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The title of the research is: *The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in selected secondary schools in Giyani.* The researcher used a qualitative research paradigm. Ten school managers and eight CS1 educators formed the sample of this study. Representativeness of the sample was considered as the study had similar characteristics to the population and was relevant to the research. The participants were:

- All school-based;
- Male and female educators working in selected public secondary schools;
- From various socio-economic backgrounds.

Purposive sampling was done in accordance with the researcher's judgement and the purpose of the study. By employing purposive sampling, the researcher based this study on the assumption that she wanted to discover, understand, gain insight into, and learn as much from the sample as possible. The school managers and CS1 educators spoke their minds about how they perceive IQMS advocacy in schools. They indicate that IQMS had possibly failed.

Focus group interviews were used as a data-gathering device. Four focus group interview sessions (two with school managers and two with CS1 educators) were used to:

- obtain general background information about IQMS advocacy;
- learn how respondents spoke of the phenomenon; and
- explore participants' experiences, opinions, wishes and concerns, which would not have been feasible by employing other research methods.
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CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM ELUCIDATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

South Africa is a democratic country, faced with rapid change. Educational changes include the consolidation of education systems according to creed, colour or race. These education systems catered for blacks, whites, coloureds and Indians (Van Schalkwyk, 1991:76; Van Wyk, 1991:44). Furthermore, education for white learners was provided for in four provinces, each with its own department, i.e.

- The Cape Education Department:
- The National Education Department;
- The Orange Free State Education Department; and

Education for black learners’ was under the auspices of the Department of Education and Training. These learners were exposed to rote learning and disciplinary methods that were abusive and humiliating, such as corporal punishment (Kallaway, 1990:55), which was in violation of section 10 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act no. 108 of 1997 (Brunton & Associates, 2003:G-3). Brunton & Associates state that:

“Everyone has inherent dignity and the right to have their dignity respected and protected.”

The teaching methods to which black learners were subjected, further disregarded learners’ rights and did not prepare them for higher levels of thinking and a healthy self-image (Kallaway, 1990:58). Black learners’ education
(Department of Education and Training) was further categorised according to their ethnic grouping in their homelands, as indicated in table 1.1 below:

Table 1.1: Black learners’ education systems, categorised according to ethnic grouping and language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNIC GROUP</th>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>EDUCATION SYSTEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bophutatswana</td>
<td>Southern Sotho</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ciskei</td>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gazankulu</td>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kwazulu-Natal</td>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lebowa</td>
<td>Northern Sotho</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transkei</td>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Venda</td>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the ANC government came to power, these education systems were combined to form one national education system and nine provincial administrations. Two types of schools existed, namely public and independent schools (Brunton & Associates, 2003:B-4). The creation of one national education system aimed to eliminate discrimination and the unacceptable disparities of the apartheid system. Brunton & Associates (2003:B3-B4) state:

“Whereas the achievement of democracy in South Africa has consigned to history, the past system of education was based on racial inequality and segregation; and

Whereas this country requires a new national system for schools which will redress past injustices in educational provision, provide an education of progressively high quality for all learners and in so doing lay a strong foundation for the development of all our people’s talents and capabilities, advance the democratic transformation of society; combat racism and sexism and all other forms of unfair discrimination and intolerance,
contribute to the eradication of poverty and the economic well-being of society, protect and advance our diverse cultures of languages, uphold the rights of all learners, parents and educators, and promote their acceptance of responsibility for the organisation, governance and funding of schools in partnership with the state; …”

Initially, black schools have an evident history of the breakdown of the culture of teaching and learning. Black parents, for example, enrol their children at independent schools, since these schools have a culture of teaching and learning. Black schools were characterised by poor student attendance, educators having no desire to teach, a high drop-out rate, poor school results, weak leadership, general feelings of hopelessness and low morale, and disrupted authority (Steyn, 2003:2; Mutshinyani, 2002:7). These elements are not conducive to effective teaching and learning.

A breakdown in the culture of teaching and learning continued in the post-apartheid era. Many educators were under-prepared and rarely taught, learners did not learn when required to apply their minds to school work, and the parent community displayed no sustainable interest in school matters and the physical and social well-being of their children (Sayed & Jansen, 2001:35). Effective teaching and learning can take place where there is involvement of all stakeholders, preparedness and a willingness to embark on teaching and learning.

The ANC government needed to put strategies in place to ensure that education in black schools improved. One of the government initiative, COLTS (Culture of Learning and Teaching Services) aimed at:

- Instilling discipline;
- Promoting dedication and motivation in educators, learners, principals and other stakeholders;
• Creating safe learning and teaching institutions;
• Providing basic resources for effective learning and teaching; and
• Creating effective schools (Steyn, 2003:2).

COLTS was aimed at urging educators, learners and parents to work together to improve the quality of education.

Through COLTS, the government, in collaboration with the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) initiated a television series called Yizo Yizo. This was the government’s strategic response to the endemic breakdown of the culture of teaching and learning (Sayed & Jansen, 2001:35). Yizo Yizo aimed at informing a large proportion of the school population and adults about the state of black schools, indicating that South Africa needed a better understanding of participative school governance. Furthermore, Yizo Yizo was a good example of policy mobilisation and advocacy in action (Sayed & Jansen, 2001:35).

After Yizo Yizo, the government initiated Tirisano, a strategic plan of the Department of Education. Tirisano means ‘working together’. Furthermore, Tirisano is a call to action and the platform of educational restructuring in South Africa in the coming years (Sayed & Jansen, 2001:8). Tirisano intends to mobilise people for change and is also a significant signal (or symbol) of the need to rethink, step back and reflect on the suite of educational policies that had been implemented.

The National Department of Education had policies in place aimed at improving the quality of education in black schools. The following table (table 1.2) shows the programme, the year it was initiated and the resolution number.
Table 1.2: Department of Education programmes, the year initiated and resolution number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME</th>
<th>YEAR INITIATED</th>
<th>RESOLUTION NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole School Evaluation (WSE)</td>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>Government Gazette Volume 433 No. 22512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measurement (PM)</td>
<td>10 April 2003</td>
<td>Agreement 1 of 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)</td>
<td>27 August 2003</td>
<td>Collective Agreement 8 of 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Limpopo Provincial Government. Integrated Quality Management System for institution-based educators (IBE) ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003 (See Annexure B).

Three of the above programmes, i.e. DA, WSE and PM were not implemented in the years in which they were initiated. As an employer, the Department of Education needs to ensure quality education and insisted that the IQMS be adopted as a way of stepping back and reflecting collectively on the enacted policies. Why collectively? For quality to exist, stakeholders (in the form of structures, e.g. School Developmental Teams and Development Support Groups) should monitor educators’ progress to ensure that there is continuous improvement in education, resulting in quality education. Scott (1998:1) stresses that quality is still an important, integral part of any vibrant service organisation.

In terms of table 1.2, the implementation of the first three programmes, i.e. Developmental Appraisal (DA), Whole School Evaluation (WSE) and Performance Measurement (PM) failed, resulting in the Department of Education launching the Integrated Quality Management System. Why IQMS? IQMS aims at ensuring quality public education for all in order to constantly improve the quality of teaching and learning (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3- Section A).
Integrated Quality Management System integrates Developmental Appraisal (DA), Whole School Evaluation (WSE) and Performance Measurement (PM). DA aims at appraising individual educators in a transparent manner whereby an educator evaluates himself/herself and discusses the outcomes with the Development Support Group. WSE evaluates 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. PM evaluates individual educators for salary progression, grade, appointment affirmation, rewards and incentives (ELRC Collective Agreement 8 of 2003:3, Section A).

In view of the above, the researcher decided to investigate the perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of IQMS in selected public secondary schools in Giyani. The successful implementation of policy reforms such as IQMS is dependent on effective advocacy and this study hopes to contribute to the body of knowledge on school reform.

The background of the problem has been highlighted and what follows is the problem statement.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The problem on IQMS and advocacy can be summarised by the following questions:

- What is IQMS?
- What is advocacy?
- What are the perceptions of school-based educators of the advocacy of IQMS in public secondary schools in Giyani?
- Which guidelines could assist the advocacy of educational reform?
Having stated the research problem, it is now necessary to state the aims and objectives of this thesis.

1.3 THE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.3.1 The aim of the research

In view of the formulated problem, advocacy was not properly carried out with regard to the implementation of IQMS in public secondary schools. The general aim of this study is to develop guidelines to advocate educational reform in a school context.

1.3.2 The objectives of the research

In order to achieve the general aim of this thesis, the specific objectives are to:

- describe and explore IQMS;
- conceptualise advocacy in school reform;
- elicit the perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of IQMS; and
- develop guidelines, which could assist in the advocacy of educational reform.

1.4 METHOD AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

1.4.1 Literature review

The researcher undertook literature review because this is a systematic, explicit and reproducible method for identifying, evaluating and interpreting the existing body of recorded work produced by other researchers (Fink, 1998:3). Literature review summarises and analyses previous research and shows how the present study is related to this research (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:51; De Vos,
Strydom, Fouché & Delport, 2002:119). Literature review facilitates a better understanding of what is currently known about advocacy and IQMS. Furthermore, literature review assists the researcher to:

- know what has already been addressed in a particular problem area;
- place a research project in context;
- display, where relevant, the conceptual and theoretical framework of the study (De Vos, et al. 2002:119, 120);
- contribute to the knowledge base;
- demonstrate how the present study advances, refines, or revises what is already known and sets the stage for the study;
- strengthens a research study, determining the best time to conduct the review (Merriam, 1998:51-52);
- understand what is currently known about the topic (Fink, 1998:3);
- demonstrate that the researcher is knowledgeable about related research and the intellectual traditions that surround and support the study;
- identify some gaps in previous research and how the proposed study will fill a demonstrated need;
- refine and redefine the research questions by embedding those questions in larger traditions (Marshall & Rossman, 1999:43); and
- relate the findings to previous knowledge and to suggest further research within the context of literature review (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:110).

1.4.2 Research design

A research design is a plan that governs what will be done, to whom, what will be measured, how and when data will be collected and how the results will be interpreted (Schuyler, 1995:36; Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:63).

Babbie (1998:89) states that a research design addresses the planning of scientific inquiry – designing a strategy for finding out something.
According to the two statements on the previous page, this study is designed to find out how school-based educators perceive the advocacy of IQMS. Focus group interviews will be used to elicit their perceptions. Data will be collected as soon as permission is granted from the Head of Department for access to his schools. The results will be interpreted based on the participants’ responses. The researcher will use a qualitative research design.

The following are characteristics of qualitative research according to Merriam (1998:9):

**Table 1.3: Characteristics of qualitative research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Qualitative research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus for research</td>
<td>Quality (nature, essence).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Philosophical</td>
<td>Phenomenology, symbolic interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Associated phrases</td>
<td>Fieldwork, ethnographic, naturalistic grounded, constructivist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goal of investigation</td>
<td>Understanding, description, discovery, meaning, hypothesis generating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Design characteristics</td>
<td>Flexible, evolving, emergent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sample</td>
<td>Small, non-random, purposeful, theoretical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Data collection</td>
<td>Researcher as primary instrument, interviews, observations, documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mode of analysis</td>
<td>Inductive (by researcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The focus of the research is qualitative.

### 1.4.3 Characteristics of qualitative research

The following are characteristics of qualitative research:

- Qualitative researchers are concerned primarily with process, rather than with outcomes or products.
Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning that people have constructed.

The researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis.

Qualitative research involves fieldwork. The researcher has to go where his participants are and to become familiar with the phenomenon that is being studied.

Qualitative research employs an inductive research strategy. The researcher builds abstractions, concepts, hypotheses and theories from details.

The product of a qualitative study is richly descriptive. These descriptions are derived from participants’ responses and documents (Merriam, 1998:5-8; Creswell, 2003:181-182).

**Table 1.4: Common types of qualitative research in education (Merriam, 1998:12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic or Generic</td>
<td>• Includes description, interpretation and understanding.</td>
<td>• Meaning-making in transformational learning (Courtenay, Merriam, &amp; Reeves, forthcoming).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies recurrent patterns in the form of themes or categories</td>
<td>• A study of twenty successful Hispanic high school students (Corderio &amp; Carspecken, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May delineate a process</td>
<td>• The role of intuition in reflective practice (Mott, 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>• Focus on society and culture.</td>
<td>• Practices inhibiting school effectiveness (Aviram, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uncovers and describes beliefs, values and attitudes that structure the behaviour of a group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>• Is concerned with the essence or basic structure of a phenomenon.</td>
<td>• A framework for describing developmental change among older adults (Fisher, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses data that are the participants’ and the investigator’s firsthand experience of the phenomenon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded Theory</td>
<td>• Is designed to inductively build a substantive theory regarding some aspects of practice.</td>
<td>• A comparative case study of the power relationship in two graduate classrooms (Tisdell, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is “grounded” in the real world.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>• Is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single unit or bounded system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be combined with any of the above types.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.4 Common types of qualitative research

The following are common types of the qualitative research:

- **Basic or generic**
  Qualitative research includes description, interpretation and understanding. The researcher describes data from an interview and interprets the participants’ responses. The description and interpretation provide a researcher with the opportunity for better understanding of the topic under study.

- **Ethnography**
  Ethnography focuses on society and culture by uncovering and describing beliefs, values and attitudes that structure the behaviour of a group. The participants will state how they believe IQMS should have been advocated, what they value and how educators are to behave when IQMS is implemented.

- **Phenomenology**
  The meaning of the phenomenon can be interpreted. Data is used from participants’ and investigators’ firsthand experience of the problem. Participants’ responses are important as they enable the researcher to interpret the meaning of their perspectives.

- **Grounded theory**
  Qualitative research is grounded in the real world.

- **Case study**
  Case study is the intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single unit or bound system. This is designed to acquire an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning of those involved. The interest is in the process and in discovery (Merriam, 1998:5-8; Creswell, 1994:146).
The common types of qualitative research were discussed. A discussion of population and sampling now follows.

1.5 POPULATION AND SAMPLING

1.5.1 Population

Babbie (1998:109) states that the population for a study is that group (usually of people) about whom we want to draw conclusions. The population in this research will be all public secondary schools in Giyani.

De Vos, et al. (2002:198) state that a population is the total set from which individuals or units of the study are chosen. In this case, that population is all the public secondary schools in Giyani. The group that will be studied is from this bigger group, a population. Giyani consists of four circuits, i.e. Klein Letaba, Man’ombe, Nsami and Shamavunga, with a total of 48 secondary schools.

1.5.2 Sample

A sample is a portion of the population and contains some, and only some, of the elements, which, in total, constitute a population (Abrahamson, 1983:200). De Vos, et al. (2002:199) state that a sample is a small portion of the total set of objects or persons that, together, comprise the subject of our study. From the two statements above, a sample is a small portion of some people who are from the population and who form the study. In this study, a sample will be one school manager and one CSI educator from the selected public secondary schools. In other words, the sample will consist of ten school managers and ten CSI educators - a total of twenty participants.

De Vos, et al. (2002:199) state the following reasons for using samples in research. They:
• provide more accurate information than might have been obtained if one had studied the entire population; and
• produce better quality research.

A non-probabilistic sampling strategy will be used (De Vos, et al. 2002:206; Merriam, 1998: 61) - the most common being purposive or purposeful sampling.

1.5.3 Purposive sampling

The researcher will use purposive or judgmental sampling (Babbie, 1998:89; Devers & Frankel, 2000:2). Purposive sampling means that groups or categories will be selected on the basis of their relevance to the study and an explanation that is being developed (Mason, 1996:94). Furthermore, purposive sampling is based entirely on the judgement of the researcher, as a sample is composed of elements that contain the most characteristics, representative or typical attributes of the population (De Vos, et al. 2002:207; Abrahamson, 1983:238).

From the statements above, the groups of school managers and CSI educators are relevant to this study as they are school-based in terms of the research topic. These groups are representative because they consist of both female and male educators from different socio-economic backgrounds who possess high and average academic qualifications. These groups have the following characteristics:

• They were trained on IQMS;
• They are information-rich key informants;
• They are knowledgeable and informative about advocacy and IQMS (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:401; Merriam, 1998:61); and
• They can voice their feelings, perceptions and beliefs on advocacy and IQMS.
The purpose of using a purposive sampling strategy is to discover, understand gain insight and select a sample from which the most can be learned (Merriam, 1998:61).

1.6 DATA COLLECTION

The researcher will use focus groups interviews as a data-gathering device.

1.6.1 Focus group interviews

De Vos, et al. (2002:306) define a focus group interview as a research technique that collects data through group interaction on a topic determined by the researcher. Furthermore, a focus group interview is a group of people who are brought together in a room to engage in a guided discussion (Babbie, 1998:248; Edenborough, 2002:109). From the two statements, a focus group interview thus collects data from a guided discussion that is determined by the researcher. The guided discussion is based on sharing a controlled experience (Keats, 2000:16). The shared experience is of advocacy and IQMS. Four focus groups are planned but the researcher will continue to gather data until a saturation point is reached. The following aspects are considered when sharing a controlled experience:

- Questions are written down and asked exactly as worded.
- Any unclear or incomplete answer is probed.
- Inadequate or brief answers are not probed in a biased (directive) manner (Hult, 1996:69).

The researcher should be aware that the following criteria should be met when collecting data:
• Exhaustion of sources – the respondents should give their perceptions until they have nothing more to say;
• Saturation of data – continuing to collect data (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:144);
• Emergence of regularities – the sense of “integration”;
• Over extension – new information does not contribute usefully to the emergence of additional viable categories (Merriam, 1998:164);
• The researcher should have as many groups as are required to provide a trustworthy answer to the research question; and
• Data described should be rich (De Vos, et al. 2002:312).


1.6.2 Data analysis

The researcher will analyse the transcribed data from the interviews. Brown and Dowling (1998:73) indicate that such analysis will focus on making sense of what respondents say and how they say it. Furthermore, data collection and analysis will take place concurrently or simultaneously (Locke, Silverman & Spirduso, 1998:140; Merriam, 1998:162).

The researcher will use the constant comparative method of analysing data (Merriam, 1998:159). Glaser and Strauss (1967), in (Merriam, 1998:159) devised this method to develop grounded theory. Qualitative research is grounded in the real world (Merriam, 1998:12). Data analysis will be based on how the respondents view their real world by what they say.
The basic strategy used is to constantly compare. When data is analysed, the researcher starts with a particular incident derived from an interview and compares this with another incident in the same data (Merriam, 1998:159).

1.7 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

1.7.1 Validity

Validity is the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under study (Babbie, 1998:133).

McMillan and Schumacher (2001:407) state that validity refers to the degree to which the explanation of phenomena matches the realities of the world.

From the two statements above, validity reflects the real meaning which matches the realities of the world. In other words, if we say a study is valid, it implies that the manner in which the participants respond should match with what is real in the world. For example, if the participants show the ability of conveying situated experiential realities in terms of what is locally comprehensible, that study will be said to be valid (Silverman, 1997:117). This study further yielded the correct answers according to the participants' perceptions, understanding and beliefs.

De Vos, et al. (2002:357) propose the following four alternative constructs that more accurately reflect the assumptions of the qualitative paradigm:
1.7.2 Credibility

Credibility is the alternative to internal validity (De Vos, et al. 2002:351; Merriam, 1998:201). Credibility ensures that the subjects were accurately identified and described. This study is credible in the sense that accuracy in identifying the participants is based on the judgement that:

- The participants are relevant to the study by being school-based;
- The participants are representative;
- The participants attended a workshop on IQMS; and
- The participants are knowledgeable (besides the workshop that they attended, they can read more on IQMS (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:401; Merriam, 1998:61)).

1.7.3 Transferability


- Whether the results of the study are transferable to other contexts or situations, and
- Whether they fit (Merriam, 1998:207; Miles and Huberman, 1994:279).

The findings of this study will be transferable to other contexts or situations where IQMS was advocated. The guidelines that will be developed in this study to assist in the advocacy of educational reform could be used in other situations. The findings will fit only if educational reform is advocated.
1.7.4 Dependability


Dependability ascertains:

- Whether the study will yield the same results if repeated; and

If this study is repeated, taking into consideration a purposive sampling strategy, the same results can be yielded/obtained.

The methods and techniques are reliable (focus groups). They afford the participants the opportunity to share how they perceive, feel and believe IQMS should have been advocated and how it should be advocated in future educational reform initiatives. This is referred to as the consistency of the results obtained from this study (Merriam, 1998:206).

1.7.5 Confirmability

Confirmability is an alternative to objectivity (De Vos, et al, 2002:352: Miles & Huberman, 1994:278). The questions that need to be answered are: Do the data assist in confirming the general findings and lead to the implications? Can someone confirm the results as being objective? The emphasis on confirmability is on the replicability of the study by others (Miles & Huberman, 1994:278). If someone undertakes this research, using the same participants, or participants from the same area and using the same methods, the findings can be confirmed.
This study is based on the facts gleaned from the participants’ experiences, feelings, beliefs and perceptions of IQMS and advocacy.

1.8 DEMARCATION OF THE INVESTIGATION

This study is restricted to Giyani, a town in Limpopo Province. Limpopo is the last province to implement change in terms of the National Department’s timeframes. IQMS had not been implemented by 10 January 2005, the implementation date. However, the researcher intends to carry out research to elicit the perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of IQMS in selected public secondary schools.

1.9 CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

The following concepts will be clarified.

1.9.1 Perceptions

Perception is a belief or opinion, often held by many people and based on appearances (Gillard, 2003:920). Cassell's Pocket English Dictionary (1995:595) defines perceptions as a way of seeing, or viewpoint. From the two definitions, perceptions are what people believe is an opinion or viewpoint. These viewpoints are based on the way something appears to others. In this study, perception is the viewpoint held by many people about a specific thing/subject.

1.9.2 School-based educators

A school is a place where children go to be educated (Gillard, 2003:115). Furthermore, Cassell's Pocket English Dictionary (1995:741) stresses that a school is an institution for education or instruction. The working definition in this
study is that a school is a place where education takes place. Schools are
categorised as primary and secondary schools.

A base is the main place where a person lives and works (Gillard, 2003:91).
School-based indicates a place where educators work.

An educator is any person who teaches, educates or trains other persons or who
provides professional educational services, including professional therapy and
psychological services, at any public school, further education and training
institution, departmental office or adult basic education centre and who is
appointed in a post on any educator establishment (Brunton & Associates,
2003:C-3). Furthermore, an educator is a person who teaches people (Gillard,

In this study, an educator is a person who is employed in an educator position at
an establishment or institution, for the purpose of educating learners. The
educator offers remedial, psychological and other services that are needed in
that environment.

1.9.3 Advocacy

Advocacy is from the term advocate, which means to publicly support or suggest
an idea, development or way of doing something (Gillard, 2003:19). The idea
that is advocated is that policy should be implemented. Advocacy answers the
questions what and why advocating is necessary (ELRC Collective Agreement 8,
2003:6 – Section A). Advocacy should be raised and offered for public use in a
sound, honest manner, without bias (House & Howe, 1998:2). Was IQMS, as a
policy of the National Department of Education, offered to the public in a sound,
honest and unbiased manner?
1.9.4 IQMS

IQMS is the abbreviation for Integrated Quality Management Systems. Integrated is derived from the term integrate, which means to combine two or more things in order to become more effective (Gillard, 2003:653). Quality management is based on the concept that the quality of pupils’ learning is at the heart of effective learning. Quality management has three concepts, i.e. quality control, quality assurance and total quality management. Quality control takes place after a process. Quality assurance takes place before and during the process. Total quality management takes place before, during and after the process (Oldroyd, Elsner & Poster, 1995:94-95).

A system is a way of doing things together (Gillard, 2003:1299). IQMS is a system where two or more programmes are connected or combined in order to become more effective. In this case, three programmes are combined to make them more effective, i.e. DA, PM and WSE (ELRC Collective Agreement 8 of 2003:3 – Section A). The three programmes aim at continuously improving the quality of education.

1.9.5 Public secondary school

Public means a state and national thing (Kirkpatrick, 1998:652). A school is public, i.e. it is governed by the state. Wevell (1996:870) defines public as ‘for the use of everyone’. This means that if a school is a public school, it also dictates that everyone can use it. Furthermore, all learners should have access to public schools.
Secondary

Secondary is defined as relating to the education of children between the ages of approximately 11 and 18 years old (Gillard, 2003:1126). Cassell’s Pocket Dictionary (1995:750) defines secondary as a ‘place where education is provided for children who have received elementary education’. From the two definitions, secondary implies education that is provided to learners who are between 11 and 18 years old and have received prior education for six to eight years.

The working definition of a public secondary school in this study is a place where everyone goes to receive education after receiving primary education.

1.10 PLAN OF STUDY

The content of the chapters in this thesis are presented briefly below:

1.10.1 Chapter One

The researcher focused on the background of the study, described the research problem and elucidated concepts that will be used in this thesis. The research design, data collection and analytical methods were outlined.

1.10.2 Chapter Two

The researcher reviews focused literature on advocacy as an aspect of policy implementation.

1.10.3 Chapter Three

The researcher reviews literature on IQMS.
1.10.4  Chapter Four

The researcher focuses on the discussion of the research design and research method used. In data collection, the researcher gathered data on the perceptions of school managers and CSI educators on the advocacy of IQMS in selected public secondary schools. Focus group interviews were used for this.

1.10.5  Chapter Five

The researcher analyses data that was collected through focus group interviews. This data was audio taped.

1.10.6  Chapter Six

The researcher will develop guidelines that could assist in the advocacy of educational reform.

1.10.7  Chapter Seven

The researcher provides the summary and conclusion based on the findings of this thesis.

1.11  CONCLUSION

Chapter One forms the framework of this thesis and also highlights the problems encountered on the advocacy of IQMS. The research questions were outlined, the motivation for the study and research design discussed, concepts clarified and further chapters were planned.
CHAPTER TWO

ADVOCACY AS AN ASPECT OF EDUCATION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION: A FOCUSED LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Policy implementation is imperative in educational organisations. Equally as important as policy implementation, is advocacy. Advocacy refers to representatives of organised groups, trade associations, professional associations, labour unions, other public employees and educators (Cohen, 2004:2). The above groups, who represent others, focus on the benefit for other groups, e.g. educators. In this study, an advocate is not associated with a lawyer, but with any person or group of interested people who have an interest in, as well as a benefit for a specific group of people.

Advocacy is also referred to as an act of speaking, writing or acting in support of something or someone (Aukett, 2003:1). People, who advocate something, speak (write or act) in support of specific programmes/policies that need to be implemented for specific groups, for example, educators. When advocates speak, they also argue, giving concrete reasons why such programmes or policies must be implemented. Arguing and speaking goes hand in hand with organised influence. Organised influence means meeting with policy makers and the public. The involvement of the advocates of a policy for those being supported is essential. Organised influence on policy makers by those who advocate, aims at improving the quality of life for those who cannot effectively speak out for themselves (Aukett, 2003:1-2; Cohen, 2004:4).

Advocacy is done to correct injustices to, disrespect for, and the frustrations of educators (Cohen, 2004:4; O’Connor, 2003:1-2). Those who advocate in educational reform know and have seen the injustices to and disrespect for
educators. Educators are, for example among the lowest paid group of public servants. Despite this, there are many challenges that prove that they are not respected, e.g. the disruption of their authority and undermining of discipline, resulting in frustration, coupled with an unwillingness to teach effectively, and low morale (Steyn, 2003:2; Mutshinyani, 2002:7).

Advocacy is about changing the natural order of things (McConnell, 2004:2; Cohen, 2004:4). As example, advocates have changed the natural order of things by addressing the fact that educators were never assessed in the democratic era. Some evident practices are reporting late for duty/school, their authority being undermined and a lack of parental involvement, resulting in a non-conducive teaching and learning school environment. Advocates aim to change negative practices into positive practices. Educators who are assessed for salary progression, grade or appointment affirmation would rather conduct themselves as self-disciplined and committed persons and change the natural order of things.

