowledge and attitudes for learners and to improve the learning environment that will enable
the learners to participate actively and to achieve success in the learning process. Through training and development, the IQMS is supposed to ensure that teachers possess appropriate content knowledge which is demonstrated in the creation of meaningful learning experiences. The IQMS can also monitor the impact and measure the effectiveness of ongoing development that the teacher and school are provided with.

More weaknesses than strengths were identified of the IQMS as a monitoring and evaluation tool. As earlier indicated, the DAS was the appraisal system to be used by the Department of Education in 1998 but failed because the Department was unable to deliver, citing lack of resources as the reason for non-delivery, as mentioned in Chapter 2 of the study (Mathula 2004:7). Mestry et al. (2009:476) cited a lack of proper advocacy programmes on the IQMS, insufficient training provided to teachers in the field of the IQMS, low morale of teachers due to poor working conditions and remuneration packages, and resistance due to unilateral decisions taken by the Department on the IQMS, as reasons for the unsuccessful implementation of the IQMS.

The Department, instead of dealing with those challenges, introduced the new managerial notions of monitoring and evaluation known as Education Action Zones (EAZ) as mentioned, to deal with dysfunctional/underperforming schools with the intention of developing them. The Office for Standards (OFSTED) was also established by the Department to deal with quality assurance and provide indicators that schools and teachers would be monitored and evaluated on. The approach used by EAZ officials led to resistance and as such DAS’ which was supposed to offer continuous development to both the teachers and schools failed (Mathula 2004:7-9).

Whole School Evaluation which was managed from the Office for Standards was also not coordinating the evaluation of schools and did not inform the Department about the areas of focus that were key in the delivery of quality
education. The reason for this was that many schools had not been visited by the WSE teams to identify their needs and help address the areas of development. Those that had been visited had challenges which were not addressed, mostly by the Department of Education, based on the recommendations of the EWSE. The other fact was that some of the EWSE teams were not competent enough as they did not have an understanding of how schools should be managed while the attitude of some team members was not at all welcoming (Sebolaishi 2004:86). Appointments into such positions should be people who have moved into the ranks of managerial positions at school level, who could understand the operations of the schools.

Performance measurement was a once-off lesson observation as the lesson that was observed, would determine if a teacher qualified for a salary or grade progression. A salary progression was when a teacher received a 1% increase after the summative results had been submitted and grade progression was when a teacher’s salary moved to the next notch. It must be indicated that most of these grade progressions, teachers received them by default as intense monitoring and evaluation was not done. In most cases the teacher evaluation was done as a formality and did not carry any weight. However, it could be stated that there was no recourse for the employer since development was not thoroughly done and impact sometimes not seen by all parties.

One of the characteristics of the performance measurement programme was that the peer formed part of the Development Support Group and that the teacher chose whom he wanted as his/her DSG. The issue of peer compromised the whole system. It was also ironic that performance measurement had to be implemented while the Heads of Department were not allowed to conduct class visits in some schools. District Facilitators who were subject specialists were also barred from visiting schools to offer subject related assistance to teachers.
One other striking weakness of the implementation of the IQMS was that it was not at all related to learner performance. There was no correlation between the scores the teacher received during the PM process and the learner results that were yielded at any given time during learner assessments be it during the first quarter, or the last quarter. Most teachers received grade progressions and the learner results did not match their performance. The performance measurement system therefore was more about incentives that the teacher received rather than the quality of teaching and learning that was delivered. The system did contribute by not meeting the standards such as ensuring that resources were available on time for quality teaching and learning as was the case recently in Limpopo of textbooks and in the Eastern Cape of teaching personnel.

The South African Democratic Teachers’ Union (2009:1), also acknowledged that effective (developmental) teacher evaluation and teacher development has been on hold for the last ten years. This indicated that there was indeed no monitoring or evaluation by the Department of Education.

The IQMS was not effective as performance standards that had been proposed were not adhered to. The advocacy and training for the IQMS process only lasted for one day and the instrument that was used, was too long, hence its ineffectiveness in some of the schools. The IQMS was also a too complex evaluation system and that was a challenge as efficiency could not be achieved. It involved a lot of components, namely, the DSG, the SDT, the SMT, the IWSE and the EWSE and they all repeat the same process which became cost-inefficient. It was time-consuming as members of the DSG, SDT and SMT were also teachers who needed to complete the syllabi and the responsibilities then became cumbersome.

In the National General Council of SADTU (2011:2), the following resolutions were taken:

- to reject the Teacher Performance Appraisal in its current form;
• to cause the ELRC to commission the study on the IQMS in order to identify the strengths and the challenges related to its implementation;
• that learner performance should not be included as part of appraising Educators;
• that there should be one performance appraisal system for all School-based Educators;
• to insist on the re-packaging of the IQMS to reflect the de-linking aspect as resolved by the Teacher Development summit with a view of strengthening it by 2012;
• to refer the discussion on the performance appraisal and development to the Policy Conference on Labour and Education to be held before the end of March 2012.

It seems as if the IQMS failed in the integration of all its sub-systems. There was no accountability, monitoring, competence and quality assurance that could be measured within this IQMS. Instead tensions were created as some teachers blamed the DSGs and SDTs for improperly implementing the performance measurement system because in some schools teachers received grade progression without even lesson observations being conducted.

The Department of Education attempted to institutionalize the monitoring and evaluation system into the IQMS as the main aim was to consolidate all the systems into one, but the department underestimated the complexity of the system. Teacher development was not supposed to be infused with Whole School Evaluation as a lack of resources will negatively affect the performance of teachers. The Department of Education failed to acknowledge the key issues in monitoring and evaluation of institutional design as it did not adequately plan for the evaluation. Hence some provinces did not implement the IQMS. The Department of Education also did not cost the evaluation as resources needed for the development of teachers could not be provided and no right approach in
the implementation of the IQMS was chosen as a result of the complexity of the system.