Advocates are people who possess a non-judgmental attitude, patience and persistence, a genuine belief that change can be achieved, and the capacity to negotiate and communicate effectively (Field & Baker, 2004:1). Those who advocate need not judge while advocating. Their patience is seen when they still negotiate on the date of policy implementation when this takes two to three days to do so. They need to continue to advocate, showing persistence. Advocates believe that they will achieve change (especially when what they advocate for shows an indication of approval). Furthermore, their abilities to effectively negotiate, speak, write and communicate their facts could be seen in patience.

2.2 ADVOCACY NEED

Although advocacy appears important, as alluded to in the statements above, it is essential because of the following aspects:
(i) Schools today are experiencing a widening gap between what should be and what is provided to meet the projected demands of the 21st century.

(ii) Educators need to think differently about the purpose of schools and the kind of delivery system that will meet the needs and expectations of the core customer.

(iii) A fear of the unknown, threats to individual power and influence, insecurity about learning new skills, and the need to perform tasks differently with different standards threaten educators’ comfort zones - the security that people derive from work routine.

(iv) For management to be successful in instilling a new culture, two phenomena associated with change have to be understood:

- Every organisation consists of employees engaged in multiple interacting linkages, which, when combined, comprise the total workforce of the organisation.

- The dynamics of change are basically dichotomous; one force drives for change while the other resists change.

(v) The principal promotes a “can do” attitude among educators and serves as a motivator and stimulator to build self-confidence among the staff in order to undertake cultural change (Weller, 1998:2-7).

(vi) Educators will hesitate to publicly declare their views for fear of appearing foolish, should their views differ.

(vii) Educators will thus simply wait for the answer to be handed down.

(viii) It is impossible for an educator to be free of values and concealment thereof is impossible. All educators possess personal and educational values (Moroney, 2004:2).

An approach to advocacy is now discussed
2.3 APPROACHES TO ADVOCACY

House and Howe (1998:2-3) state that a deliberative democratic approach could be used as an approach to advocacy. The following aspects are considered in a deliberative democratic approach.

2.3.1 Inclusivity

All stakeholders' views, interests and values should be included when approaching advocacy (House & Howe, 1998:2-3). Inclusivity stresses that stakeholders' views, interests and values should not be categorised into those to be omitted and those that are favourable.

2.3.2 Sufficient dialogue

Sufficient dialogue with relevant groups ensures that stakeholders' views are properly and authentically represented (House & Howe, 1998:3). A representative who can advocate for specific groups should gather sufficient information based on their true views.

2.3.3 Sufficient deliberation to arrive at proper findings

Sufficient deliberation takes place with evaluators, policy makers and the media (House & Howe, 1998:3). Stakeholder pressure disturbs discussion. If deliberation leads to a powerful win at times, it can be aborted, thus influencing the deliberative democratic approach to advocacy.

2.4 FORMS OF ADVOCACY

Advocacy takes the following forms:
2.4.1 Personal advocacy

Personal advocacy includes helping people on other continents to get supplies and services, to understand their rights, file grievances, etc. Personal advocacy also ranges from sharing ideas in a support group to helping deal with bureaucrats and educators, etc. (Aukett, 2003:2).

2.4.2 Public advocacy

When advocates speak to an organisation about the needs of their members, they are advocating (Aukett, 2003:2) e.g. advocating about educators’ low salaries and the need for assessment through IQMS for adjustment of remuneration.

2.4.3 Legislative advocacy

This form of advocacy aims at influencing legislation on a national, state or local level to provide more funds or to create or improve services. When advocates write, call or meet with elected representatives, they are undertaking legislative advocacy (Aukett, 2003:2).

2.4.4 Administrative advocacy

This advocacy is directed at governmental agencies and is designed to influence the implementation of a programme or law. Administrative advocacy can be very effective in ensuring that the letter of the law is followed, that services are provided to those who are entitled to them, and that service quality is high (McConnell, 2004:2).
2.4.5 Programme advocacy

This focuses on service organisations or their trade association representatives and is designed to change organisational practice to improve quality of, and access to services for a specified population (McConnell, 2004:2).

2.4.6 Issue advocacy

Issue advocacy precedes a legislative advocacy or lobbying effort and is designed to mobilise public opinion in support of a specific policy change, e.g. an anti-smoking campaign (McConnell, 2004:2).

2.4.7 Legal advocacy

This type of advocacy uses the courts to bring about social or policy change (McConnel, 2004:2).

In this study, advocacy in a teaching fraternity includes public, legislative, administrative and legal forums. Governmental agencies have the interest of educators at heart when they advocate on IQMS. Legislatively, funds are needed to improve the services rendered by educators, e.g. the implementation of performance measurement. Administratively, advocacy is designed to influence the implementation of a programme. Service will be at high levels since performance standards will strictly be adhered to. From a legal perspective, it was advocated that an educator should receive a better salary or grade progression when assessed. Furthermore, if IQMS is implemented, one of the following automatically takes place: salary progression, salary grade or employment affirmation.
2.5 ADVOCACY STRUCTURES

Government relies on two types of advocacy structures to address policy demands:

(i) Policy offices and programmes that remain under direct cabinet control; and 
(ii) An array of quasi-judicial and other arms-length agencies (such as human rights commissions) that usually focus on individual cases and incidents. (Malloy, 1999:3).

Advocacy structures are directly involved with actual programme design and/or delivery. Other institutional forms include cabinet and interdepartmental committees and advisory councils consisting of persons outside of public service.

Advocacy structures denote any state institution that has a nominal formal mandate to ensure the interests and advancement of one or more social groups, as individuals or collectively. These are structures that ensure that IQMS is in place for all educators, irrespective of rank. Educators’ interests are considered in terms of salary progression, salary grade or employment affirmation.

2.6 SOURCES OF ADVOCACY

The following are sources of advocacy:

(i) Committees and volunteers from the Ministry of Education.
(ii) Citizen review committees (Freeman, 1996:3).
(iii) Coalitions (those members who support legislation).
(iv) Government relations staff (advisory committees) (Freeman, 1996:3).
(v) Members paid by the staff.
(vi) Funders.
(viii) Senators and representatives.
(ix) Legislators (Lehman, 2005:2).
(x) Evaluators.
(xi) Policy makers.
(xii) The media (House & Howe, 1998:3).

The roles of these sources are:

- To ensure sufficient dialogue with relevant groups for the proper and authentic representation of their views; and
- To have sufficient deliberations that will assist them at arriving at proper findings on policy implementation (House & Howe, 1998:3).

2.7 OBSTACLES TO ADVOCACY

Although the sources of advocacy are stated above, there are obstacles that hinder advocacy in the implementation of policy:

(i) Inadequate resources;
(ii) Insufficient funds;
(iii) Opposition of other providers;
(iv) Lack of collaboration;
(v) Resistance of public policy makers;
(vi) Lack of training in advocacy;
(vii) Not enough time to deal with advocacy;
(viii) Lack of advocacy leadership;
(ix) Lack of awareness of advocacy issues;
(x) Not a priority or little interest in advocacy; and
(xi) Not having a training package in advocacy (Myers & Sweeney, 2004:4-5).
It is not possible for advocates to do their job effectively if resources are inadequate, funds are insufficient, training is lacking and there is a lack of advocacy leadership. Why? Funds are required to make documents available. All these factors have the same impact and can hinder the implementation of policy.

2.8 ADVOCACY IN TERMS OF IQMS AS EDUCATION POLICY

A study of the ELRC document on IQMS (Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6-Section A) states that effective advocacy is regarded as essential for the implementation of policy. A study of the literature on school reform and advocacy supports the notion.

“Advocacy should relate to what the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is and what the benefits will be for educators, schools and the system as a whole. It should explain why this particular approach was adopted” (ELRC Collective agreement 8, 2003:6 – Section A). This quotation will be elaborated on in the following paragraphs.

2.8.1 What is Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)?

IQMS is an integrated quality management system that consists of three programmes that are aimed at enhancing and monitoring the performance of the education system. These are:

- Developmental Appraisal (DA)
- Performance Measurement (PM); and
Each programme has a distinct focus and purpose.

- **Developmental Appraisal (DA)** appraises individual educators in a transparent manner with a view to determine areas of strength and weakness, and to draw up programmes for individual development.
- **Performance Measurement (PM)** evaluates individual educators for salary progression, grade progression, appointment affirmation, rewards and incentives.
- **Whole School Evaluation (WSE)** evaluates 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 (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3 - Section A). In WSE, all stakeholders are involved.
- When the school manager knows that the WSE team is to visit he/she informs the educators, learners, parents and the community of the intended visit.
- Records will be scrutinised to monitor the support provided by the District, school management and the quality of teaching and learning (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3 - Section A). There are nine areas that are evaluated, i.e. basic functionality of the school, leadership, management and communication, etc. (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:4 – 12; Collective Agreement 8, 2003:5 – Section A).

The philosophy underpinning IQMS is based upon the fundamental belief that it is to:

- Determine competence;
- Assess strengths and areas of development;
- Provide support and opportunities for development to assure continued growth;
- Promote accountability; and
Monitor an institution’s overall effectiveness (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:4 – Section A).

Besides the philosophy that underpins IQMS, there are purposes for the alignment of the three programmes. These are:

- To enable the different Quality Management System (QMS) programmes to inform and strengthen one another;
- To define the relationships among the different programmes of an Integrated Quality Management System;
- To avoid unnecessary duplication in order to optimise the use of Human Resources;
- To assure that there is ongoing support and improvement; and
- To advocate accountability (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:4 – Section A).

2.8.2 What are the benefits for educators?

Educators are empowered, motivated and trained. Educators are trained to use IQMS processes and procedures. They are motivated because they evaluate themselves through Developmental Appraisal. Educators are developed in areas where weaknesses are identified. As a way of transforming weaknesses into strengths, the school and the Department of Education can arrange in-service training. Through training and empowerment, educators will be motivated to work hard to improve the quality of teaching and learning (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3 – Section A).

Educators become more accountable. Accountability will be evident to the Development Support Group (DSG) and the School Development Team (SDT). Educators have to work closely with these structures that will evaluate, develop and support them (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:5 – Section A).
Educators will be evaluated for Performance Measurement. This means that performance standards will be used to measure their performance. The relevant forms will be completed and submitted to Persal for the purpose of pay progression in the following year (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003: 3&5 – Section A).

IQMS does not only benefit educators - schools also benefit. A discussion follows about how IQMS benefits schools.

2.8.3 The benefits for schools from IQMS

Schools are expected to do internal evaluation before external evaluation takes place. Internal evaluation will help schools to make improvements as preparation for the external whole school evaluation. The school will be using the WSE instruments that are found in WSE Instruments policy, (2001 – no page numbers – see Annexure G). These documents are:

Form A – School Information form.
Form B – Nine areas for evaluation.
Form C – Lesson observation form.
Form D – School rating form.

IQMS aims at improving schools by focusing on the quality of teaching and learning. Besides this emphasis on the improvement of quality teaching and learning in schools, the following areas in Whole School Evaluation (WSE) are evaluated in accordance with the Evaluation guidelines and criteria for Whole School Evaluation policy (2001: 8 – 12-see Annexure H).
2.8.3.1 Basic functionality of the school

Evaluation in this area will judge whether the basic conditions exist in the school to enable it to function efficiently and effectively and realise the educational and social goals set for it by the local and national community (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation policy (2001:8)). To monitor that schools function efficiently and effectively, policies and procedures will be monitored. Levels of absence, lateness and truancy, as well as procedures for dealing with these challenges will be judged. Learners’ behaviour will be judged, e.g. their interaction during breaks, etc. The benefits are that school policies and procedures will be implemented correctly. The manner in which educators deal with learner absence, truancy and their late arrival will improve.

2.8.3.2 Leadership, management and communication

Evaluation will focus on the effectiveness of leadership and management of the school at the various levels in the management structure (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:9).

The way communication takes place in a school context will be evaluated in the school’s vision, mission statement, aims, policies and procedures. The way in which stakeholders understand the intentions of visions, mission statements, policies and procedures is evaluated. Schools without visions, mission statements and policies will be assisted to formulate these and be encouraged to implement and live by them.

2.8.3.3 Governance and relationships

Evaluation focuses on the effectiveness of the governing body in giving the school clear strategic direction in line with the South African Schools Act (SASA), the National Education Policy Act (NEPA) and other related legislation.
The following will be judged:

- The governing body and its relationship with committees, e.g. the Treasurer’s relationship with the Finance Committee, etc.
- The membership of the governing body. Effectiveness goes hand in hand with attending governance meetings and efficiency. The school will benefit as the governing body will be aware of and understand the South African Schools Act and what their responsibilities are. When the school carries out internal evaluation, the SGB will ensure that it acquaints itself with the South African Schools Act. The school will further benefit in that the SGB’s relationship with the committees will be improved. Furthermore, the SGB’s membership will be improved, e.g. its functionality, including meeting attendance.

2.8.3.4 Quality of teaching and learning and educator development

The purpose of evaluation is based on:

- Overall quality of teaching throughout the school and how well this helps all learners to learn and raise their levels of performance and attainment.
- The quality of in-service professional development enjoyed by educators as highlighted by reports and the professional growth plans for the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) and other related initiations (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:9-10). To judge whether the second goal of in-service professional development is attained, educators’ expectations of the learners, the educators’ programme knowledge, their use of resources, including books, equipment, accommodation and time, as well as the use of homework will be considered. The school will benefit, as learners’ performance will be improved. In-service training sessions attended by educators after
Developmental Appraisal will improve their development, resulting in quality improvement, i.e., planning, assessment records, how homework is given and monitored.

2.8.3.5 Curriculum provision and resources

Evaluation is based on the quality of the curriculum and how closely it matches the needs of learners and any national or local requirements (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:10). This means that the curriculum the school offers should be in line with national or local policies and framework. Supervisors will monitor the planning process and the suitability of the curriculum for learners of different ages and abilities. The external evaluators will also evaluate how the school assesses learners and provides extra-curricular activities. The school will benefit in that the needs of learners will be catered for. The curriculum will be in line with learners’ ages and abilities. The school will then focus on inclusive education, where learner uniqueness is considered.

2.8.3.6 Learner achievement

Evaluation is based on the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that learners have acquired. Attention must be given to levels of performance in communication and problem-solving skills, the ability to work in groups and to make responsible decisions (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:10). Supervisors will consider the knowledge acquired by learners at the end of grades 3, 6, 9 and 12 in public examinations and in work that they see. The skills of reading, speaking, writing in the language of instruction and learning, and one other additional language will be evaluated. Learners’ standards in numeracy and in other learning areas will also be evaluated. The school will benefit when learners’ reading, speaking and writing skills are evaluated, as these skills will ultimately be improved. Learners’
attitudes towards their work will improve. Learners with learning difficulties will be assisted, resulting in improved performance.

2.8.3.7 School safety, security and discipline

When evaluation takes place, the following will be considered:

- The extent to which the school knows is aware of and understands legislation about learners’ rights and the effectiveness with which it implements this legislation.
- That the school is secure and the learners are safe.
- The effectiveness of the school’s disciplinary procedures (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:11).

Supervisors will make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the school’s procedures for safety, security and discipline and the implementation thereof. Safety regulations in laboratories and workshops and other areas of the school will be judged. Emergency procedures and how well learners and staff are familiar with them will be assessed. External evaluators will judge the support and care of learners, as well as the school’s disciplinary procedures (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:11).

The school will benefit as safety and security rules and disciplinary procedures can be formulated after internal evaluation. Safety regulations in laboratories and workshops, as well as on the playgrounds will be improved, or formulated if not in place. If no emergency plans exist, evaluators will assist schools to formulate these. Educators and learners are expected to be familiar with emergency plans, e.g. what must be done when a learner falls and breaks a leg. Learners’ disciplinary procedures will be in writing for evaluators to see. Such evaluation will improve schools’ safety and security in addition to fencing and security guard patrols.
2.8.3.8 School infrastructure

The main purpose is to evaluate to what extent the school has sufficient staff, resources and accommodation. The school’s state of repair and how well the infrastructure is maintained and used in the interests of the learners will be judged. The following will be assessed:

- The sufficiency of suitably qualified and experienced educators and support staff;
- The amount of accommodation, state of repair and suitability thereof for the school’s premises;
- The sufficiency and suitability of books and learning equipment;
- The efficiency with which the school’s resources are used; and
- The methods that the school and the school governing body employ to ensure that they get value for money (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:11).

The school may benefit in the following ways:

- Staff, resources and accommodation could be added after evaluation. Accommodation could be improved during the internal evaluation as a way of ensuring that when external evaluators arrive, the school is credited for its infrastructure.
- Under-qualified educators could be motivated to upgrade their qualifications.
- If there is a shortage of books and equipment, the school could be encouraged to order sufficient books and to buy equipment that will assist in teaching and learning, thus improving the quality of education in schools.
- If resources are not properly utilised, the school will be encouraged to use resources effectively for teaching and learning.
• If money is not given value and buying is only done for the sake of buying, educators will be shown procedures to spend money in accordance with the national regulations on the expenditure of public funds.

2.8.3.9 Parents and the community

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

• Gauge the extent to which the school encourages parental and community involvement in the education of learners and how it makes use of their contributions;
• Estimate the value of learners’ education in the exchange of information between parents and the school about them;
• Ascertain parents response; and
• Evaluate the links between the community and the school (Evaluation guidelines and criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:11-12).

In this case, the school will benefit, as parental involvement plays an important role in learner education. Parents and the school will discuss issues that affect learners’ learning. Parents’ contribution can take the school to greater heights and parents and the school will value learners’ education, which could lead to further improvement. Finally, with parents and the school working as partners, the link between the school and the community will improve.

When supervisors or external evaluators evaluate schools in terms of the nine areas of evaluation, i.e. from basic functionality to parents and the community, they will be using criteria and descriptors (see Annexure H – Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria for the Whole School Evaluation Policy, 2001:15-23) while the school evaluates internally.
2.8.4 The benefits of IQMS for the system as a whole

The system will benefit in the following manner from IQMS (Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 – Section A):

- Quality education will be delivered in accordance with the expectations of the Department of Education.
- All learners will have access to quality education.
- The system will use IQMS, which implementers understand after training. As committees will assist and ensure that proper procedures are followed, this instrument will be used in a professional manner (refer to the roles of the School Development Team (SDT) and Development Support Group (DSG), etc.).
- The system’s focus is positive and constructive, even where performance needs to improve. In this instance, educators will positively consider the system, as they know that the process is constructive in developing their performance.
- The system includes a process of self-evaluation and discussion of individual expectations. An educator evaluates himself/herself and discusses the evaluation with the DSG to ensure that the educator’s expectations are met. The discussions held with the DSG and SDT should be open and transparent, while referring to specific records. If the process is well implemented, the instrument could be valid, reliable and relevant.
- No sanctions can be implemented, as educators will welcome the system because they realise that continuous improvement in the teaching-learning environment is essential. Educators will know that they will not be penalised if their performance is unacceptable and will try their best to continuously improve.
- The system promotes individual professional growth among educators, and ongoing support for educators and the school. Each educator is expected to complete a personal growth plan (see Annexure C) while the Development
Support Group provides support to the educator. Although an educator may be attending in-service training, the DSG will still support him/her to improve his/her performance.

- The system provides a clear protocol (step-by-step process) governing the interaction of the parties. It is clear that the DSG works hand in hand with the SDT. After discussion based on the DSG’s findings, a dissatisfied educator may lodge a grievance.

- The system ensures that it considers both ethical and legal aspects. Anything that violates educators’ rights is unacceptable. In addition, the system is legally binding, as remuneration, in accordance with salary progression, applies after implementation. These programmes (DAS, PM and WSE) are useable and effective because, if properly implemented, will become effective tools for quality improvement in schools.

- The programmes are practical, efficient, cost effective and accurate. The system will benefit, as programmes are useable and easy to follow. Being efficient means doing the right thing. If well trained, educators will implement the programmes correctly, thus improving the quality of education. Although implementation will be costly, the system is ready for implementation.

- The system will benefit because all schools will look for ways to continually improve the quality of education.

Although educators, schools and the system benefit from IQMS, advocacy also relates to the reason why IQMS was adopted.

2.8.5 Why IQMS was adopted

The Department of Education adopted IQMS for the following reasons:

- To determine competence;
- To assess strengths and areas for development;
• To provide support and opportunities for development to ensure continued growth;
• To promote accountability; and
• To monitor an institution’s overall effectiveness (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:4 – Section A).

IQMS was adopted to ensure competence in the teaching fraternity, where educators are encouraged diversity of teaching styles. A less competent educator can become more competent when observing another educator in practice. IQMS gives educators opportunities to assess themselves, thus identifying their weaknesses, which can be developed into strengths. When educators are developed, continued growth is assured. Educators are accountable for their actions and there are areas of development over which an educator has full control (in the Personal Growth Plan). For example, if an educator did not record learners’ assessment scores, he/she can start recording them with support and guidance, thus promoting accountability. IQMS can assist in monitoring the overall effectiveness of the school. How? Developmental Appraisal will first be done and thereafter Performance Measurement, where every educator will be assessed. When preparations for assessment are made, each educator will do his/her utmost for better remuneration or grade progression. In terms of WSE, the nine areas of evaluation ensure that everything is in place for internal evaluation by the school before external evaluation takes place. IQMS was adopted to improve educators’ performance, and to promote inclusivity among all school stakeholders.

In this study advocacy is linked to training. This link is based thereon that training should follow advocacy if any policy is to be successfully implemented.
2.9 TRAINING

The official IQMS document stresses that training must specifically address the issues relating to how IQMS should be implemented in schools (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:7 – Section A). Training ensures that all stakeholders are capacitated to ensure successful IQMS implementation in schools. This means that if educators, school managers, circuit managers and senior managers are capacitated through training, IQMS can be administered and successfully implemented. Training aims at improving employees’ understanding, implementation and communication with members (Merrick, 2002:2; Townsend & Gebhardt, 1992:30). If employees are trained on policy implementation, understanding is based thereon that each structure has an important role to play, whereas communication between these structures assists in the successful implementation of policy.

Training focuses on implementation in schools, i.e. on self-evaluation, planning for the whole year and the roles and responsibilities of the structures that will be involved in planning, co-ordinating, monitoring, reporting and maintaining appropriate records. Furthermore, training ensures that all stakeholders understand and are familiar with the evaluation instrument (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:20 – Section A).

2.9.1 Planning

Planning is derived from the term plan, which implies a set of decisions about how to do something in the future (Gillard, 2003:943). All levels in educational structures need to plan for the successful implementation of IQMS. Planning should take place at school, circuit, district and provincial levels.
• **At school level**

Together with The School Manager, the School Management Team should plan when IQMS structures should be established (i.e. School Development Teams and Development Support Groups). This should take place after advocacy and training (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:20 – Section B). The SMT should ensure that the SDT is formed first and, thereafter, the DSG. Among others, the DSG should ensure that all educators evaluate themselves for development purposes (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:15 – Section A). The SDT should determine when self-evaluation, Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans must be completed (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13-14 – Section A).

• **At circuit and district levels**

Circuit managers must determine when schools are expected to have established School Development Teams (SDT’s) and Development Support Groups (DSG’s). Their planning should include dates by which Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans should be submitted. After having received the SIP’s, the District will determine when In-service Training (INSET) can be provided for schools with similar needs. These schools will be “clustered” for development purposes (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:24 – Section B). The District should determine the number of representatives to be included in the grievance committee per union. The District (Persal section) should determine whether pay progression, grade progression, appointment affirmation, incentives or rewards, are to be processed by the circuit or by the school.
• At provincial level

At provincial level, those dealing with IQMS implementation should determine how disputes will be resolved, i.e. by district, and how they will be registered in the province. The province should consider deadlines by which feedback will be given to those who have registered complaints (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:11 – Section A).

2.9.2 Co-ordination

Co-ordination means getting all the people involved in a plan or activity to work together in an organised manner (Gillard, 2003:270). In IQMS, all stakeholders are expected to work together in an organised way. The school manager works in an organised way with the SDT (although (s)he is a member), with the DSG’s for each educator and with the Circuit. There should be clear communication on when what must be submitted.

The school manager works with the Circuit in an organised manner by ensuring that the deadlines for the submission of documents are adhered to for proper compilation by the latter. The Circuit co-ordinates with the District to ensure that specific records reach the District in time, e.g. School Improvement Plans, which should inform the District Improvement Plan (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:24 – Section B). The school manager informs educators who are to receive INSET, when these programmes will take place and arrange that they attend the programmes (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:25 – Section B).

2.9.3 Monitoring

Monitoring means to observe and assess a situation carefully for a particular period to discover something about it (Gillard, 2003:803). Monitoring is done by someone whose job it is to watch or notice particular things (Gillard, 2003:803).
This term implies that someone has to watch and carefully check IQMS for a period to discover something about it. Who should monitor IQMS processes?

The Circuit ought to monitor schools on the progress that they make and challenges that they face and attempt to assist them. If they do not physically monitor, they can rely on the feedback from schools on the challenges the latter face or the progress that they make. The District was supposed to monitor the information that the Circuits had received on progress made by schools and the challenges they face and try to assist. In so doing, the Circuit and District will discover whether implementation is possible and, if not, try to improve on this implementation, based on the recommendations that schools have made (ELRC Collective Agreement 8 of 2003:26 – Section B).

2.9.4 Reporting

*Reporting* means to describe something or to provide information about it to someone (Gillard, 2003:1058). In terms of IQMS, the DSG has to report to the SDT on how educators evaluate themselves. If the DSG’s experience problems, the SDT should help in resolving them. The school manager is further expected to report to the Circuit on the progress of IQMS in schools. These reports should include recommendations on how the Circuit and District can improve on the delivery of developmental INSET and other programmes (ELRC Collective Agreement 8 of 2003:26 – Section B). The District should report to the Province on the success of INSET programmes for school development and make recommendations on how the delivery of the developmental INSET and other programmes can be improved.
2.9.5 Maintaining appropriate records

As an accounting officer, the school manager ensures that the SDT and DSG’s have signed the necessary documents for Performance Measurement (i.e. for remuneration).

After ensuring fairness and accuracy, the school manager submits the necessary documentation to the Circuit timeously (ELRC Collective Agreement 8 of 2003:12 – Section A). It is advisable to make photocopies of all the submitted documents for safekeeping. In the future, photocopied documents can be referred to. The photocopied documents are to be kept at the school. A record is kept of forms submitted to the Circuit and District. The District must keep forms received from schools so that they are available to the external WSE teams (ELRC Collective Agreement 8 of 2003:27 – Section B).

When planning IQMS implementation, e.g. observing educators in practice, educators with the relevant structures (i.e. the SDT, DSG’s) will be familiarising themselves with the IQMS instrument.

2.10 POLICY EFFECTIVENESS

Although there may be obstacles, policy effectiveness is important. The following factors lead to policy effectiveness.

2.10.1 Shared methodologies and data

People and the state share fewer common methodological assumptions with state actors regarding valid data or preferred policy instruments (Malloy, 1999:11).
2.10.2 Political stability

Jurisdictions and political areas experiencing less rapid change do not exhibit internal conflicts, tensions and focal changes. South Africa is a country with political stability where many political parties exist, but one party leads (Malloy, 1999:11).

2.10.3 Involvement

- All educators have personal and educational values that should be made known through daily contacts (Moroney, 2004:2).
- Letter writing is effective and efficient when expressing one’s opinions about an issue and as a way of educating decision-makers about one’s work and actions that benefit educators (Abshire, 2004:1; Hardison, 2004:2).

The following should be clearly indicated when writing letters and e-mails to policy makers:

- Positive language should be used;
- One’s position must be stated;
- Indicate how the issue affects you;
- Furnish one’s district and state province;
- Indicate what action you would like the policy makers to take (Abshire, 2004:2); and
- A State Legislative Action Team should be formed to speak on behalf of educators’ to relay their positions on public policy issues and to deliver
• effective presentations to businesses, unions and school boards (Hardison, 2004:2).

When the above actions are taken, policy becomes effective and implementation will be simple. Stakeholders are involved and this makes it easier for policy-makers to get direct feedback. Presentations and letter writing are effective and efficient ways of showing commitment to policy. When legislators receive specific examples that provide value and purpose to what they (legislators) are doing, this encourages them to support educators’ views/inputs. In those letters, legislators can be thanked for the programmes they have designed and funds received that have made a difference in educators’ lives (Lehman, 2005:2).

2.11 WHAT IS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION?

Policy is a politically derived intervention (often taking the form of a law). Its purpose is to resolve a perceived societal problem. Furthermore, a policy is a rule formulated by some government authority expressing an intention to influence the behaviour of citizens, either individually or collectively (Nicholson, 2002:1; Warren, 2002:1). In this context, IQMS is a government initiative, aimed at resolving educators’ societal problems collectively. Educators’ performance was not measured against performance standards. Educators’ behaviour is influenced, as they will be assessed for salary progression, grade or appointment affirmation.

Policy implementation is the activity of groups or individuals directed towards achieving the goals outlined in a policy mandate (Warren, 2002:2). Policy implementation is further said to be those actions of public or private individuals (or groups aimed at the achievement of objectives set forth in prior policy decisions) (Cloete & Wissink 2000:166). In an educational context, policy
implementers are the school boards, the superintendents, principals and educators (Warren, 2002:2).

If policy is to be implemented in schools, the principal is the key person to drive this process. Principals are:

- **Initiators** – they get projects started.
- **Innovators** – they develop new ideas.
- **Motivators** – they exhort others to reach goals and objectives.
- **Calculators** – they plan programmes and activities.
- **Communicators** – they disseminate information (Warren, 2002:2; Conger, Spreitzer & Lawler, 1999:93).

Despite being a key person, the principal, as a leader, is expected to possess the following qualities and skills:

- Intelligence, including judgement and verbal ability;
- Emotional maturity and stability;
- Dependability, persistence and a drive for continuing achievement; and
- The skill to participate socially and adapt to various groups (Certo, 1992:349).

### 2.11.1 Roles of the school managers in policy implementation

Successful policy implementation depends solely on the school manager’s ability to influence educators and their behaviour (Warren, 2002:2). School managers are obliged to provide leadership during policy implementation, which also dictates that they positively influence educators’ attitudes. The school manager is expected to design a plan that acknowledges the three stages associated with any change process, i.e. initiation, implementation and institutionalisation. In addition, the school manager needs to develop strategies that will persuade educators to accept and adopt the advocated policy. Put simply, the school
manager must be in a position to “sell” the advocated policy in a positive manner (Warren & Aretha, 2001:2).

The roles of a school manager during policy implementation are as follows:

2.11.1.1 Embracing the educational policy

Once the school manager is aware of a new policy, he or she decides whether or not, and to what extent, to support its implementation. The public reception that a new policy receives from a school manager conveys a message to educators and staff (Warren, 2002:2). If a school manager projects a negative perception, educators will resist implementing the policy. On the other hand, if the school manager is positive about the implementation of the policy, it will be implemented with ease. A school manager’s code of conduct is thus important (Normann, 1999:174).

2.11.1.2 Conceptualising the policy in the school context

The school manager has to take a leading role in creating a vision of the policy and what it means to the school. The vision serves to motivate educators to focus their efforts on attaining a goal. The articulated vision of the policy should highlight the benefits to be derived from its implementation (Warren, 2002:2). In the case of IQMS, the school manager has to create a vision – where the school will be in three years’ time as well as its meaning in terms of salary progression, grade or affirmation of appointments. Educators will then be motivated to focus
their efforts on attaining goals, especially after understanding how they are going to benefit when policy is implemented.

### 2.11.1.3 Demystifying the policy through information disclosure

The school manager has a responsibility of collecting, organising and disseminating information about a policy for the following reasons:

- Educators should understand the implications of a policy;
- Educators should receive sufficient information about the policy’s purpose; and
- Educators should know how a specific policy is to be implemented (this will be dealt with during staff meetings when procedure is discussed and during training sessions) (Warren, 2002:3; Van der Wagen & Davies, 1998:135-136).

### 2.11.1.4 Providing staff development for successful policy implementation

Staff development provides educators with the knowledge of the why, what and how of the policy. If educators know what advocacy and IQMS are, why implementation of the latter is necessary and how to measure performance, they will possess the tools and skills to perform their tasks. Educators who lack the knowledge to implement IQMS should receive further training that aims at improving educators’ understanding, implementation and communication skills (Warren, 2002:3; Merrick, 2002:2; Townsend & Gebhardt, 1992:30).

### 2.11.1.5 Providing encouragement for policy implementation

The school manager must be prepared to promote policy implementation by encouraging, motivating and supporting educators. By applying pressure on
them is a form of encouragement. The school manager should identify ineffective educators so that he/she can provide them with the necessary support and guidance (Warren, 2002:3).

2.11.1.6 Follow-up

The school manager has to follow up that:

- Educators have access to hard copy policies and/or user-friendly electronic manuals.
- Signed forms are issued to educators on which they acknowledge that they have read and understand the policies, and collected again.
- Periods of grace are given during which managers will closely monitor their adherence to the new policies, although educators are not penalised for errors.
- Follow-up training is conducted or additional resources are provided to address and resolve unexpected difficulties (Merrick, 2002:2).

The purpose of follow-up is to establish direction and to ensure that people keep moving accordingly (Kotter, 1990:5).

Although follow-up is done, there may be factors that affect policy implementation.

2.12 FACTORS AFFECTING POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

The following factors may affect policy implementation:
Implementers’ apathy towards a policy.
• A lack of resources
• Insufficient time for implementation.
• Disagreement about how results are to be achieved (Warren, 2002:2).
• A lack of involvement among policy makers and policy implementers.
• Educational policies that compete or conflict with the pedagogical beliefs of educators are more likely to delay implementation of such policies, or result in the superficial implementation thereof (Warren & Aretha, 2001:2).
• Resistance (Bateman & Snell, 1999:608-610).

The following are forms of resistance:

• Inertia: Educators might be comfortable with the old ways in which things were done and are unwilling to try something new.
• Timing: Poor timing can lead to resistance. Managers should introduce changes when people are ready for the changes.
• Surprise: If policy implementation is sudden and unexpected, resistance can result. Educators need to be informed in advance of proposed changes so that they can prepare for implementation.
• Peer pressure: This can cause individuals to resist even reasonable changes.
• Misunderstanding: Educators may resist policy implementation, as they do not fully understand the purpose thereof (Bateman & Snell, 1999:609-610).

2.13 EVALUATION OF POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Policy implementation requires evaluation to determine the impact of the new policy. It is essential to ascertain whether a policy addresses the problem it was intended to address (Warren & Aretha, 2001:3).
Policies should be evaluated in terms of the following critical questions:

a) **Needs assessment**: Does a programme correctly conceptualise the social problem it addresses?

b) **Programme “theory”**: Is the alleged “theory” of a programme consistent with existing social science knowledge and theory and internally consistent?

c) **Implementation**: Has a programme been implemented with fidelity and at the level of intensity needed?

d) **Impact**: Is a programme effective in the sense that desired outcomes are statistically and substantively greater for programme participants than had they not participated in the programme?

e) **Efficiency**: Do the benefits of the effects produced by an effective programme justify the costs of the programme to society and participants? (Alkin, 2004:127-128).

The following bodies evaluate policies:

- Non-governmental actors;
- The media;
- University scholars;
- Research centres;
- Private research organisations;
- Pressure groups;
- Public interest organisations; and

Policies are evaluated for the following reasons:

- To judge the worth of a programme;
- To assist decision makers; and
• To serve a political function. (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:528).

There are two forms of evaluation of educational policies, i.e. *formative* and *summative* evaluation (Anderson, 2000:276; Warren & Aretha, 2001:3; De Vos, Strydom, Fouché & Delport, 2002:377).

**2.13.1 Formative evaluation**

Formative evaluation is also called programme monitoring. This is designed to assist officials to make midcourse corrections or adjustments to programmes to improve their operation (Anderson, 2000:276). Formative evaluation, or assessment, determines whether the plan is working and whether to make the required adjustments. Policy implementers (educators) should be given regular feedback that will enable school managers and educators to make informed decisions throughout the implementation phase. Feedback is important as it determines the adjustments and modifications necessary that will continue to promote the implementation process (Warren & Aretha, 2001:3; De Vos, et al. 2002:377).

**2.13.2 Summative evaluation**

Summative evaluation is used to inform upper-level policy-makers of the overall effects of important policies and programmes. If there are major effects, major programme changes could take place (Anderson, 2000:276). Summative evaluation focuses on determining the policy’s impact, i.e. whether or not implementation thereof addresses the problem that it was intended to address (Warren & Aretha, 2001:3).

The following table shows the differences between formative and summative evaluation.
Table 2.1: Differences between formative and summative evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formative evaluation</th>
<th>Summative evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Purpose</td>
<td>To improve the programme.</td>
<td>To certify programme utility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Audience</td>
<td>Programme administration and staff.</td>
<td>Potential consumer/funding agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Questions asked? | • What is working?  
• What needs to be revised?  
• How can it be improved? | • What are the results?  
• In what situation?  
• Requiring what costs, materials and training? |

(McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:530)

2.14 LESSONS LEARNT FROM POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN SELECTED COUNTRIES

2.14.1 United States of America (USA)

There are three lessons that can be learnt from the USA’s policy implementation:

- Effective policy implementation is possible, and that there is hope for improvement.
- Better implementation can be achieved through career administrators who play a larger role in policy formulation.
- The development of an elite group of administrators can make a major contribution to improved policy implementation (Cothran, 1987:450-451).
2.14.2 Japan

The following lessons can be learnt from the Japanese system:

- Effective policy implementation is possible.
- Better policy implementation will allow high-level bureaucrats to participate more in initial policy formulation.
- Top administrators bring subordinates from all levels into the decision-making process. Public agencies look to lower level staff to provide the first draft of proposed legislation. A bottom-to-top approach draws them into the purpose of the agency from the beginning of their service (Cothran, 1987:151-152).

2.14.3 South Africa

In South Africa, policies were made by the following groups both prior to and after the 1994 elections:

(i) Trade Union Movements (COSATU, SADTU AND COSAS).
(ii) The business community.
(iii) The Urban Foundation.
(iv) Anglo American Chairman’s Fund.
(v) Research and Development Groups.
(vi) National Education and Training Forum.
(vii) National Education Crisis Committee.
(viii) National Educational Policy Investigation.
(ix) Portfolio Committee (Sayed & Jansen, 2001:8-17 & 38).

From the literature analysis, the following lessons could be learnt from the South African experience:
(i) Policy implementation could be unsuccessful largely because the particular policy was poorly conceived and developed.

(ii) In certain defined instances, the ability of the public service to act may be compromised in many ways, as South Africa has a complicated set of intergovernmental arrangements within a three-tier system of government - national, provincial and local (Sayed & Jansen, 2001:32).

2.15 CONCLUSION

There is a need for advocacy among the education fraternity. There are also benefits for those for whom advocacy is done. Educators’ salaries and grades will progress and their appointments affirmed. Different forms of advocacy enable policy makers to establish what kind of advocacy is appropriate for what they are advocating. Policy effectiveness needs the involvement of all stakeholders. Policy implementation comes with obstacles that need to be challenged and overcome. Policy implementation must be evaluated to establish whether the policy addresses the societal problems that it was intended to address. If discrepancies exist, such a policy can be withdrawn or revised.
3.1 INTRODUCTION

Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) was clearly defined in Chapter One of this thesis. IQMS integrates three programmes that enhance and monitor performance of the education system. These programmes are:

- Developmental Appraisal (DA);
- Performance Measurement (PM); and
- Whole School Evaluation (WSE) (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3).

Although the three programmes are geared towards enhancing and monitoring performance, they have different focal points and purposes:

- **Development Appraisal (DA)** appraises individual educators in a transparent manner with a view to determine areas of strength and weakness and to compile programmes for individual development.

- **Performance Measurement (PM)** evaluates individual educators for salary progression, grade progression, appointment affirmation, rewards and incentives.

- **Whole School Evaluation (WSE)** evaluates 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 (ELRC Resolution 8, 2003:3 - Section A).
The purpose of integrating the three programmes above is to:

- Enable the different IQMS programmes to inform and support each other;
- Define the relationship between the different programmes of an IQMS;
- Avoid unnecessary duplication by optimising the use of human resources;
- Assure that there is ongoing support and improvement; and
- Advocate accountability (ELRC Resolution 8, 2003:4 - Section A).

The above points indicate that the programmes work hand in hand by informing and strengthening each other. There are thus procedures, e.g. DA should be implemented before PM, etc. The three programmes are interrelated and, as procedures need to be followed, no duplication should take place. Ongoing support, based on advocating accountability, should take place throughout the process, thus improving the quality of education in schools.

The roots of integrated quality management system (IQMS) can be found in the works of quality consultants such as Deming, Juran and Crosby.

### 3.2 QUALITY CONSULTANTS

After World War II, Japan needed to be transformed. It was a largely illiterate country that turned out cheap, unreliable and poorly made products (Bank, 1992:60; Bonstingl, 2001:6) and something had to be done to improve the quality of its products. Japan sought information on product improvement and discovered the philosophy of three quality consultants, Deming, Juran and Crosby.

#### 3.2.1 Deming

Deming, an American, was born in 1900 and obtained a doctorate in mathematical physics (Kelemen, 2003:25). He was invited to Japan as an
advisor to lecture engineers and senior managers on quality control techniques (Kelemen, 2003:25). His visit was aimed at rebuilding the Japanese economy. Deming believed that any process had two causes, i.e. special and common causes. Special causes are assignable, identifiable and solvable by operators. Special causes can be identified and solved by educators, without involving school management. Common causes are the result of design and operation, and can only be eliminated by management. They are based on how the process has been designed and how it is to be operated (Kelemen, 2003:25)

The following are Deming’s fourteen principles of transformation (Beckford 1998:72):

- **Create constancy of purpose toward improvement of product and service.** Schools are expected to focus by assisting learners to maximise their potential through continuous improvement of educators’ and learners’ work (Bonstingl, 2001:95; Bank, 1992:66; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:6; Stamatis, 1996:16).

- **Adopt a new philosophy to improve every system.** The school leaders (management – referring to the school management team and school governing body) must adopt and fully support the new philosophy of continuous improvement through greater empowerment of educator and learner teams. Interpersonal trust should be developed, possibly resulting in success. This means that if educators and learners are empowered towards continuous improvement and supported by all stakeholders, there is a likelihood that they will excel in their work as teams (Bank, 1992:66; Bonstingl, 2001:95; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:6; Stamatis, 1996:16).
• **Cease dependence on inspection to achieve quality.** If tests are used as a major means of assessment of learners’ progress, they are neither reliable nor authentic. It is also too late to assess learners’ progress at the end of the unit if the goal is to maximise their productivity. Tests and other indicators of learning should be given throughout the learning process. Learning is shown by learners’ performance, as well as through the application of information and skills to real-life challenges (Bank, 1992:66; Bonstingl, 2001:96; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:6; Stamatis, 1996:16).

• **End the practice of awarding business on the basis of price tag.** Relationships of trust and collaboration need to be built within the school and between the school and the community. All stakeholders need to work together to maximise each team’s potential (learners, educators, administrators and the community) (Bank, 1992:66; Bonstingl, 2001:96; Kelemen, 2003:27; Stamatis, 1996:16).

• **Constantly improve the system of production and service to improve quality and productivity, thus decreasing costs.** School administrators must create and maintain an environment in which educators are empowered to make continuous progress in the quality of their teaching and other aspects of personal development, while learning valuable lessons from (temporary) failures. Management accounts for quality (Bank, 1992:66; Bonstingl, 2001:97; Deming, 1994:35; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:6; Stamatis, 1996:16).

• **Institute training on the job.** School leaders must initiate programmes of training for new employees who are unfamiliar with the specific culture and expectations of the school. Effective training programmes are intended to show new educators how to set goals, how to teach effectively and how to assess the quality of their teaching with the learners. Educators must also
institute programmes in which learners learn how to set their goals, how to become more effective in, and to assess, their own work. Organisational goals and requirements for training, e.g. planning and evaluation, are considered if the training programme is to continuously improve an organisation (Bank, 1992:66; Bonstingl, 2001:97; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:6; Stamatis, 1996:16).

- **Institute leadership.** As coach and mentor, school leadership means working with educators, parents, learners and members of the community. This allows organisational context in which all learners’ growth and improvement is valued and encouraged to maximise stakeholders’ involvement and support. School leadership should aim at helping all stakeholders by not punishing or threatening them. There needs to be shared leadership in schools, where all stakeholders contribute towards attaining team goals and enhancing relationships among team members (Bank, 1992:66, Bonstingl, 2001:98; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:6; Stamatis, 1996:16).

- **Drive out fear.** Fear destroys school culture and everything good that is intended to take place within the school, as it reduces everyone’s ability to participate in improving quality. Institutional changes must reflect shared power, shared responsibilities and shared rewards. A fear of putting questions to management, reporting problems, or making suggestions will hamper the desired climate of openness, thus preventing a process of quality improvement. To improve quality, all stakeholders need a consistent, supportive, non-threatening, secure environment (Bank, 1992:67; Bonstingl, 2001:98; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:6; Stamatis, 1996:6&101).

- **Break down barriers between departments.** Educators’ and learners’ departments are enhanced when talents are combined to create more
integrated opportunities for learning and discovery. Management should create cross-departmental and multi-level quality teams to break down role and status barriers to productivity. Furthermore, schools need to be characterised by open communication and co-ordination based on the common organisational goals (Bank, 1992:67; Bonstingl, 2001:98; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:7; Stamatis, 1996:16&101).

- **Barriers in organisations are a result of poor, or lack of communication, ignorance of the organisation's mission and goals, internal competition, fear, etc.** Organisations find themselves in situations where quality and customer satisfaction has decreased. There is a need for retraining throughout the organisation to break down barriers. Aspects that need to be considered to break down barriers are to create a team atmosphere by empowering individuals to do what is required for customer satisfaction, open communication and team forming (Bank, 1992:67; Bonstingl, 2001:98; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:7; Stamatis, 1999:102-103).

- **Eliminate numerical goals and slogans.** Educators, learners, administrators, families and community members may collectively arrive at slogans and exhortations to improve their work together, as long as power, responsibility and rewards are equitably distributed. If the educational goals are not met, individuals are not to blame, but the system needs to be fixed. For example, numerical goals and slogans can be eliminated by introducing bottom-up financial planning, based on processes in control (Bank, 1992:67; Bonstingl, 2001:99; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:7; Stamatis, 1996:16).

- **Eliminate work standards on the factory floor.** Assignments and tests that focus attention on numerical or letter symbols of learning and production often do not fully reflect the quality of student progress and

- **Remove barriers to pride and joy of workmanship.** Educators and learners generally want to do good work and feel proud of it. Schools need to dedicate themselves to remove the systematic causes of educators’ and learners’ failure through close collaborative efforts. In most organisations, workers (educators) no longer have pride in their work because of several factors that affect them, e.g. the poor treatment of educators by school managers, educators not being certain about the organisation’s direction, and communication channels that are not open sufficiently to report the challenges faced by educators. Management should be made aware of problems and act accordingly. Educators must be encouraged to report whatever challenges they face and to be involved in most decision-making processes. Finally, if educators report challenges and are involved in decision-making processes, pride of their workmanship will then be restored (Bank, 1992:67; Bonstingl, 2001:99; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:7; Stamatis, 1996:104).

- **Institute a vigorous programme of education and self-improvement for everyone.** The school needs to have continuous learning programmes if it is to be on the learning edge and to maximise customer satisfaction. If learning programmes are designed in a manner that will assist educators to know how to satisfy customers, quality of service will improve. When employees are trained, they are motivated to avoid job stress, which might result in the smooth transition to a managed organisation, as educators will be motivated to continuously improve, avoid job burnout, etc. It is important that senior and middle managers be trained first. In school context, the school management team (school manager, deputy school manager, heads of department and elected educators or senior educators) should first be trained on the changes to be implemented and thereafter all the educators.
Training must be on the required basic skills, job related subjects and personal improvement training, as requested. The skills that educators receive will lead to improved service delivery and customer satisfaction (Bank, 1992:67; Bonstingl, 2001:100; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:7; Stamatis, 1996:106-107).

- **Put everyone to work on the transformation.** Senior management should carry the burning desire for change. If management’s vision and true commitment are not seen, no change will take place. If management has the desire for change they must acquire people who understand a need for change. Furthermore, educators that support management should understand that it might take some time before the benefits of change are noticed (Bank, 1992:67; Bonstingl, 2001:100; Kelemen, 2003:27; Ross & Perry, 1999:7; Stamatis, 1996:107).

As Deming’s fourteen principles for transformation have been discussed, Juran’s Trilogy and ten steps to quality improvement follow.

### 3.2.2 Juran

**Introduction**

Juran’s seminars reinforced Deming’s earlier teaching. He stressed that management is responsible for the organisation’s performance. Juran defines quality as “fitness for use” and “freedom from defects”. This definition aims at meeting customer expectations (Bonstingl, 2001:14; Stamatis, 1996:14). Customers are categorised into *internal* and *external* customers. Internal customers are persons or organisations who are part of our company. In a school context, internal customers are educators, learners, parents with learners and caretakers. External customers are persons who are part of our company.
but who are impacted by our products (Bonstingl, 2001:14). In a school context, external customers are business people, churches and the community.

**Juran’s trilogy**


**Quality planning**

Juran stressed that during planning, consideration should be given to identifying customers (Rao, et al. 1996:40). A *customer* is any person or group one must satisfy to achieve and maintain reputation, image, market share, more challenging work, profit or the like (Dennis, 1992:27). In a school, a customer may be a parent, a learner, a security guard or the community. Where a school has a good reputation and a good image, more work can be done to ensure that this is maintained, e.g. through the involvement of stakeholders, good grade 12 results, etc. The two types of customers need to be considered when planning, i.e., *internal* and *external* customers (Saylor, 1996:2; Davies & West-Burnham, 1997:10).

**Quality control**

Educators' performance should be monitored, as 15% of quality problems in an organisation are the result of special causes. Management needs to be accountable by controlling the quality of work done by the educators, as management takes 85% of the responsibility (Beckford, 1998:112; Bank, 1992:73).
Quality improvement

Juran stresses that quality is aimed at reducing waste. In schools, waste can be the result of a lack of time management or through awarding unchallenging tasks over a long period, etc. Management needs to improve educators’ morale to ensure that waste is reduced by continuous improvement, as quality improvement is an ongoing, never-ending process that starts and ends with the customer. Schools need to ensure that their customers are satisfied (Beckford, 1998:112; Bonstingl, 2001:14).

Despite the trilogy discussed above, Juran formulated ten steps to quality improvement (Bank, 1992:70; Beckford, 1998:117; Kelemen, 2003:28-29; Ross & Perry, 1999:8). These steps are as follows:

**Step 1: Create awareness of the need and opportunity for quality improvement**
Management is responsible for quality improvement by, for example, introducing a new programme in a school (i.e. IQMS). As a way of improving quality, management can make educators aware of a need for quality improvement by training them and providing them with the opportunity to implement such programmes, (Bank, 1992:70; Beckford, 1998:116; Kelemen, 2003:28-29; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).

**Step 2: Set goals for continuous improvement**
Shared goals in schools can be set, aiming at improving the services that are rendered (Bank, 1992:70; Beckford, 1998:116; Kelemen, 2003:28-29; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).
Step 3: **Build an organisation to achieve goals by establishing quality council, identifying problems, selecting a project, appointing teams and choosing facilitators**

A quality council ensures that quality prevails in an organisation. This council identifies problems and selects a project where teams will work together. Facilitators, who engage in continuous improvement, are appointed from these teams (Beckford, 1998:116; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).

Step 4: **Train everyone**

Training is essential for an organisation to continue improving. The entire staff complement needs to be trained to know how to improve continuously. If educators are trained on a new programme to be implemented, training will ensure that every educator regards quality as important (Beckford, 1998:116; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).

Step 5: **Carry out projects to solve problems**

Projects can be carried out in schools to solve problems, for example, a financial problem at school. A fundraising project could be established to solve such a problem, where educators cook food to sell during parents’ or fun days. The amount raised could be deposited into a school’s bank account to improve lacking funds. Teamwork also promotes projects (Beckford, 1998:116-117; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).

Step 6: **Report progress**

The manager needs to report progress to staff members, e.g. how shared goals were attained, how training was provided and how projects were carried out to solve problems (Beckford, 1998:117; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).
**Step 7: ** *Show recognition*

If educators have performed their duties well, e.g. by achieving the shared goals, the manager needs to recognise their efforts and congratulate them on their excellent performance (Beckford, 1998:117; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).

**Step 8: ** *Communicate results*

If educators are to be successful in improving quality, the results need to be communicated to the whole organisation. All the educators must be informed of the achieved results, therefore sharing successes throughout the school, e.g. five educators have been appraised and have received salary progression, grade progression, or their appointments have been affirmed. A meeting must be held to share such successes as a way of motivating others to continuously improve (Beckford, 1998:117; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).

**Step 9: ** *Keep a record of successes*

Management needs to keep a record of successes, such as those mentioned in step 8. If a record of successes is maintained, this can be referred to in the future. By referring to successes, most educators would be willing to go the extra mile to add their names to the list (Beckford, 1998:117; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 10: ** *Incorporate annual improvements into the company’s regular systems and processes, thereby maintaining momentum*

This step is on business level and public commitment to the achievement of higher quality is required. This step is seen as reaffirming the quality process in the minds of both employees and customers. By signing a public commitment to implement a specific programme, educators commit to improving quality, thereby
enforcing individual accountability. Although a public commitment can be made, resistance could hinder the momentum of a programme. Juran proposes two methods to be used to avoid resistance. These are that:

- All those affected by the change should be ‘allowed to participate’ and
- ‘Adequate time should be allowed for change to be accepted’ (Beckford, 1998:117-118).

If all educators are permitted to participate in training and are given sufficient time to accept change, ownership will be promoted, experimentation allowed and resistance overcome.

After having discussed Juran’s ten steps to quality improvement, Crosby’s programme for quality improvement follows.

3.2.3 Philip B. Crosby

Introduction
Phil Crosby is an American consultant whose name is primarily associated with ‘do it right first time’ and ‘zero defects’ (Kelemen, 2003:137). Crosby worked as a reliability engineer. He described quality, as ‘free’, as the small cost of prevention is always lower than the cost of detection, correction and failure (Rao, et al. 1996:43; Ross & Perry, 1999:9). Crosby prefers to target managers with his training (Bank, 1992:76). Managers are accountable for quality. Crosby further argues that poor quality in the average firm constitutes about 20 percent of revenue, most of which could be avoided by adopting good quality practices (Ross & Perry, 1999:8). He defined quality as conformity to requirements, particularly those of the customer (Rao, et al. 1996:43).
Crosby’s philosophy is seen in his five absolutes of quality management, which are described as follows:

(i) **Quality is defined as conformity to requirements, not as ‘goodness’**

When Crosby talks of quality product or service, he refers to customer requirements. These requirements must be defined in advance, e.g., learners at secondary school having to achieve grade 12 exemption, with a pass mark in mathematics and physical science on the higher grade. These requirements should be reviewed regularly to ensure conformity to the stated requirements (Beckford, 1998:52; Rao, et al. 1996:43; Ross & Perry, 1999:8; Basu, 2004:21; Stamatis, 1996:17).

(ii) **There is no such thing as a quality problem**

Crosby stresses that quality is free. If quality problems exist in schools, poor management has created those problems. To ensure that there is quality in schools, management has to lead, guide and control all processes that will result in quality outcomes. If poor management is a result of lack of leadership, those in leadership must be trained to be able to show the way, thus improving quality (Beckford, 1998:52; Basu, 2004:21; Rao, et al. 1996:43; Stamatis, 1996:17).

(iii) **It is always cheaper to do it right the first time**

Prevention of error is considered better than rectification. For quality to be evident in schools, mistakes should be prevented. Training and discipline can improve quality in schools. Educators must be trained to overcome their weaknesses to prevent non-conformity to Performance Standards (Beckford, 1998:52; Basu, 2004:20; Kelemen, 2003:37; Rao, et al. 1996:43).
(iv) Cost of quality is the only performance measurement

The cost of quality is most measured. It is best to avoid reworking and rejection. For example, when whole school external evaluators arrive at a school, they measure the overall performance of the school. If educators need to rework, this implies that they have to improve on quality, which may be rejected, leading to a negative report by the external evaluators. It is therefore essential that educators measure their performance internally to maintain quality (Beckford 1998:52-53; Basu, 2004:21; Kelemen, 2003:37; Stamatis, 1996:17).