The critical point with the IQMS was that the focus was on “how” to go about evaluating teachers and schools and not “what” development and support structures were needed to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the classroom. It should really be about the learners in the classroom. What shortages there were that could affect service delivery (for example a lack of furniture in the classroom that hampers teaching and learning, textbooks or other related teaching and learning materials), were factors that could have been taken into consideration before implementing the system. A needs analysis in addressing what teachers believe and understand to be teacher development could have been considered. In other provinces, brick and mortar schools are still a luxury as there are no proper schools and sanitation remains the biggest challenge.

The IQMS has to consider “how” to evaluate and monitor teachers because the “what” to evaluate and monitor would be informed by a variety of other factors. The core business of the Department of Education is the development of learners in totality, while the IQMS seems to miss that and to focus on only one aspect of the education triangle, namely, the teacher, who was emphasized more than the learner and the parent. Building capacity for accurate monitoring and evaluation is crucial, and it is therefore imperative that when operational managers are appointed, that they must be people who know and understand monitoring and evaluation systems well and are able to reflect accurately on the results that they study. Experienced evaluators must be appointed to manage the monitoring and evaluation processes.

5.3 Conclusions and recommendations

The main conclusions of the research are the following:
Firstly, the IQMS as a national policy is a very important tool that can assist schools to improve if the focus is on quality teaching and learning. Teacher development should be emphasized in line with the improvement of learner achievement. Schools can be centres of excellence when development of teachers is fully and correctly implemented and that will be displayed when the learners realise expectations.

Secondly, the Department needs to fully resource schools in terms of textbooks and other physical resources needed for proper curriculum delivery. The target that each learner must have textbooks in each subject cannot be realized because township schools depend on the Department of Education to provide the funds to procure such resources. Development of teachers can also not be addressed as a lack of financial resources is cited as one of the issues prohibiting the implementation process.

Thirdly, the aims and objectives of monitoring and evaluation should be well communicated to all the stakeholders and accountability should not be one-sided. The schools belong to all the stakeholders and when positive results are not achieved, the Department of Education should not blame those that are at the tail-end of curriculum implementation but the responsibility and accountability of the output should be with all the stakeholders.

Lastly, refresher workshops should be conducted in all provinces simultaneously so that uniformity in the implementation of the IQMS can be validated.

The recommendations are to conduct a meta-evaluation of the IQMS to establish which aspects of the implementation are well understood by the stakeholders and which are cumbersome to implement. Adequate resources should be provided by the Department of Education in addressing the current lack of capacity in the implementation of the policy. The issue of the DSG should
be revisited as the teachers interviewed complained about the process because some teachers served in more than one DSG and still had to continue with their normal teaching and administrative duties. The IQMS policy is silent when it comes to teachers’ performance being compared to learners’ achievement. The policy can be more effective if teachers’ performance can be matched or measured against learners’ achievement.

The training of the SGB should not only focus on issues of governance but members should be taken through the nine focus areas of the Whole School Evaluation process. Learner achievement, curriculum provision and resources among others are critical in school improvements and therefore in the improvement of learners’ abilities. The SDP drawn up by all stakeholders can be well implemented if the SGB members understand the nine focus areas better. Advocacy of a policy should be seriously considered.

Resources are still a challenging issue in ensuring that IQMS is fully implemented. It will therefore not be practical to use the same tool to monitor and evaluate teachers who teach in different education settings. For example, teachers in affluent schools where learners pay school fees, buy their own textbooks and are very few in a class as compared to a teacher where the learners do not pay fees, the allocation from the government is inadequate and the classes are overcrowded, then there will be inconsistency regarding the validity of monitoring and evaluation strategies. The monitoring and evaluation tool should be adapted to suit the conditions that teachers find themselves in.

Performance standards are themselves a nightmare as the tool takes time to complete. To include all these standards is not a reality when trying to develop teachers. For example, performance standard 5 deals with professional development in field of work/career and participation on professional bodies. For teachers who are not members of unions this performance standard might have no impact. The performance standards that are classroom based and learner-
centred should be considered as monitoring and evaluation tools and anything outside the classroom should be considered as an observation and not be rated. The criteria in all Performance Standards must address specific objectives and skills of educators. The National Teachers’ Awards must be directly linked to IQMS outcomes; but at the moment that is not the case.

WSE should be conducted but the findings thereof should inform the school about its good practices as well as areas of improvement but should also be directly associated with teacher development. Although WSE is not an entity, it can be used to address the lack of resources within the school that impede delivery of quality teaching and learning. National strategies and plans should always strive to address the development of the child in totality hence the challenge for the National Department of Education is to ensure that the challenges of resource allocations are addressed.

District Officials who are supposed to offer support and develop teachers are unable to do so due to a shortage of personnel. For example, a Mathematics facilitator would cater for +200 schools in the district. Surely this is impossible as teachers need mentors and coaches that are subject-related and able to support them. Again it is also crucial that qualified and knowledgeable personnel be employed to deal with this mammoth task. Lastly, a recommendation would be that meta-evaluation of the IQMS be conducted.

Circular 18/2007 of the Gauteng Department of Education indicated a need for refresher training in implementing the IQMS and that proper understanding of the performance standards should be established to facilitate a proper moderation process that will ensure that scores assigned to a teacher by the DSG are a true reflection of their performance.
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