(v) Zero defect is the only Performance Standard

Although sometimes unavoidable, error should not be tolerated in schools. To maintain quality performance in schools and to sensitise educators to a philosophy of zero tolerance of error, they should be charged with misconduct and/or dismissed when committing serious offences. Perfection is therefore encouraged in schools, where educators continuously attempt to act correctly. It should then be easy to continuously improve on quality (Beckford, 1998:53; Basu, 2004:20; Kelemen, 2003:37; Rao, et al. 1996:43; Stamatis, 1996:17).

In addition to the above Crosby, like Deming, also developed fourteen steps to a quality improvement programme. These steps are discussed below:

Step 1: Establish management commitment

The school management team must be convinced of the need for quality. This need should be communicated clearly to all staff members. Crosby stated: "Perform exactly like the requirement or cause the requirement to be officially changed to what the organisation and the customers need". This indicates that schools and customers are very important when improving quality. If
management is committed to quality, it will get the support of all other stakeholders (Bank, 1992:76; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 2: Form quality improvement teams**

These teams are to be formed by representatives from each department, e.g. sport, culture, languages, etc. The role of these teams is to oversee improvements in their departments and in the school as a whole. Crosby sees the responsibilities of individual team members as follows:

- To lay out the entire quality improvement programme;
- To represent their departments on the team;
- To represent the team in their departments;
- To carry out the decisions of the team within their own departments; and

**Step 3: Establish quality measurement**

- This is done to provide a display of current and potential non-conformity problems. The main purpose of establishing quality measurement is to facilitate objective evaluation and corrective action. Evaluation is done to ascertain how effective quality measurement is, as well as to correct non-conformity (Bank, 1992:77-78; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 4: Evaluate the cost of quality**

Evaluation is based on quality measurement as in Step 3. Crosby stresses that the cost of quality is rework, test labour and other
costs of doing wrong things. It is imperative to identify the areas where improvements would be profitable. In a school context, costs of doing wrong things could be arriving late, skipping lessons, etc. By identifying and improving on these areas will help in improving quality in education (Bank, 1992:78; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 5: Raise quality awareness**

By training supervisors and managers by using videos and books to communicate quality could be raised. This will provide them with a source of reference when facing problems in schools. Raising quality awareness is re-affirmation of the first two steps, i.e. establishing management commitment (Step 1) and forming quality improvement teams (Step 2). The two first steps focus on gaining commitment and is a multi-functional approach (Bank, 1992:78; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 6: Take action to correct problems**

Educators are encouraged to identify problems that they face daily. These problems can be directed to higher supervisory levels where they can be addressed, e.g. the school manager or deputy school manager. The SMT should support and guide educators. Once this step has commenced, the school is seen to have established a sound platform for quality improvement (Bank, 1992:78; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 7: Zero defects planning**

The philosophy of zero defects is to do it right the first time. The school manager is expected to establish a committee to develop ways of initiating and implementing a zero defects programme. All people in supervisory positions must be informed of a zero defects
approach and enough time should be scheduled for this. When educators show improved performance, they will be recognised, as a system of recognition would have been designed by the quality team (Bank, 1992:78; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

Step 8: **Train supervisors and managers**
All supervisors, i.e. from the chairperson of the SGB and all managers, are to receive training on quality awareness. This is followed by a specialised training session on zero defects, scheduled for four weeks before the zero defects day. This training is aimed at enhancing supervisors’ confidence in presenting the messages to the educators. Crosby recommends that such a training programme needs be repeated. Repetition assists managers to be certain of what to do in their organisations. Put simply, training will give supervisors, a sense of direction (Bank, 1992:79; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

Step 9: **Hold a ‘zero defects’ day**
School managers need to commit schools and educators in public that the organisation has set a new standard, that of zero defects. It is recommended that this is done at a large open gathering where educators celebrate their achievements to date and a new beginning to a quality improvement programme. Badges and buttons could symbolise this commitment and will be a means of establishing the attitude and expectation within the school. This commitment will encourage educators who have achieved little, as well as those who have achieved something to continuously improve on quality (Bank, 1992:79; Beckford, 1998:58; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).
**Step 10: Encourage individuals to establish improvement goals for themselves and their groups**

School managers are expected to lead the group and to set goals that are specific and measurable. The school's progress would be measured against the improvement goals (Bank, 1992:79; Beckford, 1998:58; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 11: Obstacle reporting**

This step encourages educators to communicate to management the difficulties they have encountered in achieving their improvement goals in the error-cause removal campaign. Crosby suggests that a suggestion box be set up in which educators could deposit a one-page error-cause removal form.

The following rules are suggested:

Every educator, who submits an error-cause removal form, receives an immediate thank you note. The form is directed to the department that is responsible for the error-cause. This department sends an acknowledgement to the person who has submitted the form. Every error-cause removal form is taken seriously. If nothing is done about the error-cause removal form, that person should clear the decision with the two levels of supervision, e.g. a school manager and deputy school manager or head of department (Bank, 1992:79-80; Beckford, 1998:58; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).
**Step 12:**  **Recognition for contributors**

This step is aimed at recognising educators who participated in the error-cause removal programme. This should be public recognition on an important school day, e.g. school fun days, parent-educator consultation days, etc. Congratulatory notes could be given, while no money is awarded. When educators who have contributed to the error-cause removal campaign are recognised and rewarded, the quality culture at that school will be embedded (Bank, 1992:80; Beckford, 1998:58; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 13:**  **Establish quality councils**

Quality professionals and team chairpersons at school form quality councils. These members meet regularly to share their experiences, with the aim of generating ideas that will improve the quality of education at school. The quality councils form part of the embedded quality culture (Bank, 1992:80; Beckford, 1998:58; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

**Step 14:**  **Do it all over again**

This process starts from step 1 as a reminder that quality improvement never stops – it is a continuous process. At times, managers no longer have the enthusiasm and drive to continuously improve and, as an alternative, new energy (young educators) can be appointed to take the process forward. Crosby indicates that such young educators have the following characteristics:

- Integrity;
- Dedication to communication and customer satisfaction; and
3.3 GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF IQMS

The alignment of the Quality Management System programme is informed by the following principles in terms of ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 - Section A.

Quality Management System recognises the crucial role of quality public education delivery. To ensure that all schools deliver quality education, efforts are made to safeguard this delivery in accordance with the Performance Standards outlined in this document. Despite the geographical locations of learners in South Africa, it is believed that through the introduction of IQMS in schools, all learners will have equal access to quality education. Through the introduction of IQMS, all schools are expected to find ways to continually improve, although they may lack the necessary support from circuit, district and provincial levels. Schools do not always get the necessary support to continuously improve. A school with poor matric results or a school requiring resources from the Department, e.g. textbooks, educators and departmental support, are examples. If this support lacks, schools should themselves continuously find ways to improve.

The need for an Integrated Quality Management System, which is understood, is credible, valued and used professionally is essential (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 - Section A). All stakeholders do not understand IQMS. When IQMS was advocated, advocacy and training was done in one day. Is it possible to understand a large and complicated document like ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003 in one day? If IQMS was well understood, implementation should have been in accordance with the scheduled dates on pages 16-18 of this document (see Annexure C- a flow chart). IQMS is practically credible in the
sense that when advocacy was done, the focus was on educators receiving salary progression, grade progression, appointment affirmation, rewards and incentives (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3 - Section A). During the course of time, the Department indicated that it was facing financial constraints – hence a delayed implementation phase. IQMS was first valued when introduced, since the tone on advocacy was to improve educators’ commitment to, and accountability for, teaching and learning processes in schools. When addressing the issue of the professional use of IQMS, this leaves much to be desired. The problem lies with the evaluation of the educator himself/herself, as well as with the School Development Team. These teams may agree on issues to avoid confrontation and therefore do not practice professionally, as professionalism requires honesty, integrity, etc.

ELRC Collective Agreement 8 (2003:6 - Section A) states that the system’s focus is positive and constructive even where performance needs to improve. The system is positive, as it encourages educators to develop areas where they show weakness. Constructiveness will not be practised honestly in schools. After assessing an educator, instead of aiming at developing himself/herself, the assessed educator has already aimed at scores that will afford him/her an opportunity for salary progression, grade progression, appointment affirmation, rewards and incentives (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3 - Section A). The issue of including a process of self-evaluation and discussion of individual expectations is also problematic (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 - Section A). When educators evaluate themselves that is how they see themselves. There is no need for the School Development Team to discuss an individual’s expectations, as an educator may demand to know the reason why scores are low when compared to his/her expectations during Performance Measurement.

ELRC Collective Agreement 8 (2003:6 - Section A) states that there is a “need to minimise subjectivity through transparency and open discussion, and quality control to ensure validity, reliability and relevance.” During performance
measurement, the focus of every educator, subjectivity is maximised instead of
minimised because, despite an educator’s acceptable standard of performance,
ratings may be changed at school level because of intimidation. Intimidation from
an appraisee threatens transparency and open discussion, as the appraisee will
demand what he/she wants and ratings will be changed. Finally, no quality
control measures will exist, as the whole exercise will be invalid (if someone from
another school is a DSG member, different scores will be reached). In terms of
reliability, ratings will not be trustworthy if people are intimidated. IQMS was
relevant in ensuring the delivery of public quality education but the application
thereof creates the problems indicated above.

ELRC Collective Agreement 8 (2003:6 - Section A) further states that there is a
“need to ensure fairness by affirming the rights of educators, for example, there
can be no sanctions against individual educators before meaningful development
takes place.” We live in a democratic country where rights should be exercised
in terms of the constitution of our country. The Department aims at changing
educators’ weaknesses into strengths. An appraisee who receives training might
reject the support of the DSG, creating tension and stress in the work situation.
In some instances, the SMT may be aware of such tension, but does nothing
because of the danger involved. This is unfortunate for the individual whose
support is rejected.

IQMS will promote the professional growth of individual educators and ongoing
support for educators and the school (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 -
Section A). Promotion of the individual and professional growth of educators is
possible as educators will complete Personal Growth Plans and make
submissions. Ongoing support for educators and the school will not be possible
and is attributed to the lack of support in learning areas offered in schools
because of staff shortages and a lack of expertise. The same applies to IQMS –
ongoing support for educators and the school will be affected by a lack of staff in
the Department and a lack of expertise regarding IQMS. ELRC Collective
Agreement 8 (2003:6 –Section A) further states that: “the system provides a clear protocol governing the interaction of the parties.” A protocol is the step-by-step process to be followed where an educator is observed in practice (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:8 - Section A). The steps provided by the Department are clear and easy to follow. The challenge is about governance of interaction of the parties. Because of contextual factors that challenge educators, the authenticity of the parties will be affected by many factors, e.g. intimidation, friendship, etc. If an appraisee and a DSG member are friends, they will simply agree on the scores in their interaction, despite a clear definition of a peer in the IQMS document, and no developmental aspects will be identified.

ELRC Collective Agreement 8 (2003:6 - Section A) further states that there is a need for the IQMS to provide for, and encourage diversity in teaching style. Provision for, and encouraging diversity in teaching style can be done for IQMS only during the observation of an educator in practice. After performance measurement, the same educator who showed diversity in teaching style may not continue to maintain such teaching style.

ELRC Collective Agreement 8 (2003:6 - Section A) also states: “The system meets professional standards for sound quality management, including propriety (ethical and legal), utility (useable and effective), feasibility (practical, efficient and cost-effective) and accuracy.” The policy section had good intentions when IQMS was developed and sounded good. IQMS aimed at ensuring that there was delivery of quality public education in schools. How? IQMS, especially Performance Measurement, aims at salary progression, grade progression, appointment affirmation, rewards and incentives (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3 - Section A), which will motivate educators to work hard, improving on the quality of education. With the advocacy of IQMS, the ethical and legal aspects implied that IQMS focuses on the positive aspects of educators, e.g. educators’ weaknesses being developed into strengths, as a way of improving their status. The legal aspect meant that if an educator was assessed and qualified for salary
progression, the document (IQMS) would be legally binding, ensuring that an appraisee receives his/her money. *Utility*, in terms of ELRC Collective Agreement 8 (2003:6 - Section A) means useable and effective. It is true that generally, IQMS is useable because its starting point is Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation. IQMS will be effective in schools where the SMT and the majority of educators are honest, guided by the Christian belief of doing unto others what you will like them to do unto you. Put simply, honesty goes hand in hand with one’s expectation of being treated in a good way. In other words, IQMS will be ineffective where dishonesty prevails. In a school where dishonesty prevails, cheating will take place and submissions made to the school manager, to circuit and district will not be a true reflection of what actually took place in the school. IQMS will hence be ineffective.

IQMS procedure is practical, easy to follow and expensive. All educators will be assessed, receive salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointment, rewards and incentives. It will, however, not be implemented accurately. Accuracy refers to exactness. Dishonesty and contextual factors in schools, makes the whole process inaccurate, e.g. if an appraisee threatens the panel, the process will not be accurate and dishonesty will govern the process.

### 3.3.1 Protocol

*Protocol* is a set of step-by-step processes and procedures to be followed while observing an educator in practice (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:8 - Section A). These steps should thus follow each other chronologically allowing educators and officials to be aware what step follows another.

The protocol consists of two processes. Process A is based on internal appraisals and evaluations, whereas Process B is based on external evaluations for WSE.
Process A: Internal appraisals and evaluations

Establishment of Quality Management structures
The Regional, District, Circuit and School Managers should facilitate and establish Quality Management structures in the school, i.e. the School Development Team (SDT) and the Development Support Group (DSG) (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:8 - Section A). The facilitation of SDT and DSG is based solely on advocacy. If IQMS was not well advocated, facilitation would not be possible as the District, Circuit and School Managers would not know what to do. At times there is no communication about what should be done.

3.3.2 School Development Team (SDT)

A SDT is formed by the School Manager, the WSE coordinator, a democratically elected SMT and democratically elected post level 1 educators (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:12 – Section A).

When forming a SDT, obvious inclusions are the School Manager and the WSE co-ordinator. In most schools, a WSE coordinator was elected and a name kept. In cases of SMT members where no official appointment of Deputy School Manager or Head of Department existed, some senior educators were requested to assist the School Manager to run the school. The requests were verbal and some were written, leading to the exclusion of such members when forming the SDT. A simpler way of electing post level 1 educators was based on their willingness to serve. A school is given the task of deciding on the size of its own SDT. The size of a SDT ranges from three to six members, depending on the size of the school. A school may re-elect the SDT annually, or decide on a term
of office of between two to three years (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:12 – Section A). The Department should state clearly the term of office of the SDT, as the SDT of school A may have a term of office of two years and school B a SDT term of office of three years. If the Department clearly states the duration of term of office, this will assist in keeping to a uniform period, as opposed to having every school deciding on its own term of office of the SDT.

3.3.3 Roles and responsibilities of the school development team

The SDT has the following roles and responsibilities:

The SDT ensures that all educators are trained in the procedures and processes of an Integrated Quality Management System. Lack of proper training and understanding of IQMS does not give the SDT a platform for training others. In effect, each School Manager trains his/her staff in terms of his/her understanding of the procedures and processes, which may differ from what is conveyed in another school in the same circuit and district. The SDT is expected to co-ordinate activities pertaining to staff development. This role will be well performed, as the SDT will submit Personal Growth Plans (PGP’s) for inclusion in the School Improvement Plan, and thereafter in the District Improvement Plan. The SDT will also prepare and monitor the management plan for the Integrated Quality Management System to co-ordinate what is in the PGP’s and SIP’s and to ensure that all processes and procedures have taken place (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:12 - Section A).

The SDT links Developmental Appraisal to the School Improvement Plan (SIP). When an educator has performed self-evaluation, areas will be identified that will need improving. These development areas are included in a School Improvement Plan. The SDT should involve the SMT in the development of the SIP’s. This is a plan in which an individual educator’s performance will be improved or developed in a school. The SDT should involve the SMT in
developing SIP’s. The SDT also submits the SIP’s to the School Manager for later submission to the District office (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 Section A). The SDT also liaises with the Department, through the SMT, in terms of high priority needs, such as INSET, short courses, skills programmes or learnerships (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:12 - Section A). The implementation of INSET, short courses and skills programmes might not be successful if offered by the Department. From the researcher’s experience, lack of knowledge and expertise affects all departmental programmes. Learnerships and INSET can be successfully implemented if offered by private service providers, where expertise is a priority.

The SDT monitors the effectiveness of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) and reports to the relevant parties (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:12 - Section A). The School Manager forms part of the SDT, meaning that he/she will monitor the effectiveness of IQMS. Reporting will be directed to the Circuit Manager. It must be clearly indicated that even ineffective IQMS should be reported to the relevant person. The SDT further ensures that all records and documentation on IQMS are maintained (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:12 - Section A). These records will be referred to in the case of a dispute or be reviewed by the Whole School Evaluation Team.

The SDT oversees DSG mentoring and support. A mentor is a person who assists and advises someone over a period, often also teaching him/her how to do his/her job (Gillard, 2003:779). Those on School Management Teams could easily do mentoring. It is not easy to monitor someone on the same level as oneself, as this could result in rejection.

The SDT co-ordinates ongoing support provided during the two developmental cycles each year (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:12 – Section A). When the Department thus communicates with the School Manager, the SDT should know this in order to inform the educator being developed about when INSET or
short courses will take place. The SDT still supports educators annually. Besides supporting the educators, the SDT completes and signs off the necessary documentation for Performance Measurement (for pay or grade progression), ensuring fairness and accuracy and submits the documentation to the School Manager (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:12 – Section A). As the SDT ensures that all documentation on IQMS is maintained, it will be responsible for completing the necessary documentation for Performance Measurement, particularly for purposes of pay or grade progression. Fairness and accuracy will not be assured, as elements of cheating, threats and dishonesty may exist. Lack of commitment might hinder the submission of this documentation to the School Manager on time.

The SDT deals with differences between appraisees and their DSG’s in order to resolve these differences (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 – Section A). If possible, and for the school’s reputation and image, differences need to be resolved at school level. If not resolved, the matter is referred to the Grievance Committee. The Grievance Committee will face many challenges, since the lack of trained educators might lead to serious breaches of the guidelines of the process (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:11 – Section A).

The SDT coordinates the internal WSE processes. Co-ordination is simple, as this links people in a specific process. The SDT further liaises with the external WSE and School Management Teams (SMT) to co-ordinate and manage the cyclical external WSE process (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 – Section A). When the external Whole School Evaluation Team visits the school, the SDT must accompany the team to class to observe educators in practice. Finally, the SDT ensures that QMS is applied consistently. The SDT will find it challenging to act consistently. Consistency implies that some things will always happen in a similar manner (Gillard, 2003:259). Inconsistency will result in schools, as observation will differ when observing an educator in practice in the presence or absence of the WSE team.
3.3.4 Development Support Group (DSG)

The composition of the DSG

Each educator must have his/her own DSG. The DSG is formed by an educator's immediate senior and a peer, who are selected on the basis of appropriate phase/learning area expertise (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 –Section A). The School Manager should properly identify peers. If not checked, an educator could select a friend or a relative in the workplace as his/her peer, which may lead to bias. In terms of an IQMS document, a peer is an educator in the same phase, based on learning area or phase expertise e.g. Senior Phase, i.e. from grades 8-9 and from grades 10-12. Examples are given in table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Composition of educators' DSG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Educators’ post level</th>
<th>Immediate senior</th>
<th>Senior phase</th>
<th>GET band</th>
<th>Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI educator</td>
<td>Head of Department (HOD)</td>
<td>Grades 8-9</td>
<td>Grades 10-12</td>
<td>Learning area or phase expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2-HOD</td>
<td>Deputy School Manager</td>
<td>Grades 8-9</td>
<td>Grades 10-12</td>
<td>Learning area or phase expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 – Deputy School Manager</td>
<td>School Manager</td>
<td>Grades 8-9</td>
<td>Grades 10-12</td>
<td>An educator with learning area or phase expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 or 4 – School Manager</td>
<td>Circuit Manager</td>
<td>Grades 8-9</td>
<td>Grades 10-12</td>
<td>An educator with learning area or phase expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.5 Roles and responsibilities of the Development Support Group (DSG)

The DSG provides mentoring and support to educators (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 – Section A). When mentoring, someone guides and supports that educator. The mentoring and support of DSG's will not be effective, as an educator might also be a DSG member. Each educator has to facilitate in class, adding to mentoring and support. Daily teaching-learning activities need time. Mentoring and support needs time and will not be done as expected. The DSG assists the educator in developing a Personal Growth Plan. Assisting implies that an educator completes his/her PGP and discusses it with, or seeks help from the DSG. It is possible that an educator may not be willing to be assisted by someone who is said to have expertise in the learning area or phase where experience and expertise are challenged (see Annexure C- a PGP).

The DSG works together with the SDT to incorporate plans for the development of a particular educator into the School Improvement Plan (SIP) (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 - Section A). After Developmental Appraisal, each educator will have areas that need to be developed. All educators' developmental areas are included into a School Improvement Plan (SIP). The DSG is also responsible for baseline evaluation of the educator (for developmental purposes). The DSG is expected to possess a list of all educators, as well as a time frame, within which baseline evaluation should be completed. Put simply, the DSG should ensure that each educator evaluates himself/herself. Finally, the DSG verifies that the information provided for Performance Measurement (PM) is accurate (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 - Section A). The immediate senior, who is part of the DSG, ensures that summative evaluation for each educator takes place. This evaluation is a
process during which an educator is assessed for the purpose of salary or grade progression (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 - Section A). The immediate senior will verify the evaluation to ensure accuracy of records (ratings).

3.4 EDUCATOR SELF-EVALUATION

After the establishment of the SDT and DSG, all educators must evaluate themselves (see Annexure C) to show how other educators should evaluate themselves (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:8 - Section B).

The educators are expected to evaluate themselves by using the pre-evaluation profile checklist on pages 8-9 of the ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003 - Section B). In addition, DA forms from the Developmental Appraisal for Educators' manual, pages 36-37 should be completed (see Annexure C). These forms require information about the individual educators, their qualifications, learning areas and grades that they are currently teaching, relevant diplomas, teaching and non-teaching experience. Self-evaluation forms part of Developmental Appraisal (DA) and Performance Measurement (PM) (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:21 - Section B). The educators will familiarize themselves with the evaluation instrument when completing DA and PM forms, disregarding the fact that they were not trained by Department officials or by private service providers, but by their School Managers, who did not understand the whole IQMS process. Performance Measurement is aimed at determining educators’ pay or grade progression and should be done within a calendar year, for pay or grade progression in the following year (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:21 - Section B).
In terms of ELRC Collective Agreement 8 (2003:21-22 – Section B), the purposes of self-evaluation follow.

The educator becomes familiar with the instrument to be used for Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:21 –Section B). The Department did not provide training based on familiarity with, and understanding of, the evaluation instrument. It is therefore not easy to familiarise oneself with the instrument. Delay in the implementation of IQMS is caused by a lack of familiarity and understanding of the instrument. The educator is expected to critically reflect on his/her own performance and to set targets and time frames for improvement. The educator takes control of his/her improvement and is able to identify priorities and monitor personal progress (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:22 - Section B). Some educators cannot reflect critically on their own performance, and one may find that an educator has completed only one exercise in a period of three months. The DSG should monitor and discuss the educator’s performance with him/her. Since the educator monitors his/her own progress, time frames for improvement will not be achieved. Furthermore, the educator may identify priorities, but will fail to control his/her improvement of the identified priorities, as the system gives ownership to the educator.

Self-evaluation becomes an ongoing process that is more sustainable in the long-term, as fewer “outside” evaluations (involving other people) are required (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:22 - Section B). In time, self-evaluation becomes sustainable and there is no need to involve outsiders to observe an educator in practice during external WSE. If sustainability is reached, educators will relax as they did before the launching and implementation of IQMS. Outside evaluations help in quality improvement because educators’ work and plan, knowing that outside evaluation will take place.
Self-evaluation becomes more participatory when observing an educator in practice for the purpose of evaluation during Performance Measurement (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:22 – Section B). Once the process is participatory, the level of reliability is hindered because participation may lead to cheating, especially where scores are changed. Participation will be high in relation to scores for PM – which will result in salary or grade progression. Self-evaluation enables the educator to measure progress and success and to build on these without becoming dependant on cyclical evaluations (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:22 –Section B). The committed educators will be able to measure progress and success, but less committed educators will only depend on cyclical evaluation to be in a position to measure their progress and success.

The structures that are important in IQMS were discussed. A discussion of records and documentation that are important in IQMS follows

### 3.5 RECORDS AND DOCUMENTATION

The following records and documentation are important in IQMS:

#### 3.5.1 Educators and school: The Personal Growth Plan (PGP)

An educator develops the PGP in consultation with members of the DSG (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 –Section A). As the PGP is designed, there is no need to consult with the DSG, as the educator is in complete control of his/her own success and progress. The DSG signs the documents to certify that it has seen them. The PGP forms an important record of the needs of, and the progress made, by individual educators (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:13 –Section A). The PGP enables an educator to urgently identify needs that require attention, the type of guidance needed, etc. Each educator’s PGP, particularly item 1, should inform the SIP (see Annexure C – a PGP).
The PGP aims at addressing an educator’s growth on four levels, i.e.:

- **Those areas in need of improvement of which the educator is in full control (e.g. punctuality).** It is possible that an educator was not punctual for a year, but as one has to indicate that he/she is in full control, that person could change without external pressure (disciplinary intervention by the School Manager) (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:23 – Section B).

- **Those areas in which the DSG (immediate senior and or mentor) or someone else in the school is able to provide guidance (e.g. record keeping).** Some educators do not record learners’ scores after tests or project assessment. If recorded, these records leave much to be desired. If a mentor assists an educator or someone else in the school, improvement takes place immediately, whereas this is not the case for those assisted by the School Manager (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:23 - Section B).

- **Those areas for which the Department should provide INSET or other programmes (skill development).** The educator could be challenged with lesson planning and preparation. If indicated in the PGP, the same educator could receive INSET and acquire lesson planning and preparation skills that will help to improve his/her performance, thus resulting in quality education (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:23 – Section B).

- **Where the educator is under-qualified or needs re-skilling in order to teach a new learning area (e.g. Economic and Management Sciences),** this information needs to feature in the Workplace Skills Plan (WSP) of the Department (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:24 - Section B). Should an educator be under-qualified, he/she may be given the opportunity to be retrained, which will improve performance. Quality of education will also improve.
3.5.2 Regional/District/Area Improvement Plan

The Regional/District/Area Improvement Plan enables officials to plan, co-ordinate and monitor the delivery of support and development opportunities in the schools in their areas (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:14 – Section A).

Planning, co-ordination and monitoring of support by the Regional/District/Area officials is hindered by a lack of training. Although they (particularly Circuit Managers) read through the documents, they do not know where to start with the development of their schools. They compile the Area Improvement Plan based on the SIP’s submitted. From the SIP’s, they cluster schools with similar needs. Regional District/Area Office face the challenge of providing INSET, based on the schools’ identified needs. It is said that, by deploying officials, this can run concurrently in different areas. It is evident that there is a shortage of staff in the Department and, consequently, some centres are not attended to.

Now that the important structures of IQMS have been discussed, a discussion on the resolution of differences and/or grievances follows.

3.6 RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES AND/OR GRIEVANCES

Grievances are unavoidable in the workplace. Should there be differences of opinion between an educator and his/her DSG about performance ratings, these need to be resolved at that level. The matter can be referred to the SDT if agreement is not reached between the parties. Referral to the SDT must take place within a week (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:11 – Section A).

Should a grievance not be resolved within five working days because of (a) serious breaches of the guidelines of the process, or (b) there are serious grounds for challenging the overall performance rating, each party engaged in the grievance may request a formal review by the Grievance Committee. This
request must be submitted in writing, stating the reasons why the educator believes that there are grounds for challenging the process or the results. There will be many grievances where rating dishonesty is prevalent, although the two stated grounds are not violated. The Grievance Committee shall consist of a peer (Senior Manager), observers from the trade unions admitted to Council and a neutral person appointed by the Regional or District Manager (or his/her delegate). In cases where the Senior Manager forms part of the grievance committee, this is a challenge. In a district where research was undertaken, there was only one Senior Manager, which will delay dispute resolution. Delegating neutral person(s) is still a challenge. Are these delegates conversant with IQMS implementation and grievance resolution? The inclusion of delegates will further handicap observers (trade unions) because of a lack of knowledge regarding union matters (grievance resolution) (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:11 - Section A).

The Grievance Committee will make a recommendation to the Head of Department, who shall deliver a decision within five working days of receiving the recommendation (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:11 - Section A). The Grievance Committee needs to decide how quickly the Head of Department must receive the recommendations from the districts.

The implementation of IQMS will now be discussed.

3.7 FIRST YEAR OF IQMS IMPLEMENTATION

The diagram in Annexure C (A flow chart), shows the what, how and when the three programmes of IQMS are to be implemented. As stated in Chapter One, Limpopo lags behind other provinces with regard to the implementation of the policies of the National Department of Education, including the implementation of IQMS. In terms of the flow diagram, June 2005 was the scheduled implementation month for the first development cycle. At the time, schools
submitted self-evaluation forms for educators to the Circuit, well after the implementation date.

**Schools: Planning for implementation**

After the establishment of the SDT, the school focuses on broad planning for IQMS implementation. In the case of secondary schools, grade 12 educators should be evaluated before the year-end examinations commence. By February of that year, educators should be provided with a timetable indicating approximately when they can expect to be evaluated (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:21 - Section B). To prevent the timetable being rejected by the educators, each educator should be requested, by a specific due date (before grade 12 examinations commence), to select convenient dates on which he/she can be observed in practice. Put simply, consultation must take place in all activities in a democratic society.

As implementation planning has been addressed, a discussion of the observation of educators in practice follows.

### 3.8 OBSERVATION OF EDUCATORS IN PRACTICE

All school-based educators must be observed in practice, using the instrument in [Annexure C](#). The instruments during lesson observation are used for the three IQMS programmes, i.e., DA, PM and WSE (external evaluation). There are twelve Performance Standards, consisting of those that are observed in the classroom and those observed outside the classroom.
Table 3.2: Performance Standards observed in and outside the classroom for all school-based educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standards observed in the classroom</th>
<th>Performance Standards observed outside the classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The creation of a positive learning environment.</td>
<td>5. Professional development in field of work/career and participation in professional bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes.</td>
<td>6. Human relations and contribution to school development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lesson planning, preparation and presentation.</td>
<td>7. Extra-curricular and co-curricular participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learner assessment.</td>
<td>8. Administration of resources and records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Decision-making and accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Leadership, communication and servicing the governing body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Strategic planning, financial planning and EMD (Educational Management and Development).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:2-3 - Section C)

School Managers face challenges in classroom observation. The first four Performance Standards should have been designed for post levels 1 and 2. Those educators on levels 1 and 2 still have a long way to go in a teaching fraternity. Post level 3 and 4 educators should be assessed on management and administrative duties, excluding Performance Standards 1-4 and 7. The role of any School Manager is to support educators as they participate in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities, while not participating in such activities themselves.
A summary of Performance Standards is shown in table 3.3 below.

Table 3.3: Performance Standards applicable to all school-based educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standards</th>
<th>Post level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Performance Standards 1 – 7</td>
<td>All post level 1 educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance Standards 1 – 10</td>
<td>All HOD’s (Education Specialists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance Standards 1 – 12</td>
<td>All Deputy and School Managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:4 - Section C).

The Performance Standards are discussed and summarised above and are now followed with a discussion of the standard expectations.

3.8.1 Expectations

For each Performance Standard an expectation is indicated, e.g. the expectation for Standard 1 is that the educator is expected to create a positive learning environment that enables the learners to participate actively and to achieve success in the learning process. This implies that an educator is expected to ensure that the learning environment is positive and conducive, where learners will be willing to participate actively to achieve success in the learning process. If the environment is positive, the likelihood that success is achieved is very high. Expectations vary as the Performance Standards vary.

3.8.2 Criteria

There are four criteria for each Performance Standard. The criteria for Performance Standard 1 are:

a) Learning space;
b) Learner involvement;
c) Discipline; and
d) Diversity

Each criterion has four descriptors, which are derived from a four-point rating scale. The descriptors enable the DSG to rate according to the level of performance. For example, if the expectation and question for Performance Standard 1 are not met, the rating will be ‘1’ in terms of the level of performance. If the expectation and question for Performance Standard 1 are met, the rating will be ‘4’. Table 3.4 illustrates an example.

Table 3.4: An example of criteria in a Performance Standard - Performance Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Source</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Learning space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Learner involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: Max 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating

(ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:10-11 - Section C).

After observation in practice, the appraisee and his/her DSG discuss and agree on the final scores. There will be no true reflection of these scores. Factors affecting these ratings are intimidation, rejection of some DSG members, etc.

The criteria of the expectations of Performance Standards have been discussed. A discussion on the rating scale follows.
3.8.3 The rating scale

This scale is used to rate educators’ performance level. The rating scale (in terms of ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:4 - Section C) is consolidated in table 3.5 below.

Table 3.5: The rating scale for educators’ performance levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Level of Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Does not meet the minimum expectations and requires urgent intervention and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfies minimum expectations</td>
<td>Is acceptable and is in line with minimum expectations, but development and support are still required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Are good and meet expectations, but some areas are still in need of development and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Is outstanding and exceeds expectations. Although performance is excellent, continuous self-development and improvement are advised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.4 Final scores

The final scores are taken into consideration after the DSG has discussed these with the appraisee. The appraisee has the right to voice his/her opinion on the raw scores before finalisation thereof. A compromise of +1 is made in terms of differences. The majority of differences will arise when educators realise that their scores do not afford them the opportunity for pay and/or grade progression.
3.9 USING THE SCALE FOR AN INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The scale is used for the three programmes of IQMS, i.e. DA, PM and WSE.

3.9.1 For development appraisal

Totals as ratings are not required. All evaluations carried out are strictly developmental and areas that needed development were identified and the DSG provided guidance and support, resulting in the educator being developed into a good educator that focuses on quality education for learners in that school.

The high scores (if calculated) indicate the strengths of an educator. Low scores indicate that an educator requires development. An educator and his/her DSG must use the areas requiring development to develop a Personal Growth Plan (PGP) that enables the educator to develop and improve in the identified areas. The completed instrument forms the report for the DA as well as baseline evaluation (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:5-6 – Section C).

3.9.2 For performance measurement

The scores must be calculated to motivate pay or grade progression. The rating may be adjusted upwards, taking contextual factors into consideration, like overcrowded classrooms or personal factors, e.g. health or family. A scoring sheet (Annexure C) is used for PM purposes. The scoring sheet is submitted to Persal for data capturing after summative evaluation has taken place at year-end. Annexure C is also used for salary progression and grade progression.

For salary or grade progression, the following minimum scores must be attained for post levels 1-4.
### Table 3.6: Post level scores for salary or pay progression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post level of Educators</th>
<th>Salary progression - Minimum scores</th>
<th>Maximum scores</th>
<th>Grade progression - Minimum scores</th>
<th>Maximum scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Level 1 – Educators and Senior Educators</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education Specialists/HOD's</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level 3 &amp; 4 - School Managers and Deputy School Managers</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 – Section C) and (Exemplars A, B and C (no pages)-see Annexure C).

Space provided for comments or the reasons for any adjustments creates the impression that the educator does not deserve salary or grade progression. If comments clearly indicate that scores were adjusted, what difference does it make when compared to scores that are not adjusted? What matters in PM is money, not comment. Consequently, comments/reasons for adjustments should not have been included in Exemplars A-C. The Composite forms in the IQMS document (Exemplars A-B) are not the same. Exemplar C is not attached to the official IQMS document but appears in the file. The exemplars A-C should appear in the file and in the official IQMS document.

A discussion of an instrument for PM was discussed. A discussion of an instrument for WSE now follows.

### 3.9.3 For whole school evaluation

In WSE, the overall performance of the school is evaluated. Selected educators will be observed in practice in nine areas of development, i.e.:

(i) Basic functionality of the school.

(ii) Leadership, management and communication.
(iii) Governance and relationships.
(iv) Quality of teaching and educator development.
(v) Curriculum provision and resources.
(vi) Learner’s achievement.
(vii) School safety, security and discipline.
(viii) School infrastructure.
(ix) Parents and the community

The nine areas of development in WSE were discussed in detail in Chapter 2, Section 2.8.2. The scale for DA, PM and WSE are discussed in this chapter.

3.10 SCHOOL: DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SIP)

(i) The SDT must receive all the completed instruments (and agreed-upon ratings) and Personal Growth Plans from the DSG's. These submissions should be made by the end of March each year.

(ii) The SDT compiles the School Improvement Plan (SIP). In the SIP, educators are grouped according to their similar development needs. Grouping of these educators helps to identify specific programmes that are a priority for the school (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:24 – Section B).

3.11 SCHOOLS: DEVELOPMENT, SUPPORT AND MENTORING

(i) Schools are expected to inform educators to attend the INSET and other programmes that are organised by the Department of Education (Region/District/Area Office).
(ii) While attending INSET, DSG’s still support these educators. If educators receive support from their DSG’s, they will improve their performance, as providing support goes hand in hand with mentoring (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:25 – Section B). INSET may not be properly planned and implemented because of a lack of staff and expertise.

3.12 REGIONAL/DISTRICT/AREA OFFICE, SCHOOLS AND EDUCATORS: SELF-EVALUATION

The Regional Office and educators are expected to evaluate their progress against the Improvement Plans that they have developed. It is acceptable to revise plans and identify new priorities (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:25 – Section B). This review should be done by the end of the second term.

3.12.1 Regional/District/Area Office, schools and educators second development cycle

The Regional Office’s responsibility is to plan, organise and manage a second round of the developmental cycle for educators and schools. Furthermore, the school monitors progress on IQMS (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:25 – Section B). Most schools have not started with the first development cycle. It will thus be difficult for the district to plan, organise and manage the second developmental cycle. These roles will be easier for the district if co-ordinated properly from Step 1 of IQMS implementation, ensuring and monitoring that IQMS structures are in place.

3.12.2 Regional/District/Area Office: Receive reports from schools

The reports that are received by the Regional/District/Area Office should include recommendations about how the Regional/District/Area Office can improve on the delivery of developmental INSET and other programmes. All reports received
from schools are retained at the Regional/District/Area Office. These reports must be made available to the external Whole School Evaluation teams. An example of such a report is the Composite Form in Annexure C (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:26-27 – Section B). It is possible that the WSE team may not be given the reports from schools. If the WSE does not have a true reflection of INSET, no improvement can take place in the schools and in the district.

3.13 SECOND AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS OF IMPLEMENTATION

- Educator: Observation of educator in practice

ELRC Collective Agreement 8 (2003:27 - Section B) states that the process that will be followed is exactly the same in all subsequent years.

DSG’s will evaluate educators once every year. Summative evaluation that was done the previous year becomes the baseline evaluation for the coming year.

3.14 SUMMARY

Although IQMS aims at recognising the crucial role of the delivery of quality public education, it has many loopholes.

IQMS is said to be understood, credible, valued and used professionally (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 - Section A). The IQMS document could be understood if proper training was done. IQMS is not credible because of a lack of training. Furthermore, IQMS is not used professionally because of cheating, inflated scores that educators do not deserve, dishonesty and doing it only for the sake of submission. IQMS no longer minimises subjectivity, but maximises it, as it is not performed in a transparent manner when an educator threatens his/her DSG to submit scores that will enable him/her to receive salary and/or grade progression. Because of threatening behaviour, a discussion between the
educator and the DSG is no longer open, and validity and reliability are affected (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 – Section A).

Training focuses on capacitating all those involved to ensure the successful implementation and to answer the question: How? (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 - Section A). During advocacy, some reasons for adopting IQMS were highlighted to School Managers, SMT members and one educator representing staff. The question on how IQMS was to be implemented was not addressed. Those who advocated IQMS made the mistake of instructing all School Managers to go out and train all staff members. By training School Managers and educators separately for a number of days, instead of one day, it would have been beneficial for quality education to capacitate all involved. Supervisors and Managers should be trained for four weeks before the zero defects day to deliver quality programmes. Such training is aimed at enhancing supervisors’ confidence in the messages that they convey to the educators (Bank, 1992:79; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9). Four weeks is sufficient for training Managers in IQMS. What is important is that training requires time, at least a week. The same should have happened to Deputy School Managers, HOD’s and CSI educators. In some schools, educators rejected training by School Managers.

The Grievance Committee shall consist of a peer (Senior Manager), observers from trade unions admitted to Council, and a neutral person appointed by the Regional or District Manager (or his/her delegate) (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:11 - Section A). There is only one Senior Manager in the area where research was undertaken, causing delays in resolving differences in the four circuits. A neutral person’s familiarity with union matters should have been clearly indicated. The role of this neutral person should have been indicated in the official IQMS document. The IQMS document should have indicated that all grievances be resolved at district level, with only exceptional cases being referred for review to the Head of Department.
IQMS Implementation, in accordance with the flow chart, was not done (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:16-18 - Section B). The questions of advocacy, training, discussion and clarification about what the district office should do and when, were not addressed (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:16 - Section B). Department officials did not address advocacy, training, nor discuss and clarify what should be done and this led to a delay in implementation.

In planning for implementation, individual educators should decide when they will be observed in practice. Providing educators with a timetable indicating approximately when they can expect to be evaluated is not acceptable. As we live in a democratic country and taking into consideration that management is responsible for ensuring that there is quality in their organisations, educators should be consulted. The SDT should consult educators about when they think they should be observed in practice. Each educator should decide on a convenient date. If a booked date is not suitable to all parties, further consultation must take place to ensure that each educator has a convenient date on which he/she will be observed in practice. If the SDT enforces a timetable, indicating approximately when educators can expect to be evaluated, this will be rejected (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:21 - Section B).

The IQMS document stresses that, when evaluating himself/herself, an educator becomes familiar with the instrument that will be used for Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement. One becomes familiar with something when thoroughly trained and practiced. Lack of training will result in unfamiliarity with the instrument, thereby delaying the implementation phase (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:21 - Section B).

The IQMS document states that schools with similar identified needs or similar aspects in need of development can be ‘clustered’ together for the purpose of INSET and other programmes. The deployment of officials (Education
Support/Services and/or Management Officials) may affect INSET and other programmes (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:24 - Section B). Staff shortages exist in the Department and for the sake of quality, it would be profitable to look for expertise when deploying these officials. It is evident that Department officials are not knowledgeable. When facilitating programmes, they fail to answer questions, stressing that the Department had sent them. Alternatively, the Department could hire private service providers to run INSET, skills programmes, etc.

The application of Performance Standards 1-4 and 7 for School Managers (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:4 – Section C) and the evaluation instrument for PM, should have been designed in such a manner to set Performance Standards for CSI, HOD and School Managers/Deputy School Managers. In some instances, a CSI educator will be a peer to a senior because of his/her expertise in a particular learning area/phase. The official IQMS document should have been designed in such a manner that Deputy School Managers and School Managers be assessed in management and administrative duties. The role of School Managers in relation to Performance Standard 7 is to support what educators do and not necessarily to actively participate. Only CSI and two educators should be observed in classroom context.

Performance Standard 5 focuses on professional development in the field of work/career and participation in professional bodies (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:18 - Section C). This Performance Standard need not have been included in the document. The Department is aware thereof that when educators obtain qualifications, they receive only a cash bonus. This demotivates educators to the extent that most of them in the system are not studying. Against the background of the stated criteria, how can educators participate in professional development? Some educators’ attitude to professional development is often so negative that they challenge those who are studying.
Job advertisements require undergraduate degrees, implying that persons with M.Ed and D.Ed will never be considered for employment in South Africa.

Furthermore, studying for a Master’s degree and/or Doctorate, costs up to R20000, to get a cash bonus of R3 000. This Performance Standard will create tension in the workplace where agreement is reached to allocate scores indiscriminately and this need to be reviewed. There should be a balance between post placements of those who have higher academic qualifications and those with lower qualifications.

For purposes of Performance Measurement, i.e. for salary or grade progression, School Managers’ scores are high, compared to those on post levels 1 and 2 (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 - Section C). The allocated high scores (minimum and maximum) should have been designed for use for level 1 and 2 educators, as they have more time compared to level 3 and 4 educators.

The way the composite score sheets are designed for use in performance measurement for pay and grade progression, should have excluded provision for comments and reasons for adjustment (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003 (no page number) – See Annexure C). Money, and money only, matters in terms of salary and grade progression, not comments. Will adjusted scores differ from those not adjusted with regard to salary or grade progression?

The statement that reads, "I agree/do not agree with the overall performance rating", should have been excluded in the composite score sheets. It is indicated in the IQMS documents that, should there be a difference in rating; the SDT must be involved in the matter within a week. Furthermore, either party may request formal review by the Grievance Committee (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:11 - Section A). Finally, if one differs with his/her DSG about ratings, a review must be requested in writing. The statement that indicates agreement or
disagreement should therefore have been excluded from the composite score sheets for salary and grade progression.

In terms of lesson preparation and presentation (Performance Standard 3), the expectation for Performance Standard 3 is that the educator demonstrates competence in planning preparation, presentation and management of learning programmes (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:14 – Section C). The question of Performance Standard 3 is: Is lesson planning clear, logical and sequential and is there evidence that individual lessons fit into the broader learning programme? (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:14 – Section C). The asterisk that appears at the top of page 14 – Section C, should not have been included. It will cause problems in schools – some educators will not plan and prepare for their observation in practice, as the note next to the asterisk indicates that evidence of planning does not imply that there must be written lesson plans. However, it must be evident that the lesson has been planned. There will be no proof that a lesson has been planned, or evidence that the lesson fits into broader learning programme. Where will the proof be? This Performance Standard should be reviewed. School Managers must advise their educators to plan and prepare, as the levels of performance will ultimately rate them a ‘1’, which is unacceptable.

All schools need to be monitored by the Department officials. The term monitor means to watch and check a situation carefully for a period to discover something about it (Gillard, 2003:803). It is evident that Department officials visited some schools and excluded others. In terms of monitoring, a particular person was supposed to visit schools for the purpose of watching and checking whether or not IQMS was implemented, and the challenges that schools face during implementation. Monitors’ findings in schools will enable the Department to strategise to improve schools with regard to IQMS. These officials review IQMS programmes with some educators and SMT members, sometimes without the
knowledge of the School Manager. The following questions could be directed to the Department officials who monitor IQMS programmes.

- How can officials visit schools without seeing School Managers?
- How can officials monitor some schools and exclude others?
- Is monitoring based on random sampling of schools?
- What is the Department doing about those schools that are not implementing IQMS?

In the area where research was undertaken, there is one Circuit Manager for many schools. Is it possible for a Circuit Manager to be in the DSG of each School Manager in his/her circuit? This could delay the process, as School Managers should have been evaluated during March. It was found that such assessments have failed because of Circuit Managers’ other job-related engagements.

3.15 CONCLUSION

IQMS was critically discussed, indicating how IQMS structures should be formed, records and documentation maintained, grievances or differences resolved, and the evaluation instrument reviewed. Weaknesses in the official document (IQMS) were highlighted.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

4.1 INTRODUCTION
The research design and methods were elaborated on in Chapter One and will now be discussed. A research design is a constructed plan and strategy, developed to seek, explore and discover answers to research questions (Taylor, 2000:79). This means that a researcher uses a design to look for, explore and to obtain answers to research questions such as: When did you first hear about IQMS?

Mouton (1996:107), Denzin and Lincoln (1998:28) define a research design as a set of guidelines and instructions to reach the goal that the researcher has set for himself or herself. Guidelines direct on what should be done, how and to whom. The goal of this study is to gather the perceptions of school-based educators on IQMS. A research design in this study is a set of guidelines that seek and discover answers to the research questions. De Vos, et al. (2002:269) state that terms such as strategies, methods, traditions of inquiry and approaches are used interchangeably with design.

The qualitative research designs are naturalistic, as research takes place in real-world setting (Patton, 2002:39), such as schools, where the participants live, having knowledge and experience of the phenomenon under study. The researcher will use a qualitative research design.

4.2 WHAT IS QUALITATIVE RESEARCH?

Merriam (1998:5), defines qualitative research as “an umbrella concept, covering several forms of inquiry that help us understand and explain the meaning of
social phenomena, with as little disruption of the natural setting as possible”. Qualitative research will enable the researcher to understand and explain what the perceptions of school-based educators are on the advocacy of IQMS in selected public secondary schools. Participants’ understanding of IQMS in their natural settings is needed. Furthermore, Strauss and Corbin (1990:17), define qualitative research as “any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures”. Qualitative research uses words that best explain the phenomena under study, particularly how school-based educators perceive the advocacy of IQMS. The following terms are used interchangeably with qualitative research; naturalistic inquiry, interpretive research, field study, participant observation, inductive research, case study and ethnography (Merriam, 1998:5).

The following are philosophic assumptions of qualitative research and are based on:

- Individuals interacting with the reality of their social world’s construct. What is important in qualitative research is that the participants give to the phenomenon from their world, as well as their experiences. The insider’s perspective, also known as *emic*, is emphasised (Merriam, 1998:6).

- The researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis and goes where people are, collects data and later analyses this data (Merriam, 1998:6).

- Qualitative research involves fieldwork. The researcher is expected to physically go to the people, natural settings, site or institution (Merriam, 1998:6; Woods, 2001:2). In this study, the researcher went to a setting where the participants were gathered to conduct focus group interviews as a way of determining their perceptions of IQMS.
Qualitative research primarily employs an inductive research strategy. This means that the findings are in the form of themes, categories, typologies, concepts, tentative hypotheses, even theory, which have been inductively derived from the data (Merriam, 1998:7; Woods, 2001:2).

Qualitative research product is descriptive. The participants describe their experiences of the phenomenon under study. In this study, participants described their knowledge, understanding and experience of IQMS and advocacy (Merriam, 1998:8; Miller & Dingwall, 1997:6).

As the assumptions of qualitative research have been discussed, a discussion on sample selection follows.

4.3 SELECTING THE SAMPLE

Sampling and selection are principles and procedures used to identify, choose and gain access to relevant units that will be used for data generation by any method (Mason, 1996:83). The purpose of sampling and selection is to identify the units to be studied and to gain access to schools for data generation.

Sampling is defined as a representation of a population (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:88; Mouton, 1996:136; Henry 1990:136). A sample is a small portion of the total set of objects, events or persons that, together, comprise the subjects of the study (De Vos, et al. 2002:199). Although the sample is small, it should represent the larger population, i.e. all school-based educators. The sample in this study consists of ten School Managers and ten CSI educators to be studied. Representativeness of samples means that the sample should have approximately the same characteristics as the population, relevant to the research in question (De Vos, et al. 2002:201). The participants were all school-based and had the following characteristics: they were male and female educators working in selected public secondary schools, from various socio-
economic backgrounds. The educators socialised in accordance with their job categories, i.e. School Managers and CSI educators during departmental meetings or workshops, during memorial services for educators and finally during union meetings. As educators, their socio-economic backgrounds differed, because of differences in their academic qualifications. CSI educators and School Managers’ academic qualifications ranged from BA degrees to M.Ed’s/MA’s/MBA’s. One of the School Managers is completing a doctorate. This proves that their socio-economic backgrounds differ because of their salary ranges, e.g. a CSI educator with a BA degree is not on the same salary range as a School Manager who is in possession of an M.Ed/MA or MBA. What is disturbing is that these School Managers are not studying, as they will be on retirement in two to five years. On the other hand, CSI educators are busy studying project management and labour relation management, indicating that they may quit the teaching profession to explore other career opportunities.

The ages of both categories (School Managers and CSI educators) differ. According to their registration forms for the focus group interview sessions, the CSI’s ages are in the thirties to forties. School Managers' ages range from the forties to fifties.

The sample is drawn/selected for the following reasons:

- **Feasibility.** The total population was covered. The research was undertaken in four circuits i.e. Klein Letaba, Man’ombe, Nsami and Shamavunga. From these circuits, at least one or two schools were selected to ensure feasibility (De Vos, et al. 2002:199).

- **Accuracy.** In view of the feasibility considered above, the researcher believes that accuracy is maintained. The sample represents the population to the extent that the views/perceptions of the participants are accurate in terms of IQMS advocacy in schools (De Vos, et al. 2002:199).
• *Sampling saves time, money and effort.* Sampling enables the researcher to save time in order to focus on few individuals rather than the whole population. Samples save money, e.g. paper for registration and consent forms, when it is not necessary to study the entire population. Finally, less effort was used when communicating with the participants (letters and telephone) and catering for the participants (De Vos, et al. 2002:199; Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:86).

The researcher based the selection on non-probability sampling, where purposive sampling was used. During non-probability sampling, the probability of including each element of the population in a sample is unknown, i.e. it is not possible to determine the likelihood of the inclusion of all representative elements of the population into the sample (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:88). This means that some units can be selected and others not, based mainly on having no chance of inclusion in the study. Purposive sampling is used in this study.

### 4.3.1 Purposive sampling

Purposive sampling is done in accordance with the researcher's judgement and the purpose of the study (Babbie, 1998:195). In terms of the researcher's judgement school-based educators are the target group (School Managers and CSI educators). The purpose of the study is to gather school-based educators' perceptions on the advocacy of IQMS. To support the statements above, purposive sampling involves making choices about cases or settings according to some pre-specified criteria (Hardy & Bryman, 2004:635). The pre-specified criteria are school-based educators that obviously know about IQMS advocacy. Purposive samples are thus based entirely on the judgement of the researcher, as a sample is composed of elements that contain the most characteristics, representative or typical attributes (De Vos, et al. 2002:207; May 2003:95).
Purposive sampling derives from the emphasis on in-depth understanding. This led to the selection of information-rich cases for in-depth study (Merriam, 1998:61; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:400; Patton, 2002:46). School Managers and CSI educators were selected purposively, with the aim of getting rich information, as the managers and educators know what IQMS is and how it was advocated to them. Purposive sampling is based on the assumption that the researcher wants to discover, understand, gain insight into, and learn as much from the sample as possible (Merriam, 1998:61). The researcher gained insight into and understanding of what school-based educators face in terms of IQMS implementation, discovered how IQMS was advocated, and the challenges faced regarding the implementation phase of IQMS.

4.3.2 Sample size

There are no strict rules on the sample size in qualitative inquiry (Patton, 2002:244). A lack of rules on the sample size makes samples dependent on what the researcher wants to know, what will be useful, and what can be done with the available time and resources (Patton, 2004:244). In this study, the researcher was curious about the perceptions of school-based educators about IQMS advocacy and, with the available time and resources, the researcher preferred to use small samples.

Most authors prefer different sample sizes. Barbour and Kitzinger (1999:8) prefer 8 to 12 participants in a sample. Krueger (1994:6) and Marshall and Rossman (1999:114) prefer sample sizes of between 7 and 10 participants. De Vos, et al. (2002:311) recommend smaller groups of 4 to 6, based on the following:

- Participants having a great deal to share about a topic, or lengthy experiences of the topic under discussion. Smaller samples are manageable, as each participant will be given sufficient time to share his/her experiences on IQMS, as opposed to dealing with larger samples, where time limits may prevent this.
The amount of detail the researcher needs to hear from each participant. The researcher needs to hear rich, descriptive information and small samples serve this purpose.

In this study the researcher chose to use a sample of three to five (3 to 5) participants.

The emphasis on sample size is mainly for in-depth information and understanding (Patton, 2002:46). Groups A, B and C consisted of five participants each. Group D comprised of 3 participants, as two participants did not attend. One was scheduled for the afternoon session, but attended the morning session. He was requested to come back in the afternoon, as scheduled, but never reported back. The fifth participant chose to withdraw. In-depth information and understanding was evident, as the participants provided rich information, leading to a better understanding of IQMS advocacy.

A sample should take cognisance of a common characteristic in participants to create psychological 'comfort' for the group, making it easier for participants to speak their minds (Riley, Wood, Clark, Wilkie & Szivas, 2000:136). School Managers and CSI educators formed the samples and all were free to speak their minds about how they perceive IQMS advocacy in schools.

The following guidelines are used by qualitative researchers to determine the sample size: the purpose and focus of the study, the primary data collection strategy, the availability of informants, the redundancy of information, and peer review or consensus judgement on the sample size (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:404). The purpose and focus of the study is on the perceptions of school-based educators on IQMS advocacy in selected public secondary schools. Focus group interviews were used to collect data. The participants were available in sessions A to D. Information gathered in two of the groups showed
saturation. The research team consulted each other on what should be done with group D and consensus was reached that the three remaining participants be interviewed.

The sample size has been discussed. A discussion on data collection follows.

4.4 COLLECTING DATA

Data will be collected by means of focus group interviews. A focus group interview is a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment (De Vos, et al. 2002:385; Krueger, 1994:6; Litosseliti, 2003:1). Patton, (2002:385) defines a focus group as a small group of people discussing a specific topic. This means that a focus group is a group of people, which is led in discussion on the area of interest by the researcher (who asks questions). The environment where the discussion takes place should be conducive for discussion and be based on issues that affect participants, allowing them to say how they feel and indicate their understanding and perceptions of the topic. The environment was non-threatening, as all the participants were from the same background (De Vos, et al. 2002:310). They were not threatened by, for example, seniority, etc.

The focus group interviews enable participants to be comfortable and to enjoy the discussion, while sharing their ideas and perceptions (Krueger, 1994:6). As focus groups are involved in some kind of collective activity (De Vos, et al. 2002:305; Litosseliti, 2003:2), they feel comfortable in sharing their experiences and perceptions of a topic in group activity. In the focus group, participants have similar levels of understanding and can influence each other by responding to ideas and comments in the discussion (Krueger, 1994:6; Litosseliti, 2003:32). All the participants had similar levels of understanding on IQMS advocacy. Participants in the same group or in other groups supported the various
perceptions. An example of responding to ideas and comments in the discussion was “To add on what was said…” etc.

4.4.1 Historical background of focus group interviews

Early forms of focus group interviewing were developed during World War II by two prominent social scientists, Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert Merton, at Columbia University. The purpose of using focus group interviews was to obtain audience reactions to radio programmes. During the development of focus group interviewing, a small audience listened to radio programmes and indicated their reactions by pressing a red button when they responded negatively. Those listeners who had positive responses were expected to press a green button. The respondents were further asked to discuss their negative and positive reactions after having pressed the green or red button. Lazarsfeld and Merton recognised the potential of this type of interviewing as a form of data collection in social research. In the 1980’s, new interest in the use of small groups of people to discuss a focussed topic emerged (Baker, 1999:224-225).

Focus groups are a data-gathering device that can be used alone or with other methods of data collection. Although it is not certain when focus groups were first used in education, they can be used in social sciences as qualitative or quantitative research methods (Baker, 1999:224; Vaughn, Schumm & Sinagub, 1996:33). Focus group interviews were later used in education to bring an improved depth of understanding (Vaughn, et al. 1996:33) and are used by information seekers such as social scientist, evaluators, planners and educators (Krueger, 1994:8).

4.4.2 Reasons for using focus group interviews

Focus group interviews are used in this study for the following reasons:
To obtain general background information about a topic of interest (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:15). Integrated Quality Management System is a new concept in education, and the researcher intended to obtain general background information on this.

They generate new stimulating ideas and creative concepts (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:15). Participants were excited and interested about IQMS, causing them to talk freely. Some participants produced original ideas on the relevancy of IQMS and its creative implementation.

Focus groups are used to learn how respondents talk about the phenomenon of interest (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:15).

They provided useful information and offered the researcher a number of advantages (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:15). The researcher was informed of more loopholes on IQMS advocacy in selected public secondary schools (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:15).

Focus groups explore people's experiences, opinions, wishes and concerns, which is not possible when using other methods (Litosseliti, 2003:16). During focus group interviews, participants shared their experiences on IQMS and its advocacy, its failures and successes, what they thought it was and what should have been done to make it successful.

They enable the researcher to work with pre-existing groups - people who are already acquainted through living, working and socialising together (Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999:8). The researcher worked with school-based educators, categorising them into School Managers and CSI educators. In the two categories, School Managers and CSI educators knew each other and their views. At times, the School Managers and CSI educators socialise together in teacher union meetings, at educators' memorial services etc. (Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999:8; Litosseliti, 2003:16; Krueger, 1994:14).

Focus groups interviews are used because they fundamentally a way of listening to people and to create lines of communication (De Vos, et al. 2002:306). The researcher had no knowledge of what school-based educators were experiencing in terms of IQMS advocacy. The researcher
listened to participants as they shared these experiences while interviewing them. Lines of communication were created, which were supported by trust and rapport. Possibly, in the end, improvements of the IQMS programmes could become a reality.

- Focus groups are a powerful means of exposing reality and to investigate complex behaviour and motivation (De Vos, et al. 2002:307). Participants indicated how IQMS was advocated to them and said why it caused some educators in particular schools to behave in particular ways e.g. by threatening the DSG. In some instances educators observed in practice rejected peer expertise. Participants stress that when educators observe others in practice, they gain much knowledge and consequently improve their performance.

- Focus groups enabled the researcher to interview several people at the same time (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995:113). During four focus group sessions, the researcher gathered information in each session, which could not have been gathered during one-on-one interviews.

### 4.4.3 Advantages of focus group interviews

Focus group interviews have the following advantages:

Focus groups elicit data from a group of people quicker and at less cost as opposed to one-on-one interviewing (Bickman & Rog, 1998:508; Krueger, 1994:35; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:16). The research guide was used to obtain data quicker, as the participants were all assembled in one place. The focus group interviews were less costly, as the research team (moderator and assistant moderator) did not need to travel to various venues.

When participants are assembled in one venue, it is easier for the researcher to probe and to follow up matters (Krueger, 1994:35; Patton, 2002:372).
groups allow the researcher to interact directly with respondents (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:16; Krueger, 1994:34; Bickman & Rog, 1998:508). The researcher interacted with participants by asking questions to which the latter responded.

Focus groups provide the researcher with the opportunity to obtain large and rich amounts of information in the respondents' own words (Bickman & Rog, 1998:509; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:16). During focus group interviews, participants provided rich data in their own words, based on their feelings, opinions, attitudes and beliefs. The opportunity to obtain rich data assisted the researcher to develop a better understanding of IQMS, how it should have been advocated, and of the challenges faced by participants during the implementation phase of the system. Participants influence others with their comments (Bickman & Rog, 1998:509; Krueger, 1994:11; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:16). In so doing, other participants are also motivated to respond, and thus build upon others' responses. Participants mostly said: “... to add on to what was just said...”

Focus groups are flexible (Bickman & Rog, 1998:509; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:16; Marshall & Rossman, 1999:115), and interviewing can take place in any conducive environment, at a time best suiting the participants and the researcher. They are flexible in that the researcher can explore unanticipated ideas arising from the discussion, e.g. the educators' rejection of the DSG's observing them in practice, stressing a lack of expertise. It was not anticipated that such views existed in the schools. The results of a focus group interview are easy to understand (Bickman & Rog, 1998:509; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:16), as results are descriptive, ensuring that readers understand the research process.

Focus groups help participants to exchange views among themselves and to clarify their individual opinions or behaviour (Morgan, 1993:18). The participants' opinions or behaviour were motivated by inappropriate advocacy, resulting in a
lack of understanding of the IQMS processes. Some schools decided not to implement IQMS, as they did not know how to do this. Focus groups enabled the researcher to increase the sample size of the qualitative studies (Krueger, 1994:36; Marshall & Rossman, 1999:115). The sample size in focus groups can be enlarged if convergence is not reached. Furthermore, by viewing video or audiotape of the group session, many people can view a focus group as it was conducted (Bickman & Rog, 1998:509). In this study, individuals can review an audiotape of the focus group sessions or read the transcriptions thereof.

4.4.4 The strengths of focus group interviews

Focus group interviews have the following strengths:

Focus groups offer participants a safe environment in which they can share ideas, beliefs and attitudes in the company of people from the same socio-economic backgrounds and gender (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000:835). A boardroom on the second level of the community hall, that ensured no disruption or noise from the public, was used as this safe environment. The focus group interviews took place in four sessions, where each session was consisted of either School Managers or CSI educators. These groups were from the same socio-economic backgrounds. The incomes of participants in each category (School Managers or CSI’s) were similar. The participants were all black, male and female school-based educators who meet socially at departmental and union meetings. Participants related their stories in their own words, resulting in the furnishing of first hand information to the researcher on IQMS advocacy (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000:835; Chrzanowska, 2002:24).

Respondents in focus groups enjoy being the focus of attention and feel valued (Chrzanowska, 2002:24) by having been selected to be part of the research study. They enjoyed being the focus of attention as they are treated with respect when directing the research questions to them. Focus group interviews afford
participants the ability to produce concentrated amounts of data on the topic of interest (De Vos, et al. 2002:307). The participants produced rich data on the current IQMS situation, its implementation phase, how the policy was advocated to School Managers and how School Managers advocated the information to educators in schools. In focus groups, participants provide a stimulating and secure setting for everyone to express ideas without fear of criticism (De Vos, et al. 2002:307). When participants were welcomed at the beginning of the focus group interview sessions, they were encouraged to talk freely and to disregard the views of their fellow participants about the statements they make. The participants were also informed that their ideas would not be publicly criticised (De Vos, et al. 2002:307).

Focus groups create a fuller, deeper understanding of the phenomenon being studied (De Vos, et al. 2002:307). During the interview sessions, the researcher came to a fuller, deeper understanding of IQMS as the phenomenon of study. Focus groups draw on three of the fundamental strengths that are shared by all qualitative methods, i.e. exploration and discovery, context and depth and interpretation (De Vos, et al. 2002:307). In terms of exploration and discovery, the researcher explored IQMS advocacy to school-based educators and discovered the loopholes that this advocacy had created. Context and depth allowed the researcher to understand, from the participants' own words, how IQMS took place in the district enabling her to explain this effectively through the participants' experiences.

4.4.5 Limitations of focus group interviews

Focus groups have the following limitations:

The research study was limited to ten schools with the participation of ten School Managers and eight CSI educators and thus limits generalisation to the large population (Bickman & Rog, 1998:509; Litosseliti, 2003:22). Focus group results
may be biased by a very dominant or opinionated member (Bickman & Rog, 1998:509; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:17). In each focus group session, there was one dominant or opinionated member. Dominant means more important, strong or noticeable than anything else of the same type (Gillard, 2003:262-263). In each of the four focus group interview sessions, there was a participant who was more noticeable than the other School Managers or CSI educators. This participant would respond to a question many times more than other participants. Opinionated participants are people who are "certain about what they think and believe, and who express(es) their ideas strongly and often" (Gillard, 2003:871). In all four focus groups, there was an opinionated member who would say that he/she believed that IQMS should have been advocated in this manner or there was no advocacy at all.

In focus groups, the "live" and immediate nature of the interaction may lead a researcher or decision-maker to place greater faith in the findings than is actually warranted (Bickman & Rog, 1998:509; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:17). The idea of the "live" and immediate nature of the interaction among participants, which ranged from adding comments or reacting to someone's idea, cautioned the researcher not to place greater faith in such statements, as in some instances, the examples or context were not related to the research guide.

The open-ended nature of responses obtained in focus groups often makes summarisation and interpretation of results difficult (Bickman & Rog, 1998:510; Krueger, 1994:36; Marshall & Rossman, 1999:115; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:17). In each of the four focus group interview sessions, a participant’s response filled a quarter, half a page or more, resulting in the researcher having difficulty in terms of summarising and interpretation. Such open-ended responses require that a researcher possess good listening skills, as participants know more about the phenomenon under study, than the researcher (Crabtree & Miller, 1999:119: Rubin & Rubin, 1995:17).
The moderator may bias the results by knowingly providing cues about what types of responses and answers are desirable (Bickman & Rog, 1998:510; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:17). A cue is a signal for someone to do something (Gillard, 2003:296). The researcher will analyse participants’ responses on IQMS. In this study the focus group interviews are limited by the words or behaviour of participants during the session, as in some instances, some participants predicted what would happen e.g. inappropriate advocacy would lead to failure in IQMS implementation. In focus groups, participant’s responses are limited to the available response time given to an individual (Patton, 2002:386). In most cases, the researcher said: "Do you still have something to say?" to ensure that all participants had the opportunity to say something about the current matter.

Participants who believe that they hold minority views may not be inclined to speak up, thereby eliciting possible negative reaction from other participants (Patton, 2002:387). Dominant or opinionated participants limit focus groups and some participants may not be willing to speak their minds. In this study, participants with minority views would support others' responses quietly and sometimes unclearly.

Confidentiality cannot be assured in focus groups (Patton, 2002:387). In this study, some participants mentioned places where advocacy took place, and provided names of important figures in the district that made announcements during advocacy meetings. Some readers in Giyani, could associate some statements with a specific School Manager. References to department officials could identify officials who made announcements at district level.

Focus groups take place outside the natural settings where social interaction normally occurs (Patton, 2002:387). Focus groups are limited by arranging for them to take place in a neutral venue, where participants will be comfortable to express themselves, instead of at their respective schools, where IQMS is practiced. In this study, the four focus group sessions took place in the
Community Hall Boardroom, where it was thought the environment would be conducive for open conversation (Krueger, 1994:37). During focus group interviews, the interviewer has limited control over a group, which may result in lost time as irrelevant matters may be discussed (Krueger, 1994:36; Marshall & Rossman, 1999:115). In all four focus group interview sessions, there were dominant or opinionated members who talked for long periods without stating clearly what their focus was, discussed irrelevant matters and thus wasted time. This time should have been used for repeating important and relevant issues related to advocacy and IQMS.

Focus groups can vary considerably (Krueger, 1994:36) and this was also the case with the four focus groups of this study. During the first two sessions held in the morning, participants were more enthusiastic to share their thought about IQMS advocacy. During the two other sessions, on different days, but held at the same times, the participants lacked energy and were unwilling to discuss IQMS advocacy. This may have been because the participants were tired after work.

Focus group participants are difficult to assemble (Krueger, 1994:37). In this study, the first scheduled interview sessions for School Managers had to be postponed, as they had to make submissions and corrections to the circuit office. This commitment of the School Managers proved that participants for focus group interviews are difficult to assemble at a venue, at a specific time.

The limitations of focus groups were discussed. This is now followed by a discussion of the number of focus groups to be held in a qualitative research study.
4.4.6 The number of focus groups to be held in a qualitative research study

Crabtree and Miller, (1999:118) state that a minimum of four to five (4 to 5) focus groups are required to reach saturation. *Saturation* is derived from the term *saturate*, which means a state where no more can be added (Gillard, 2003:1108). When using a minimum of four to five focus groups, the participants are expected to reach a point where no new information is given. It is possible that facts from the first sessions may be repeated. De Vos, et al. (2002:312) emphasise that the more diverse the responses, the more groups will be needed for the researcher to understand what people are saying. More focus groups should be added if found that there are different ideas on, or responses to, a topic. What is important is that a saturation point is reached. Vaughn, et al. (1996:49) emphasise redundancy, and this requires two to four focus groups. They further stress that a lack of convergence on the theme may require that additional focus groups sessions be conducted.

De Vos, et al. (2002:312) state that if the discussion reaches saturation and becomes repetitive after two or three groups, there is little to be gained by increasing the number of groups. When saturation is reached, further focus group sessions can therefore be cancelled. De Vos, et al (2002:312) further emphasise that the number of groups in a research study is determined by the goal of the study and to provide a trustworthy answer to the research question, coupled with data richness.

Although there are varying views of authors on the number of focus groups to be conducted, the researcher felt that four focus groups would be sufficient to reach a saturation point.
4.4.7 Time required to conduct a focus group interview

Crabtree and Miller (1999:118) stress that a focus group session needs to be from 1 to 2 hours long. Vaughn, et al. (1996:49) feel that focus group interviews should last for 1½ to 2 hours. Judging from the two statements, a focus group interview can last for one to two hours. In this study, the focus group sessions took from 45 minutes to an hour. The duration of a focus group session is dependent on the type of participants that a researcher has available. As participants differ, the duration for focus group interviews will also differ. The participants of one focus group preferred to move quickly to the next research question as an indication that they had other commitments. The sessions of focus groups A and C flowed well naturally, and took longer, while the sessions of groups B and D took less than an hour.

4.5 THE GROUP FACILITATION OR MODERATION TEAM

De Vos, et al. (2002:313) state that it may be useful to consider a facilitation team consisting of a facilitator and the assistant facilitator. De Vos, et al. (2002:313) indicate that the group facilitator is also known as a moderator, the term used in this study. The moderating team consists of the moderator and one or more assistant moderators. The moderator and assistant moderator/s must possess specific qualities and perform different roles during focus group sessions. A person in the process of completing a master’s degree was formally requested to act an assistant moderator (See Annexure J). The moderator and assistant moderator/s must possess specific qualities to perform different roles during focus group sessions.

In this study, the moderating team possessed the following qualities and skills. The team believed that participants have valuable wisdom, no matter what their level of education, experience, or background (Krueger, 1998:3 - Kit 4). The relationship between the participants and the moderating team was characterised by mutual respect and trust because of their wisdom, and the participants provided the moderating team with the rich data that they needed. The
moderating team also possessed listening skills (De Vos, et al. 2002:313), enabling the team to listen to participants effectively, noting their nods and facial expressions. The research team had verbal and written communication skills (De Vos, et al. 2002:313). The team communicated with participants verbally on their arrival, during the focus group interview sessions and after the process. The team also communicated with the participants in writing when they had completed their registration and consent forms.

The moderating team had adequate background knowledge of the topic under study (De Vos, et al. 2002:313). This knowledge of IQMS enabled the moderator to probe and follow up on critical areas of concern. The assistant moderator also made notes on critical areas of concern to be in a position to debrief the participants and the moderator after each focus group interview session. Finally, the moderating team were self-disciplined in controlling their personal views (De Vos, et al. 2002:313; Krueger, 1998:6 - Kit 4). As researchers, the moderating team needed to gather data by means of the perceptions and understanding of the participants on IQMS advocacy. The research team’s personal views are not given, as they were not participants (Krueger, 1998:5 - Kit 4).

Besides the skills and qualities that the moderating team should possess, they have different roles to play before, during and after the focus group interviews.

4.5.1 The roles of the moderator

The moderator should ensure that a non-threatening and non-evaluative environment exists in which participants are able to express themselves freely, (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:87). When such an environment is created, participants will express themselves, in spite of what other participants think of their views. In this study, a non-threatening and non-evaluative environment was created and participants freely expressed their perceptions, feelings and beliefs on how IQMS should have been advocated. The moderator is primarily
concerned with directing the discussion and keeping the conversation flowing (De Vos, et al. 2002:313; Bickman & Rog, 1998:513). In this study, the moderator struck a balance between what was important to participants and what was important to the moderator (Bickman & Rog, 1998:514). While the moderator listened attentively, a participant would often express a concern on IQMS advocacy and predict that it would fail. Considering what was important to the researcher, the moderator probed further to obtain clear understanding of what the participants were trying to say.

4.5.2 The roles of the assistant moderator

In terms of the letter directed to the assistant moderator (see Annexure J) his duties would be as follows:

- **To scan the environment.**
  The assistant moderator scanned the environment (the boardroom where the focus group interviews were to take place) to ensure that the room was clean, the lights were working, etc. (Vaughn, et al. 1996:52; De Vos, et al. 2002:313).

- **To set up and test the recording equipment**
  The assistant moderator set up and tested the recording equipment (De Vos, et al. 2002:313; Krueger, 1994: 124 & 125). Three tape recorders were used. Two recorders were battery operated and one tape recorder used electricity. The duty of the assistant moderator was to ensure that the recording equipment worked, that spare batteries, blank tapes, extension cords and microphones were available and to act as operator/recorder (De Vos, et al. 2002:313). He also verified that the tapes were effective and that recording levels were correct by also requesting assistance from others in this regard.
• **To deal with environmental conditions and logistics**

The assistant moderator dealt with environmental conditions and logistics (De Vos, et al. 2002:313) by welcoming participants as they arrived and handing out registration and consent forms for them to complete. Thereafter he collected the forms and ensured that all of them had been returned. He also assisted participants to complete the forms properly.

• **To take comprehensive notes during the focus group interview sessions**

The assistant moderator took comprehensive notes during the focus group interview sessions (De Vos, et al. 2002:313; Krueger, 1994:125). He sat in a designated area, away from the participants' table, where he also controlled the tape recorders. His notes were used to briefly summarise the main points of view and to confirm with the participants whether his perceptions were accurate. He did this after each focus group interview session.

• **To lead during debriefing sessions**

The assistant moderator led discussions during debriefing sessions with the moderator (De Vos, et al. 2002:313; Krueger, 1994:125) and the debriefing sessions with the participants. This was to discuss which questions worked well and those did not. The participants did not understand questions 5 and 6 clearly. After discussion with the evaluating team, agreement was reached to rephrase questions 5 and 6 as follows:

- What do you think will make IQMS successful and why?
- What do you think will make IQMS unsuccessful and why?

The main aim of debriefing (moderators) is to stand back and assess how the interview went, and to take of what worked well, what did not work and where there is a scope for improvement (Arksey & Knight, 1999:107; De Vos, et al. 2002:317). After checking/assessing how the interview went, the moderating team, in consultation with the evaluating team, agreed to reframe questions 5
and 6 as participants' responses needed to be improved in the subsequent focus group interviews. These changes were implemented after focus group interview A.

The moderators responded to the following questions in the debriefing sessions in accordance with Krueger (1998:50 - Kit 6).

- **What are the most important themes or ideas discussed?**
- **How did these differ from what is expected?**
- **How did these differ from what occurred in earlier focus groups?**
- **What points need to be included in the report?**
- **Were there any unexpected or anticipated findings?**
- **Should we do anything differently from the next groups?**

- **To take responsibility for refreshments.** The assistant moderator took responsibility for refreshments (Krueger, 1994:124; Vaughn, et al. 1996:71) and ensured that snacks and water were available before the focus group interviews started.

- **To read and provide feedback on the analysis.** The assistant moderator's roles did not end in the focus group interview sessions. His duties continued to the end of the research. He read and provided honest feedback on data analysis where corrections and/or additions were made (Krueger, 1994: 125).

Besides the moderating team's efforts during this research, the evaluation team also had a role to play.

### 4.5.3 The evaluation team

In this study, the researcher requested two experienced interviewers (one with a doctorate and the second who was busy with his doctorate) to critically evaluate
the interviewing skills of the researcher in accordance with Arksey and Knight, (1999:108). Letters were written to the evaluating team (See Annexure K). The team used the following guidelines throughout the focus group interview sessions:

- How well is the interview schedule or guide working?
- Is the interview taking too long?
- Does the interviewee understand the questions?
- Which questions work? Which questions fail?
- Do you miss areas where you could probe for more detailed information or examples?
- Do you miss areas where you could ask follow-up questions?
- Do you talk too much instead of listening?
- Do you build up good relationships with the interviewees?
- Is there anything to indicate that you are gaining people's trust and confidence?
- Are you able to encourage interviewees to talk freely and openly with you?
- Do you feel that you leave interviewers in a relaxed and untroubled condition?

The evaluating team is expected to give honest feedback to improve the researcher's interviewing skills during the subsequent three focus group interviews. The evaluating team's response is recorded in Annexure L. It was agreed with the supervisor that only one response from an evaluator with a doctorate be recorded (See Annexure L).

4.6 PLANNING AND MANAGING FOCUS GROUPS

Planning involves the following processes: recruiting, conducting the focus group interview, analysing and reporting (De Vos, et al. 2002:309). When planning for focus groups, the researcher should first get approval from the relevant
When approval is granted from the relevant authorities, participants are recruited.

**4.6.1 Recruitment of participants for focus group interviews**

Recruiting participants is said to be a difficult and time-consuming process, depending on the topic and the targeted group (Litosseliti, 2003:37). The term *recruitment* is derived from the word *recruit*, which means to persuade someone to become a new member of an organisation (Gillard, 2003:1043). If one *persuades*, one talks to someone, giving a good reason to believe what he/she is being told (Gillard, 2003:926). This means that when the researcher recruited participants, they were convinced by her to participate as members of the organisation, i.e. the research study. As was indicated earlier, recruiting is time-consuming, as one has to decide who should be invited and what the purpose of the study is (De Vos, et al. 2002:310). The researcher required access to information on all of the secondary schools in the district, ascertain the number of schools per circuit, and the School Managers who would be willing to participate. The research topic was: *The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of IQMS in selected public secondary schools.* This implied that...
School Managers and CSI educators had to be selected. The purpose of the study was to gather their perceptions on the advocacy of IQMS in schools.

The following processes took place when recruiting participants for this study:

- Letters were written to School Managers to negotiate access to their schools.
- Letters were written to School Managers, providing feedback on approval obtained from higher authorities for access to their schools.
- Letters were written to School Managers, requesting them to participate in this study.
- Letters were written to School Managers, requesting them to select a CSI educator to participate willingly in the research study.
- Letters were written to School Managers and CSI educators, inviting them to attend focus group interview sessions.
- Letters were written to School Managers and CSI educators, confirming the dates, times and venue of the focus group interviews (see Annexure N).

Writing letters to participants indicated that the researcher was sincere with her request and appreciated their involvement and input in the research study (Litosseliti, 2003:38). In recruiting participants, homogeneity was considered (De Vos, et al. 2002:310). Homogeneity is derived from the term homogeneous, which means consisting of people who are similar to each other or are of the same type (Gillard, 2003:602). Participants in this research study were school-based educators, who were categorised into School Managers and CSI educators. They are of the same type as they are all educators who are based in schools.

A three-step strategy for recruitment was followed in this study:
• *Two weeks* before the actual group session, the researcher contacted the participants by formally inviting them to a common venue for focus group interview sessions.

• *One week* before the focus group interview, the participants received letters confirming the dates, times and venue of the focus group interviews.

• *On the day* of the focus group interview sessions, the researcher telephoned each participant (De Vos, et al. 2002:310) to remind them of the time at which the focus group interview sessions would take place. At this stage the researcher ensured that the participants did not forget to attend the sessions.

4.6.2 Conducting focus group interviews

4.6.2.1 The logistics of conducting focus group interviews

The five factors that influence an interview session and need to be considered are:

• The duration of a session. It was indicated that the sessions would be at least two hours long (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:449).

• The number of interviews required to obtain data. Four focus group interviews were scheduled (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:449).

• The setting or location of the interview. The community hall boardroom was reserved as a venue to conduct the four focus group interviews (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:449).
Interviews should be held in a comfortable, non-threatening setting where participants are free from interruption (Baker, 1999:227; De Vos, et al. 2002:316; Patton, 2002: 386; Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999:11). Such an environment could be a community centre (Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999:11), with which the participants are familiar, as they usually meet there to hold union meetings, memorial services for educators or to attend other functions. It should be a neutral venue that is easy to find and in which participants feel comfortable and relaxed (Morgan, 1993:68).

The community hall boardroom is situated close to where most participants live and it is well lit. There is adequate free parking (Vaughn, et al. 1996:53). The room was hot and an electric fan was switched on to ensure that the room remained cool. Some artificial flowers were arranged to make the room attractive. Tables were arranged for participants to sit around. A comfortable distance between the participants and the researcher was ensured for eye contact and to create an atmosphere of equality and informality (Litosseliti, 2003:48).

The seating arrangement created a protection barrier between participants. Participants feel safe when sitting around a table, which establishes a sense of territoriality and personal space. The heat dictated that there be a comfortable space between the participants during the focus group sessions. Participants could rest their arms on a table (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:87).

There were three tables, a discussion table, a refreshments table and a registration table. The participants received their registration forms at the registration table and then sat down at the discussion table to fill these in. A discussion table was where the focus group interviews were to be conducted. Snacks and water were placed on a refreshments’ table that was situated in a corner of the room. Drinking water was also provided on the discussion table.
Chairs were arranged around the table. The recording equipment was checked to ensure it was working (Denscombe, 2003:173; Krueger, 1998:13 - Kit 4; De Vos, et al. 2002:16; Vaughn, et al. 1996:52).

The identities and presence of the individuals involved in the session was checked (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:449). When participants arrived for the focus group interviews, they were checked to the school that they came from against a list (the name of schools) that the research team had obtained. The information styles or communication mores of the interviewees were also checked (McMillan, 2001:449). Mores refers to the traditional customs and ways of behaving that are typical to a particular (part of) society e.g. middle class mores, (Gillard, 2003:806). As most of the participants were Tsonga speaking, and some Venda-speaking, this prescribed that information be conveyed in Xitsonga and in Tshivenda. As professionals, however, it was agreed that communication be in English.

4.6.2.2 The interview guide

The interview guide or schedule is a list of questions that the researcher intends to ask during an interview (Arksey & Knight, 1999:97; Merriam, 1998:81; Litosseliti, 2003:55). The researcher had an interview guide, in which questions to be asked during the focus group interview sessions had been written down in advance. The funnel approach in the interview guide was used (Litosseliti, 2003:59; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:76). Closed or general questions were followed by open-ended questions. Although such questions limit the participants’ answer options, the purpose of starting the interview with closed or general questions was to encourage them to talk freely about IQMS, (Litosseliti, 2003:63). The first two questions and question 4 aimed at assisting participants to recall what IQMS is and to make it easier for them to answer (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:76). The other questions were open-ended, aimed at giving the participants the freedom to choose what to say, how much to say, and how to
say it (Litosseliti, 2003:63). This interview guide was changed because of a lack of understanding among participants during focus group A of questions 5 and 6 (Bickman & Rog, 1998:513). The questions were framed as:

- *What do you think will work?*
- *What do you think will not work and why?*

The following is an interview guide that was used during the second, third and fourth focus group interview sessions:

- *When did you first hear about IQMS?*
- *What were the sources of information?*
- *What was your immediate reaction to the news?*
- *Did you read the IQMS document?*
- *What do you think will make IQMS successful and why?*
- *What do you think will make IQMS unsuccessful and why?*
- *How would you have liked to be informed about IQMS?*

4.6.2.3 The introductory and development phases of focus group interviews

The moderator created an atmosphere of trust and openness at the beginning, by putting the participants at ease by greeting them and sharing general issues. He requested each group of participants to formulate ground rules to govern participants during the discussions. The ground rules agreed on were to switch off cell phones and to give each participant the chance to speak without interruption. These ground rules were applied in all four focus group interview sessions. Participants were requested to ensure that they had completed the registration and consent forms. The information requested during registration was not to be discussed during the focus group interview sessions (Krueger, 1998:15 - 17 -Kit 4).
The researcher stated the following: "The aim of this research is to gather the perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of IQMS. The researcher's interest began when IQMS was not implemented in accordance with the scheduled timeframes. I am encouraging you to talk freely since your views will not be openly criticised. I am still assuring confidentiality that your identities will remain anonymous as per the university's ethical standards" (Crabtree & Miller, 1999:121; May, 2003:125; Denscombe, 2003:179).

“You are here because you are purposefully sampled. Your views are acceptable, and you should not worry about how the moderating team and other participants think about your responses. Each participant is expected to speak at a time. Lastly, may I be granted permission to audio-tape your responses?” (Arksey & Knight, 1999: 102). “The purpose of audio-taping your responses is that your responses will be transcribed and those transcriptions will form a basis for data analysis. You are also given opportunities to ask questions”.

The participants asked questions before the focus group session started and later granted the researcher permission to audio-tape their responses (Rubin & Rubin, 1995:127). The researcher requested the participants to introduce themselves and to say something about what they did for a living (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:92-93; Krueger, 1998:21 - Kit 4; Denscombe, 2003:179; Baker, 1999:228).

The research questions used were:

- When did you first hear about IQMS?
- What were the sources of information?
- What was your immediate reaction to the news?
- Did you read the IQMS document?
- What do you think will make IQMS successful and why?
• What do you think will make IQMS unsuccessful and why?
• How would you have liked to be informed about IQMS?

During this phase, the moderator listened and made effective eye contact. (Denscombe, 2003:173), while the assistant moderator considered non-verbal communication (Arksey & Knight, 1999:102). In accordance with the interview guide, the researcher encouraged all participants to say more.

The introductory and development phases of the focus group interview have been discussed. A discussion on closing the focus group interview now follows.

4.6.2.4 Bringing the focus group interview to closure

In this phase, the moderator posed the questions: “Do you think we said everything about IQMS? Do you still have something to say?” (Krueger, 1998:31- Kit 4). The researcher, observing that the participants were very quiet and not willing comment, added: “Thank you very much to have been participants in this research study. Thank you very much.” The tape recorders were operational until the last "thank you" (Keats, 2000:26).

4.6.2.5 What happens after the focus groups?

(i) After switching off the tape recorders, the assistant moderator debriefed with the participants and summarised what had transpired during the focus group interviews and to confirm his observations.

(ii) After the participants had left, the assistant moderator debriefed with the moderator to confirm whether the interview guide had worked, and to suggest improvements.
(iii) The researcher wrote letters to all participants, thanking them for their participation in the research study (See Annexure O).

(iv) The researcher thanked the assistant moderator and the evaluating team for agreeing to work with her during the focus group interviews.

4.6.2.6 The types of questions that were used during the central core of the focus group interview

An interview consists of three types of questions, the main questions, probes and follow-up questions (Gillham, 2000:46 - 49; Rubin & Rubin, 1995:145-151).

- Main questions

These questions are referred to in the interview guide and are questions that lead the discussion, for example: “When did you first hear about IQMS?” The main questions are written down and asked exactly as worded (Hult, 1996:69).

- Probes

These are supplementary questions that the researcher used to glean more information from the participants for them to expand on their initial responses or parts thereof. The purpose of probing is to increase the richness and depth of responses desired by the researcher (Patton, 2002:372). Probes are detail-orientated questions that require detailed explanation, e.g. “What do you think the Department should do to ensure that IQMS is implemented successfully in schools?”

Probes specify the level of depth of information that the researcher requires, e.g. “Can you tell me more about your last response?” Probes asked the participants to complete the particular answer given, e.g. “Can you add more information to
your response before we give the next participant a chance?” Probes indicate to participants that the researcher has paid attention to their responses, e.g. “I heard you saying. Can you tell us more? (Rubin & Rubin, 1995:148). Finally, the researcher probed unclear or incomplete responses. For example, when participants remarked that “the people who advocated IQMS were not clear about what they were doing,” the researcher could then probe further by asking: “What do you mean when you say they were not clear?”

- Follow-up questions

Follow-up questions are used when a narrative or example was left incomplete (Rubin & Rubin, 1995:157). An example where a follow-up question were used was when a participant said: “You know”. The researcher could react by asking: “Can you elaborate on the example you gave us?”

4.7 AUDIO-TAPING

All focus group interviews must be recorded as they provide richer access to the discussion. Audio-taping is the most popular method of recording qualitative interviews (Arksey & Knight, 1999:105; Barbour & Kitzinger, 1995:15). McMillan and Schumacher, (2001:450), state that tape recording the interview ensures completeness of the verbal interaction and provides material for validity checks. Audio-taping is important as it provides evidence that the interviews took place in accordance with the research topic. When audio-taping, it was ensured that the tapes were long enough to cover the planned duration of the interview sessions, without the need to place a fresh tape in the recorder (Denscombe, 2003:177). Finally, recorded data can be edited (May, 2003:139; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:450).
4.7.1 Advantages of audio-taping

Audio-tape provides a permanent record that has captured all conversation verbatim, as well as the volume and tone of the voices of the speakers, emphasis, pauses, inflections, etc. By listening to the tapes, the researcher was able to concentrate on what participants said. As their conversations were being recorded, the participants realised that their responses were being treated seriously (Arksey & Knight, 1999:105). The audio-tapes provided an accurate and reliable record of participant interaction (Hardy & Bryman, 2004:592). The taped information is reliable as it is based on the participants’ experiences, feelings and attitudes and is accurate in terms of how information was relayed during the focus group interviews.

4.7.2 The disadvantages of audio-taping

Audio-taping has the following disadvantages:

The transcription of audio-tapes can be a lengthy process and a thirty-minute to one-hour recorded tape can take many hours to transcribe. This challenged the researcher, as participants sometimes respond in lower voice tones and tapes needed to be re-winded and listened to repeatedly to be correctly understood (Arksey & Knight, 1999:105; Denscombe, 2003:183).

4.8 TRANSCRIPTION OF FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW DATA

Transcription forms part of the organisation and management of data and is the reproduction of a written record of the interview. It is recommended that "bad" language be edited out (Arksey & Knight, 1999:141; May, 2003:139). The researcher transcribed the tapes, as she was present during the focus group interview sessions (Barbour & Kitzinger, 1999:15). This enabled her assisted to familiarise herself with the data (May, 2003:139). When analysing data, it is
quicker to group specific patterns, as opposed to someone transcribing the data. All the tapes are transcribed verbatim (Crabtree & Miller, 1999:121; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:409). The transcribed data is a record of what transpired at a specific venue and this forms the basis for data analysis. Other researchers will have access to these transcriptions (Edenborough, 2002:109).

The transcription of focus group interview data has been discussed and will now be followed by a discussion on the analysis of data.

4.9 DATA ANALYSIS

4.9.1 Introduction

The collected and transcribed data from the four focus group interviews formed the basis for data analysis in this research (Arksey & Knight, 1999:49; Marshall & Rossman, 1999:151). Qualitative data analysis is the process of bringing order and structure to the mass of collected data for interpretation (Marshall & Rossman, 1999:150). Data analysis in this study is ordered by checking for patterns to structure this data and to make interpretation thereof possible. Hardy and Bryman (2004:4) emphasise that data analysis will always involve reduction of all data collected in order for statements to be provided about this data. Analysis therefore implies the reduction of volumes of data, where statements can be provided based on the collected data.

The following aspects were considered in this research when data was analysed:

- The aim of analysis was to identify repeating trends and patterns within a single focus group, as well as among all the focus groups. Trends and patterns that repeated themselves in the transcript of focus group A, were compared with patterns in transcripts of groups B, C and D.
- During focus groups (A-D) tape recordings were used for data analysis.
• Words spoken by the participants, the contexts in which the words were spoken, internal consistency and the frequency of comments were considered, for comparison to the words of other participants (De Vos, et al. 2002:318).

4.9.2 Data management

Data management involves using a system to retrieve data sets (field notes and interview transcripts (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:482). Hardy and Bryman, (2004:533) state that data management is the operation required for a systematic, coherent process of data collection, storage and retrieval. In this study, two approaches will be used as systems to retrieve data sets from focus group interviews, i.e. the cut-and-paste and file card techniques (Bickman & Rog, 1998:515; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:483; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:104). Data will be managed manually. The master copies from the four focus group interviews will be stored in a safe place. Photocopies of the master copies will be used during intensive analysis and report writing (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:483; Merriam, 1998:165). Coding will be done, where the type of data, source of data and page numbers are considered e.g., for School Managers' data, focus group A, page 1, will be coded. (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:127). (See Annexure A).

The researcher will use the following steps to prepare data for analysis:

Step 1: Organise and prepare the data for analysis

The researcher transcribed the data obtained from the four focus groups and arranged per focus group A-D. Focus groups A and B consisted of School Managers and focus groups C-D of CSI educators (Creswell, 2003:191).
Step 2: **Read through all the data**

The researcher read all the transcripts to obtain a general sense of the information to reflect on its overall meaning. The questions that the researcher asks are:

- What general ideas are participants bringing forth?
- What is the tone of these ideas?
- What is the general impression of the overall depth, credibility, and use of information? (Creswell, 2003:191).

Step 3: **Begin detailed analysis with a coding process**

Creswell (2003:192) states that coding is the process of organising the material into "chunks" before bringing meaning to those "chunks". **Chunk** means a part of something, particularly a large part (Gillard, 2003:208). This means that the researcher starts to sort data as a whole. Categories are identified, based on the actual language used by the participants (Creswell, 2003:192; Tesch, 1990:121).

In accordance with Creswell, 2003:192-193), coding will be guided by the following:

- Get a sense of the whole. The researcher read all the four focus group interview transcripts to get a sense of the whole and wrote down some ideas as they came to mind (Creswell, 2003:192).

- Pick one document of a transcript. The researcher took one transcript and read it, asking the following question: **What is it about?** At this stage, the researcher does not consider the importance of the information, but the meaning thereof. The thoughts that came to the researcher's mind were written in the margin.
A margin is an empty space on the side of the text of a page, sometimes separated from the rest of the page by a vertical line.

- **Make a list of all topics.** The researcher clustered similar topics. Columns were made, where they were categorised into major topics, unique topics and leftovers (Creswell, 2003:192).

- **Take a list and go back to the data.** The researcher abbreviated the topics as codes and wrote these codes next to the appropriate segments of text. The researcher listed data if categories and code emerged (Creswell, 2003:192).

- **Find the most descriptive wording for your topics and turn them into categories.** During this stage, the researcher sought ways to reduce the list of categories by grouping related topics (Creswell, 2003:192).

- **Make a final decision on the abbreviation for each category and alphabetise these codes.** The researcher made a final decision on the abbreviations for each category and alphabetised these codes. (Creswell, 2003:192).

- **Assemble the data material of each category in one place and perform a preliminary analysis.** The researcher grouped data material that belonged to each category and analysed this before actual data analysis (Creswell, 2003:192).

- **If necessary, the existing data should be re-coded.** The researcher re-coded the data to ensure that similar topics appear in one category (Creswell, 2003:192).
Step 4: **Use the coding process to generate a description of the setting or people, categories or themes for analysis.**

The researcher used coding to generate a small number of themes or categories (Creswell, 2003:194). The generated themes are those that appear as major findings in a qualitative study. Diverse quotations and specific evidence will support these findings (Creswell, 2003:194). Transcripts from interviews with school managers, groups A and B, and with CS1 Educators, groups C and D, are marked at the top (of the pages), indicating the dates on which the interviews took place.

Step 5: **Advance how the descriptions and themes will be represented in the qualitative narrative.**

Creswell, (2003:194) stresses that the most popular approach is to use a narrative passage to convey the findings of the analysis. A discussion of events will be in chronological order.

Step 6: **Interpretation or meaning of the data.**

In this step, the researcher asked this question: *What were the lessons learned?* The lessons learnt might be based on the researcher’s personal interpretation that has been brought to the study from her culture, history and experiences. Interpretation in qualitative research can take on many forms, be adapted to different types of designs and can convey personal, research-based and action meanings (Creswell, 2003:194-195).
The steps that assist in preparing data for analysis have been discussed. What follows is a discussion of a method that will go hand in hand with these steps, i.e. the *cut-and-paste* technique.

### 4.9.3 Cut-and-paste technique

This approach is a quick and cost-effective method for analysing transcripts from the focus group interviews. The researcher went through the four transcripts, and identified the sections that are relevant to the research questions. Topics were identified, as well as the materials that are related to the identified topics. Different topics within the texts were marked by symbols (colour coded brackets). The coded material could be phrases, sentences or long exchanges between individual participants. The material (coded) was relevant to the particular category with which it has been identified. After completing the coding process, the coded transcript was cut-and-pasted onto charts. The researcher's supervisor checked how the coding and cutting and pasting were done. The assistant moderator and those who had evaluated the researcher's evaluating skills also reviewed the cutting and pasting technique (Bickman & Rog, 1998:515; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:483; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:104-105; Tesch, 1990:128).

The cut-and-paste approach has been discussed and is now followed by a discussion of the file card technique.

### 4.9.4 The file card technique

This is an indexing system to locate topics within the entire data bank. Indexing is a word list that indicates how words appear in a text as well as their position (Hardy & Bryman, 2004:530; Miles & Huberman, 1994:45). The manner in which words appear in a text and where they appear in a text, play important roles in
indexing. In the file card technique, the following methods of identification of categories are:

- the document (or source), e.g. focus group A (with School Managers);
- the page (all pages were numbered, see transcripts); and
- the lines, also numbered (see the transcripts) (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:483).

The cut-and-paste and the file card techniques will be combined with constant comparative analysis.

**4.9.5 Constant comparative analysis**

The constant comparative analysis was developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) who described the process of progressive category, clarification and definition (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:126; Tesch, 1990:86). Glaser and Strauss developed constant comparative analysis as a means to develop the grounded theory (Merriam, 1994:156). The basic strategy in constant comparative method is to constantly compare (Merriam, 1994:159). In constant comparative analysis, categories are identified and the researcher clarifies and defines them, thereby developing grounded theory. The researcher starts with a particular incident from an interview transcript and compares it with another incident in the same data or in another set of data (Merriam, 1994:159). This means that the manner in which participants responded to a question in focus group interview A, question three, can be compared with participants’ responses in focus group interview B, question three.
4.10 TRUSTWORTHINESS

The terms that are used interchangeably with trustworthiness are dependability and auditability (Merriam, 1998:206; Miles & Huberman, 1994:278). Trustworthiness asks the following questions:

- **To what extent can we place confidence in the outcomes of the study?**
- **Do we believe what the researcher has reported?** (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:145).

For readers to place confidence in the outcomes of the study, to believe what the researcher has reported, the purpose of the study, how participants were sampled, the specific people and or settings studied, data collection and analysis procedures, were detailed in chapter one. The findings will be detailed as guidelines in chapter six (Denscombe, 2003:233; Maykut & Morehouse, 1998:145). Trustworthiness also answers the question: *If someone else did the research, would he or she have obtained the same results and arrived at the same conclusions?* (Denscombe, 2003:233; Merriam, 1998:205). If someone did sample the participants in the area where this study was undertaken, the findings would be the same, and the same conclusions would have been arrived at. The School Manager and CSI educators that were interviewed are all school-based and know what advocacy is, they have experience on how advocacy training took place, and know what is happening during the implementation phase.

Besides reviewing the aims and purpose of this research study and how the research was undertaken, other factors that demonstrate the trustworthiness of the research data were considered as follows:
4.10.1 Realising the limitations of the research study

This study was limited to ten School Managers and eight CSI educators. These participants were further limited to four circuits in the district. Two participants in focus group D withdrew from the study. Finally, one data collection method was used - the focus group interview - instead of using multiple methods of data collection such as interviews, observation and document analysis, which lend credibility to the findings (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:146).

4.10.2 Building an audit trail

An audit trail provides proof of the manner in which the researcher undertook the study. The interview transcripts and the cut-and-paste method of data analysis, and the use of a constant comparative method of data analysis, serve as an audit trail so that readers can understand the path that the researcher followed and judged the trustworthiness of the research outcomes (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:146).

4.10.3 Working with a research team

Working with others increased the trustworthiness of this study. An assistant moderator, whose roles were detailed in Chapter Four, was present. Among others, he scanned the environment where focus group interviews were to take place, ensuring that the tape recorders were working, and debriefed the participants and the moderator (researcher). Evaluators evaluated the researcher's interviewing skills. Their report appears in Annexure L. The assistant moderator's role concludes with comments on the analysed data, where corrections and additions could be made. An evaluator who evaluated the researcher's interviewing skills, and the assistant moderator, acted as peer debriefers, where they commented honestly. These members of the research
team reviewed the audit trail and raised questions about the researcher’s bias and helped in increasing the credibility of this research study (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:146).

4.10.4 Member checks

The researcher did member checking. Through this process, the researcher approaches the participants in an informal situation to confirm the meaning of their comments (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:409). In some instances, member checks were done telephonically, asking participants whether their experiences were accurately described (Glesne, 1999:152; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:147). In this manner, the participants commented honestly, thus assisting the researcher to take note of:

• whether the researcher reflected their perspectives;
• ensuring that something was not overlooked;
• that, if published, sections could be a problem for either personal or political reasons;
• the development of new ideas and interpretations, after considering their comments; and
• updating participants of the outcomes of the study (Glesne, 1999:152; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:152).

4.11 CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed research design, that is, the use of a qualitative research, data collection and the use of focus groups. Data analysis was by means of the cut-and-paste, file card and constant comparative methods. Trustworthiness of data was discussed to increase the research’s credibility.
CHAPTER FIVE

DATA ANALYSIS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains an analysis of the data that was gathered by means of focus group interviews. The interviews were held with School Managers and CSI educators. Details on these interviews were elaborated on in Chapter Four. These focus groups were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim (see Annexure A). In this chapter, verbatim quotations will be used to illustrate the perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of IQMS in selected public secondary schools.

5.2 DISCUSSION AND SYNTHESIS OF RESULTS

The results of this study are based on the cut-and-paste technique, which was coupled with the constant comparative method. The researcher found that the IQMS has process and content. These two parts each have sub-categories. The following references will be made throughout this chapter:

- Lines as line(s)
- Page number will be P
- Groups A - D will be referred to as Gr. A or Gr. D
- Participant A - E will be referred to as (A), (B) or (C), but bracketed.
- If reference is made to line 3, page 4, Group D, Participant A, the following will be written:

  Line 3, P4, Gr. D (A)

Now follows Table 5.1 with broad categories and sub-categories of the IQMS process.
Table 5.1  Broad categories and sub-categories associated with the IQMS process component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BROAD CATEGORIES</th>
<th>SUB-CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Funds needed for IQMS advocacy</td>
<td>• Reduction of days for IQMS workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cancellation of School Managers’ workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pay and grade progression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Catering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training of school-based educators in IQMS</td>
<td>• Duration of training school-based educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders’ involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coverage of important aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inability to implement IQMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cascading of information</td>
<td>• IQMS launched to CS1 educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clarity on the roles of different structures in advocating IQMS</td>
<td>• Roles of trade unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agreement with the employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Additional advocacy of IQMS to its members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Training of trade union members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roles of peers in DSG’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Subjectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Attitudes of school-based educators on evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cheating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roles of immediate seniors in the School Managers’ DSG’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Sources of information that informed school-based educators on the IQMS process.

- Circulars
- Verbal and written information
- IQMS documents/files

6. Reactions of school-based educators on the IQMS process

- Inspection
- Rejection
- Surprise
- Suspicion
- Doubt
- Threat
- Confusion and excitement
- Fears

7. Monitoring the implementation process of the advocated policy

- Procedure
- Follow-up
- Sampling
- Circulars
- Clustering of schools
- Expectations

The following are categories and sub-categories associated with the IQMS content component.

Table 5.2  Broad categories and sub-categories associated with the IQMS content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>SUB-CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The conceptual framework of IQMS</td>
<td>Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing support, ethical behaviour, validity, reliability and relevance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practicality and cost-effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The instrument that is understood, credible, valued, constructive and used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarity on the IQMS content</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contextual factors</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.3 RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.3.1 Funds needed for IQMS advocacy

5.3.1.1 Reduction of days for IQMS workshop

The School Managers in Group A commented on the number of days scheduled for their IQMS workshop. The scheduled three days of training was reduced to one day. The following quotes support this:

"That's why it was switched from three days to one day" – lines 19 - 20 P3 Gr. A (A).

"They came ... three days ... and they left us..." - lines 5-6 P3 Gr. A (C).

"Because of financial constraints and we ended up holding a half a day workshop" - lines 17-18 P3 Gr. A (A).

It is evident that a three-day workshop was reduced to a day due to the financial challenges faced by the Department.

5.3.1.2 Cancellation of School Managers' workshop

The reduction of the scheduled three-day workshop to a one-day session impacted on the School Managers' workshop, which was arranged at a neutral venue. The following responses from School Managers illustrate this:

"We received notices that due to financial constraints that workshop has been cancelled" - line 23 P2 Gr. A (D) line 1 P3 Gr. A (D).
5.3.1.3 Pay and grade progression

When educators are evaluated by being observed in practice, they receive pay or grade progression. School Managers are aware that the Department always faces financial constraints. One School Manager indicated that: "We are going to give our colleagues pay progression where it will be difficult for the Department again" - lines 20-21 P9 Gr. A (B). Furthermore, there are other initiatives that have failed because of financial constraints, such as the implementation of Developmental Appraisal. Based on this evidence, the following questions are posed:

"… where are they to get money to pay us?" - line 2 P3 Gr. A (D).

"… where will the Department ultimately get money to give the teachers who will be deserving to be given that money?" – lines 21 - 22 P3 Gr. A (A); line 1 P4 Gr. A (A).

School Managers know that the Department has a financial problem, making them doubt whether what has been written in the official document on IQMS will become reality and be implemented when it comes to payment. One School Manager commented that:

"… I doubt it if the Department has a financial muscle to run this thing." – lines 15-16 P3 Gr A (A).

5.3.1.4 Catering

The School Managers attended a one-day advocacy-training workshop. It was announced beforehand that trainees were to:
"... understand (that) there will be no catering" - line 20 P3 Gr. A (A).

5.3.1.5 Incentives

When school-based educators are evaluated for Performance Measurement, they may qualify for salary and pay progression, the affirmation of their appointment, rewards and incentives (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:3 - Section A). An incentive is something that encourages a person to do something (Gilliard, 2003:634). An example of an incentive is a cash bonus. The following are comments about incentives:

"... most of the teachers in schools are demotivated or frustrated because of the kind of incentives that we are receiving from the Department" - lines 12-14 P5 Gr. C (C).

"... teachers are not getting incentives, this was a way of compensating them" - lines 24-25 P6 Gr. C (A).

"... we are only going to get 1% ..." - line 29-30 P1 Gr. D (B).

"But today, for 1%, somebody came to listen to me" - lines 1-2 P4 Gr. D (A).

When IQMS was advocated, educators were informed that they would receive money. This was good news and school-based educators felt motivated to implement IQMS. As time went by, they realised that they might get a 1% increase on their salaries only, which was not worth the exercise. What at first appeared to be a motivating factor was no longer such, because of the insignificant incentive that they might receive. Some schools have not yet started implementing IQMS, as educators are not motivated.
5.3.2 Training of school-based educators in IQMS

Funds needed for IQMS impacted on role player training (all school-based educators). The following sub-categories were identified:

5.3.2.1 Duration of training school-based educators

It was clear that role player training was done in a day. The IQMS official document has three sections (A-C), totalling 65 pages. How can advocacy training on so much information be done in one day? The following quotations support this:

"It was done haphazardly in a very short space of time…" - lines 7-8 P6 Gr. B (D).

"I think it was a one-day workshop" - line 3 P4 Gr. A (A).

"All these things were done in one day" - line 9 P 9 Gr. C (E).

"… they were trained for a day…" - line 27 P1 Gr. C (D).

If training of school-based educators was done haphazardly, this implies that there was no obvious order or plan (Gillard, 2003:570). If there is no training order or plan, this confuses role players and leads to a lack of focus. Time is needed to train employees. The following responses were recorded:

"It needs a lot of time" - line 8 P6 Gr. B (D).

"I think more time should have been allocated for training" - line 21 P6 Gr. B (B).
The duration of role player training should have been longer to link theory and practice.

5.3.2.2 Stakeholder involvement

The IQMS process included some stakeholders and excluded others. School Managers and CSI educators commented as follows:

"... the principal and the teacher were trained ..." - line 15 P2 Gr. C (B).

"... the School Managers and one or two educators ..." - lines 10-11 P6 Gr. B (A).

"... headmaster, deputy principal and an educator ..." - line 19 P2 Gr. D (C).

"... just a principal who was supposed to ..." – lines 20 - 21 P7 Gr. B (D).

There is no indication from these responses that all educators were trained. What is evident is that the stakeholders involved in advocacy training included the School Manager, one SMT member and an educator representing the teaching staff. The training of the other educators was left to these people, even more so, the accountable School Manager. The School Manager has to ensure that other staff members are trained. In support of this, a School Manager remarked:

"... the rest was left to them to go to the masses to train them" - line 11 P6 Gr. B (A).
5.3.2.3 Coverage of important aspects

It is evident that there was no order or plan followed during advocacy training of stakeholders. Important aspects of IQMS were thus not attended to in a manner that would ensure proper training. School-based educators commented in the following way:

"… School Improvement Plan and to draw the Personal Growth Plans, we are not work shopped on that issue…" - lines 17-18 P2 Gr. C (B).

"… how did it reach us, the information was not enough …" - line 9 P10 Gr. A (A).

"… they want us to elaborate on the Whole School Evaluation … the form they never brought it to us." - lines 1-3 P9 Gr. C (B).

Had training been planned effectively, important aspects required during the implementation phase would have been covered. The participants indicated that the School Improvement and Personal Growth Plans were not addressed. This is why order is required for any form of training.

Participants further stated that the lack of coverage of important IQMS aspects also distorted the information passed on to schools.

"… information was distorted when it arrived at schools" - line 3 P 6 Gr. D (B).

"… that the Department gives it the attention it deserves" - line 22 P7 Gr. A (A).

Improperly planned training and information that reached the schools differed from the original intended meaning thereof (Gillard, 2003:354). The Department should provide schools directly with the correct information.
5.3.2.4 Inability to implement IQMS

Important aspects were not covered during training. This placed some schools in the position where they were unable to implement IQMS. The following statements support this:

"… we do have theory but coming to practice is a different thing" - lines 7-8 P3 Gr. A (C).

"… even those people who went for training are not well-equipped" - lines 10-11 P2 Gr. C (A).

"Some of the schools have not yet started" - lines 7-8 P 12 Gr. A (B).

School-based educators possess knowledge based on theory, i.e. they might have read the IQMS document. When they are required to implement IQMS, they find that this differs from the theory that they possess. As a result of a lack of order or planning for training, even those who went for advocacy training are not well equipped to assist School Managers. A lack of proper training makes it impossible for schools to implement IQMS.

Other factors that play a role in the type of information received at schools are:

- *Imposed* - IQMS is expected to be implemented despite the challenges that school-based educators face. The following responses were received:

  "…the Department is imposing IQMS …" - line 15 P9 Gr. A (C).

  "… just giving us an information … they tell you go and see it for yourself…” - lines 13-14 P12 Gr. A (C).
"... IQMS has just been imposed on the ground ..." - line 29 P3 Gr. C (C).

A lack of proper training led to the forced implementation of IQMS that, at first, appeared to be a good initiative.

5.3.3 Cascading of information

- **Cascading** - Cascading means a large amount of something that flows down (Gillard, 2003:181). As IQMS was imposed on school-based educators, they were to train educators on this large amount of information. Consequently, some schools were unable to implement IQMS, as they did not know what to do.

5.3.3.1 IQMS launched to CSI educators

Educators have indicated that IQMS was launched to them during 2004. The following statements were made:

"Last year" - line 2 P 1 Gr. C (A).

"2004" - line 4 P 1 Gr. C (A).

"... in 2004" - line 6 P 1 Gr. C (B).


"... it was November 2004" - line 4 P 1 Gr. D (B).

"... in 2004" - line 8 P 1 Gr. D (A).

"Year 2004" - line 10 P 1 Gr. D (C).
This confirms that IQMS was advocated to CSI educators during 2004. There is a large gap between the dates that IQMS was launched to School Managers and the year in which it was launched to CSI educators.

5.3.3.2 Delay

A large time frame is evident between the dates IQMS was launched to School Managers and thereafter to CSI educators in schools. Generally, the whole IQMS process was delayed. The following statements support this:

"… the whole thing is delayed, but we are behind schedule anyway …" - line 1 P 10 Gr. B (D).

"… the process is a little bit slow …" - line 3 P 2 Gr. C (D).

"… I think the Department is delaying information and materials" - lines 32-33 P 6 Gr. C (D).

"… it should have been done last year …" - lines 30-31 P 1 Gr. C (D).

When the first participant said that "the whole thing is delayed, there is a flow chart that shows what was supposed to be done and when", this implies a slow tempo of implementation. When the Department delays information, it does not give direction on what should be submitted. The last quotation above indicates that the IQMS process had been delayed or was behind schedule, as it should have been implemented last year.
5.3.3.3 Submission dates

As the Department has delayed the IQMS process, this has put pressure on the implementers thereof. The following statements indicate this pressure on implementers with regard to the submission of documents:

"… they go on setting up dates for submission of more work as though we have all started at the same time …" - lines 25-27 P8 Gr. C (E).

"… up to now all what we get is submit SIP's, do 1 2 3 4 5" - line 7 P 9 Gr. B (D).

"Some want us to submit the School Improvement Plan …" - line 1 P 9 Gr. C (B).

The above statements stress that the Department is aware of the delayed process. To gain IQMS process momentum, more documents need to be submitted, ignoring the fact that schools are not running at the same pace. It is impossible to submit SIP’s for a school that has not yet started with the IQMS process. It is, however, possible and easier to submit something for a school that has started with the IQMS process.

5.3.4 Contextual factors

The term contextual is derived from the term context, which means the situation within which something exists. Contextual means something related to the context (Gillard, 2003:263). There are factors that affect the situation in which IQMS should be implemented. The following factors are mentioned:

5.3.4.1 Overcrowding

Overcrowding means containing too many people (Gillard, 2003:884). If school classes are overcrowded, it means that there are too many learners in classes,
contrary to a Departmental expectation of a learner-educator ratio of 1:35 in secondary schools. To indicate that overcrowding affects the IQMS process, the following statements were made:

"... you get 50 learners in one classroom" - line 4 P 5 Gr. B (D).

"... having 94 and you can imagine being evaluated in that type of a class" - line 32 P 7 Gr. C (A).

It is not possible to talk of quality teaching and learning in schools if classes are overcrowded. Besides being evaluated for Performance Measurement in such classes, effective teaching and learning is not practical. The classroom itself is no longer conducive for teaching and learning.

5.3.4.2 Clarity on the roles of different structures in advocating IQMS

*Role* means the position or purpose that someone has in a situation or organisation. Role playing is when someone in one structure assists in the learning of new skills (Gillard, 2003:1083). The role players in the IQMS process are unions and the Developmental Support Groups (DSG’s)

5.3.5 The role of unions

The unions that are party to the ELRC played the following roles during the IQMS process.

- **Agreement with the employer.** School Managers are aware that consultation was not done. The following statements were made:

"... it is already agreed to by all the stakeholders - the teachers' unions ..." – line 20 P1 Gr. B (A).
"... but they have not gone to everybody on the ground" - lines 3-4 P 4 Gr. C (E).

It is not possible for the unions to consult with the implementers on the ground. This is because not enough time was given to union representatives to consult with its members. The provincial members consult with the district representatives who then consult with the branches. Feedback can be given if their representatives have consulted members. That is why the first statement indicated that:

"... it is already agreed to by all the stakeholders - the teachers' unions ..." - line 20 P 1 Gr. B (A).

After consultation with the above structures, the unions that are party to the ELRC, agreed on the IQMS process and the official IQMS document is therefore titled: *ELRC Collective Agreement 8 of 2003*.

- Additional advocacy of IQMS to its members

Unions do not agree with the employer on the advocacy of a programme and then leave the matter there. Although the employer has complete responsibility for ensuring that a programme is advocated, has trained its employers, and has ensured that implementation takes place, the unions also have a role to play, such as advocating such new programmes to its members. The following statements were made:

"... I attended ... advocacy, where I got something about IQMS" – lines 20 - 21 P 1 Gr. A (D).

"Not all of us were invited" - line 17 P 1 Gr. C (A).
From the quotations above, it is evident that the unions played an advocating role in terms of its members. Some educators were invited for advocacy of IQMS. Union members received more information from their unions than was offered by the Department.

- **Training of union members**

Unions have a role to train their members to empower and capacitate them. The following statements support this:

"… some of us who were not fortunate even to be workshopped by the unions …"
" - lines 11-12 P 6 Gr. A (E).

"… but at least we got more information from unions than it was from the Department" - lines 2-3 P 2 Gr. A (A).

"… those who are serving in the unions and just some few other individuals …" - lines 15-16 P 1 Gr. C (A).

Although not all union members were invited to attend the advocacy training workshop, they gained access to more information from the unions than from the Department. This indicates that the training provided by the unions was well planned.

**5.3.5.1 Roles of peers in DSG’s**

An immediate senior and a peer form DSG’s. A peer is someone who is selected by an educator in the light of his/her appropriate phase or learning area expertise (ELRC Collective Agreement, 2003:13 - Section A). One role of the DSG’s is to
support educators’ development once the latter have been evaluated. The DSG’s are subjective in the IQMS process, as they are influenced by, or base their personal beliefs on feelings, rather than on facts (Gillard, 2003:1274). The DSG’s are influenced by the perceptions of appraisees.

- **Subjectivity**

Members of the DSG are influenced to do what they are not meant to do. They remarked:

"Then it’s either I go high or I remain on the same level" - lines 16-17 P4 Gr. D (B).

"The papers must go somewhere the next thing we are supposed to get money" – lines 15-16 P6 Gr. B (A).

In some instances they agree on what the appraisee wants, based on the evaluation of himself/herself. School-based educators focus on money after evaluation and are not objective.

- **Attitudes of school-based educators on evaluation**

Although, educators are subjective in the IQMS process, their attitudes play an important role in the process. It was stated that:

"Many people have a negative attitude towards that…” - lines 23-24 P 2 Gr. D (C).

Educators' attitudes towards the IQMS process go hand in hand with subjectivity. When educators have negative attitudes, they will do anything to disrupt the process. Their integrity is then questioned. The term *integrity* refers to the
quality of being honest and of possessing strong moral principles that one refuses to change. The following aspects affect the integrity of school-based educators:

- **Cheating**

_Cheating_ means to behave in a dishonest way in order to get what you want (Gillard, 2003:199). In the IQMS process, the appraisee will cheat by allocating higher scores to himself/herself during self-evaluation. The following remarks support this:

"… it is very difficult to prove whether somebody has cheated or what …" - lines 24-25 P 3 Gr. D (C).

"… that's why we are going to cheat because we want those points" - lines 10-11 P 5 Gr. D (B).

School-based educators will cheat during the process, as they need the points to qualify themselves for pay progression. Consequently, there may not be enough evidence to prove cheating, hindering the validity of the process. Cheating could go hand in hand with friendship, for instance:

"I think you should always be for your friend" - lines 24-25 P 4 Gr. D (C).

"… obviously, my friend is not going to reveal that information" - lines 15-16 P 5 Gr. D (A).
• Rejection

*Rejection* means to refuse to accept someone (Gillard, 2003:1051). In the IQMS process, appraisees tend to reject the DSG members' judgement. The following remarks were made:

"Then he said you can't give me that. What do you know about this?" - line 7 P 4 Gr. D (B).

"So what are you going to do in class?" – lines 19 - 20 P4 Gr. D (A).

Many educators will be rejected in the IQMS process. Educators were supposed to be united as never before, as the IQMS process demands support from one's DSG. If an educator feels rejected, he/she will not be willing to attend class to be observed in practice, further promoting subjectivity.

• Tension

If an educator is rejected, this results in tension. To support this statement, the following remarks were made:

"This thing is also creating tensions around schools" - lines 9-10 P 4 Gr. D (B).

It is not healthy to work in situations characterised by tension. This may lead to depression.

• Threats

The term *threat* means a suggestion that something unpleasant or violent will happen, particularly if a particular action or order is not carried out (Gillard, 2003:1327). As a consequence of the subjectivity in the IQMS process
mentioned earlier in this chapter, educators often threaten each other (in their DSG's), particularly when scores facilitating pay progression are not given in accordance with educator expectations. Statements to support this are:

"... if I fail, you'll know." - line 19 P 4 Gr. D (A).

"You are just going to be a stumbling block" - line 18 P 4 Gr. D (C).

The subjective role of a DSG is to ensure that appraisees obtain the desired score for salary progression. In this way, they will not be the “stumbling block” in other people's lives, thus preventing confrontation or being assaulted by the aggrieved party, which may lead to injury.

- **The role of immediate seniors in the School Manager's DSG's**

An educator’s immediate senior and a peer form the DSG. The role of the immediate senior is also to develop and support the appraisee. Only one circuit manager leads each circuit, whereas there are many schools in one circuit, which is a problem for School Managers. The unavailability of a circuit manager will disturb School Managers' evaluation plans. The following statements were made:

"When it comes to seniors, you find there are 40 schools under one person. Will it be possible for him to move around all those schools?" - lines 7-8 P 14 Gr. A (D).

"... one manager, primary schools, secondary schools ..." - line 13 P 14 Gr. A (E).

It is not possible to be an immediate senior to three School Managers every day because of the geographical location of schools in circuits. This might result in a
School Manager only being evaluated during September, when he/she should have been evaluated during February of that year.

5.3.5.2 Sources of information that informed school-based educators about the IQMS process

Any process requires communication between the employer and the employees. Communication or sources of information that informed employees about the IQMS process were:

- **Circulars**

School Managers received a professional, formal document, referred to as a circular. The following statement supports this:

"... they wrote us a letter which invited us to a common venue" - line 15 P 1 Gr. A (C).

The circulars invited School Managers to a neutral venue that generally accommodated two to three members per school per circuit, such as the multi-purpose centres (former Colleges of Education and Science Centres).

- **Verbal and written information**

Besides receiving circulars, School Managers and CSI educators were informed verbally. The following remarks were made:

"... some government officials who told us verbally that we are going to start with IQMS ..." - lines 16-17 P 1 Gr. A (C).
"We first received information from our principals when they came from training on IQMS" - lines 8-9 P 1 Gr. C (B).

"... it was verbal from the principals ..." - line 12 P 1 Gr. D (A).

"... it was verbal and then followed by written information ..." - line 16 P 1 Gr. D (C).

School Managers were informed verbally about the IQMS process. When School Managers advocated IQMS to other staff members they initially did so verbally and provided further written (but poorly printed) information later.

- IQMS document/files

Besides the verbal information that school-based educators received, they also received information by means of IQMS documents which are on file. The school-based educators had to read the files first, as there was no time to familiarise themselves with IQMS during advocacy. The following responses indicate that they read the IQMS documents/files:

"Yes, I read it" - line 8 P 2 Gr. D (A).

"I read it" - line 8 P 5 Gr. A (C).

"Yes, I read it" - line 23 P 1 Gr. B (D).

The above responses confirm that the IQMS files were read. The files included the IQMS official document and forms used in IQMS process. To support that school-based educators read everything pertaining to IQMS files, they responded as follows:
"We only received files from the circuit …" - line 22 P 4 Gr. A (D).

"The pay progression is also written on the files that we are using for IQMS" - lines 3-4 P 2 Gr. D (B).

" … received files after the June holidays …" - line 19 P 12 Gr. A (B).

"But the files that they gave us before they bought files from the shop" - lines 8-9 P 7 Gr. C (D).

June was the time where schools should have completed the first development cycle for Development Appraisal (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003: 16 - Section C). The files that School Managers received during advocacy were poorly printed. Some of the lines were illegible. The School Managers were expected to make copies for each educator. One participant said:

" … they bought files from the shop" – line 9 P7 Gr. C (D).

If the Department had been well organised, IQMS files received in June should have been received during advocacy.

Besides the files that school-based educators had received, they reacted in specific ways when they were informed about the IQMS process.

5.3.5.3 Reaction of school-based educators about the IQMS process

School-based educators reacted differently to the IQMS process. Their responses were:
• Inspection

"My reaction was that inspection is coming back in another form" - line 11 P 1 Gr. B (B).

This respondent thought that inspection was to be reinstated, as the IQMS process required the DSG to observe someone teaching in a classroom. The difference being that the panel consists of the appraisee's friend, a peer and an immediate senior, instead of two strangers.

• Rejection

Others rejected IQMS at advocacy because of the lack of knowledge of facilitators. The participant remarked:

"…I just reject because even the facilitators didn't know it correctly" - lines 12-13 P 1 Gr. B (C).

When one rejects something, one does not concentrate.

• Surprise

When an individual is surprised, he/she experiences a feeling caused by something that happened unexpectedly (Gillard, 2003: 1288). This participant thought that they were going to be informed about the initiatives that were not implemented, such as Developmental Appraisal. The participant said:

"Actually, I was surprised of what was going to come …" - line 14 P 1 Gr. B (D).
If one is surprised, it is possible that one may develop an interest and want to know more about the subject under discussion.

**Suspicion**

If a participant is suspicious he/she lacks trust in, or has doubts about, someone or something (Gillard, 2003: 1290). The participants’ responses were:

"I was also suspicious but just because this other one was dropped …" - line 18 P 1 Gr. B (A).

"I was suspicious of the success of the whole thing" - lines 16-17 P 1 Gr. B (D).

The participants were suspicious as they thought IQMS had nothing to do with Developmental Appraisal and WSE, which are the programmes that failed. The second participant suspected whether IQMS as a process will succeed compared to DA and WSE.

**Doubt**

When one doubts something, it implies that one experiences a feeling of uncertainty about something, especially about how good or true it is (Gillard, 2003:366). During advocacy, this means that the participant questioned the value of IQMS? Is what the facilitator says true or not? Their responses were:

"…I personally doubted if it will eventually take off the ground" - line 5 P 2 Gr. A (A).

" … which made us doubt … we realised that even in the case of the Department, it was failing to give us enough information …" lines 3-4 P3 Gr. A (C).
The participants' doubts were based on the uncertainty of the success of IQMS, compared to other Departmental initiatives that had failed, such as DA. Another concern, which led to doubt, was that the facilitators provided insufficient information.

- **Threats**

  *Threat*, means that something unpleasant or violent might happen, particularly if a certain action does not take place or order is not followed (Gillard, 2003:1327). The participants felt threatened by the IQMS. They said:

  "… that's why we felt threatened" - line 16 P 2 Gr. A (E).

  "… the teacher feel threatened by IQMS" - line 12 P 3 Gr. A (C).

  "I think I have experienced that it is very threatening" - lines 29-30 P 3 Gr. D (A).

The IQMS process, e.g. being observed in practice, threatens the educators. Furthermore, they felt threatened by referring to IQMS as a monster. A monster is an imaginary frightening creature, especially one that is large and strange (Gillard, 2003:804). The participant regarded IQMS as a large and strange thing, as there are many procedures to be considered. IQMS can be regarded as strange because school-based educators were no longer being evaluated, they performed as they wished, or relaxed without close monitoring.

- **Confusion and excitement**

  Participants were confused, as they did not understand the IQMS process. This excitement was based thereon that they would receive money after evaluation. Their responses were:
"... it was confusion and excitement at the same time" - line 18 P 1 Gr. D (B).

"...the news were exciting because it was just about money" - line 20 P 1 Gr. C (E).

Participants felt confused and excited at the same time. Although they did not understand the IQMS process, they experienced a feeling of happiness and enthusiasm (Gillard, 2003: 422). The participants felt they had enough energy to embark on IQMS to get money. Educators had never been evaluated to get money in ten years of democracy.

- **Fears**

Fear means to be frightened of something (Gillard, 2003:448). The participants were frightened of IQMS, responding as follows:

"... there were lots of fears about IQMS because people were not certain of what is going to happen ..." - lines 24-25 P 1 Gr. C (D).

Uncertainty frightens most people. Although school-based educators were not evaluated during the last ten years, they were comfortable with this, as opposed to having a new programme advocated to them where people have many questions to ask, such as: *What will happen after this?*

The reactions of role players about the IQMS process have been discussed. A discussion on monitoring now follows.

### 5.3.5.4 Monitoring the implementation process of the advocated policy

Monitoring is from the term *monitor*, which means to watch and check a situation carefully for a period of time to discover something about it (Gillard, 2003:803).
This means that Department officials must monitor schools, to watch and check whether IQMS has been well implemented. During the monitoring process they might uncover problems or challenges, which should be reported to the Department. The following sub-categories were found:

- **Procedure**

  Procedure means a set of actions that is the official or accepted way of doing things (Gillard, 2003:988).

  When Department officials visit schools, they are expected to monitor them in an acceptable manner. The respondents remarked:

  "… sent by the Department to check how far we've gone …" - line 14 P 10 Gr. A (D).

  "… came to find out what is happening there" - line 1 P 11 Gr. A (C).

  The Department officials monitored how schools had progressed, although they do not know what IQMS is. It is only hoped that as they monitor the progress of schools or what is happening in these schools, they will see progress or detect problems. Solutions should be found to assist schools that have not yet started the IQMS process.

- **Follow-up**

  Follow-up means to find out more about something (Gillard, 2003:481). In terms of IQMS, the Department has to find out more about IQMS, its progress, its failures and ways of improving the entire process. One participant said:
"… there is no follow-up on the part of the Department …" - lines 16-17 P8 Gr. A (A).

The time that Department officials spend in schools is so limited that it does not give them sufficient opportunity to identify the challenges that schools face, or to create solutions for these problems.

- **Sampling**

A sample is a small amount of something that shows you what the rest is, or should be like (Gillard, 2003:1105). Department officials are expected to monitor all schools. A participant responded as follows:

"… where I work no one need come" - lines 20-21 P 10 Gr. A (A).

This means that Department officials are only visiting a sample of schools, implying that all schools are like the ones visited. School sampling will not give them sufficient ground to generalise their findings.

Sampling schools should not have taken place, as circulars were distributed to schools to inform them of the intended visits (See Annexure Q).

- **Circulars**

Circulars are letters to schools from the Department to inform them about something. Circulars are a means of communication between schools and the employer. One participant said:

"I only received a circular indicating that from such a date up to such a date they will be moving around, but none of them ever came to my workstation" - lines 5 – 7 P 11 Gr. A (E).
When schools received circulars, they were convinced that Department officials would visit them. However, schools were sampled. Some School Managers even thought that their schools were excluded because they were located far from the tarred road.

- **Clustering of schools**

Clustering is from the term *cluster*, meaning a group of similar things that are close together (Gillard, 2003:225). Clustering can be used as a form of monitoring, where schools are grouped together to identify problems and closely monitor progress. One participant said:

“… we are following a particular programme …” - line 17 P 3 Gr. C (E).

When clustering schools, Department officials will be aware of progress made and can judge the pace of implementation of the IQMS process in schools.

- **Expectations**

All Department officials have expectations with regard to the implementation of IQMS when they visit schools. One participant remarked:

“They are having some expectations” - line 19-20 P 8 Gr. C (E).

These expectations are not clear to School Managers. At times, these Department officials only check IQMS progress with educators, without also meeting with the School Managers.
Broad categories and sub-categories associated with the IQMS process have been discussed in terms of Table 5.1. A discussion of broad categories and sub-categories associated with the IQMS content follows.

5.4 A DISCUSSION OF RESULTS OF BROAD CATEGORIES AND SUB-CATEGORIES ASSOCIATED WITH IQMS CONTENT (SEE TABLE 5.2)

5.4.1 Clarity of the IQMS content

Clarity implies clear and easy understanding (Gillard, 2003:214). Anyone who facilitates a programme is expected to possess clarity on the content of that programme. The facilitator should be clear on the procedures and processes on which recipients must embark, which goes hand in hand with understanding the content. The following are sub-categories of clarity:

5.4.1.1 Certainty

Certainty is something that cannot be doubted (Gillard, 2003:190). IQMS facilitators are expected to be sure of content and therefore School Managers must be certain of this content when advocating IQMS to other educators in schools. The participants responded:

“… even those people who conducted advocacy training to our principals and those CSI educators were not 100% sure of certain issues related to IQMS” - lines 31-33 P 5 Gr. C (A).

“… they are not sure …” (extra-curricular activities) - line 7 P 6 Gr. C (A).

“… he was not clear because we went out of that workshop like the way we …” - lines 9 – 10 P 4 Gr. A (B).

The four quotes above indicate that it was easy to doubt what School Managers were facilitating because of their uncertainty about IQMS. If a facilitator is not sure, this breeds uncertainty and confusion. In terms of performance standard number 5, which is based on extra-curricular activities, School Managers simply give scores because both they and the facilitators are unsure. Who is to be fully informed in schools on IQMS content?

Participants indicated that they were as uncertain of IQMS content when advocated to them as they were when advocating IQMS to school-based educators. This means that they did not gain insight into IQMS. School Managers were not certain about what should follow after assessment. The opposite is true - if facilitators are certain of their facts, the recipients will also be.

5.4.1.2 Understanding

Facilitators were expected to have a better understanding of IQMS content in order for recipients to demonstrate the same skills when advocating IQMS to other educators. The responses were follows:

“… is a clear indication that they do not understand this” - line 9 P 6 Gr. C (A).

“… most of the questions he did not answer” - line 9 P 4 Gr. A (B).

The facilitators did not demonstrate that they understood IQMS content. When School Managers reached schools, they advocated IQMS in the manner that they thought they understood the content.

The first quotation is from an educator who realised that School Managers did not understand IQMS content, especially in terms of scoring. Facilitators did not
understand IQMS content and could not answer questions posed by stakeholders attending IQMS advocacy. The question is: Who is to answer these questions? What criteria are considered if one is to be a Department facilitator?

5.4.1.3 Knowledge

Knowledge is the understanding of information about a subject and has been obtained by experience, either in a person’s mind or possessed by people generally (Gillard, 2003:693). Facilitators were expected to have demonstrated knowledge of IQMS content. If facilitators had displayed knowledge of IQMS during advocacy, stakeholders would have acknowledged and accepted such knowledge. A participant said:
“… the people who were training us were not knowledgeable …” - line 22 P 6 and line 1 P7 Gr. B (B).

When one is knowledgeable, reference to the training manual is sometimes unnecessary. One explains when content has been mastered. Besides, during advocacy, monitors are not familiar with IQMS content. The following was quoted:
“I wanted help from him so he told me that didn’t you read the document?” - lines 22-23 P 10 Gr. A (C).

Sometimes, school-based educators do read the policy document and, due to a lack of knowledge, School Managers still need help and support from facilitators. At times, reading the document does not provide solutions to schools, but expertise helps and this is expected from facilitators.

Sub-categories have been clarified and a discussion of the second broad category associated with the IQMS content follows.
5.4.2 Conceptual framework of IQMS

The conceptual framework consists of ideas or principles and a supporting structure around which IQMS is built (Gillard, 2003:250 & 493). This means that principles are supporting structures on which IQMS is based. There are many identified sub-categories that are grouped together. The sub-categories are:

5.4.2.1 Protocol

A protocol is a set of step-by-step processes and procedures that are to be followed in any instance when an educator is observed in practice (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:8 - Section A). When Performance Measurement is done in a classroom, the guiding principles dictate that there should be diversity in teaching styles (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:6 – Section A). This principle is indicated by an asterisk at the far right hand side that reads, “Evidence of planning does not imply that there must be a written lesson plan. However it must be clear that the lesson has been planned” (ELRC Collective Agreement 8, 2003:14 - Section C). These statements will create confusion in schools. The two participants in the focus groups said:

“… preparation is not writing … But for the whole year… the lessons must co-ordinate. The way the papers present IQMS I don’t think is correct” - lines 12-13 P3 Gr. B (A).

“… that this person is well prepared whereas the other things are not there” - lines 22-23 P 6 Gr. A (C).

The two quotations indicate that it is not easy to evaluate a person whose lesson shows no co-ordination and evidence that individual lessons fit into a broader learning programme. How are the SDT’s and DSG’s going to ensure that the
expectations, questions and criteria will enable the DSG to allocate appropriate scores?

5.4.2.2 Ongoing support, ethical behaviour, validity, reliability and relevance

Ongoing support is one of the DSG’s roles. The DSG is expected to provide appraisees with ongoing support and mentoring. Ethics are accepted beliefs that control behaviour, especially morals (Gillard, 2003:415). The DSG’s behaviour tends to be subjective and influenced by the idea of receiving money, thus practising dishonesty. *Validity* is based on truth or reason (Gillard, 2003:1409). If one is subjective, validity is challenged and the evaluations of educators will not be truly reflected. *Reliability* means to be trusted or believed (Gillard, 2003:1053). *How can you believe someone who does not base his/her judgement on the truth?* *Relevance* relates to what is happening (Gillard, 2003:1052).

Generally, and from the focus group interviews, ongoing support, ethical behaviour, validity, reliability and relevance are questioned in IQMS because of the following:

“… it is very difficult to prove whether somebody has cheated or what …” - lines 24 –25 P 3 Gr. D (C).

“… that’s why we are going to cheat because we want those points” - lines 10 –11 P 5 Gr. D (B).

“…If I fail, you’ll know” - line 19 P 4 Gr. D (A).

“You are just going to be a stumbling block” - line 18 P4 Gr. D (C).
“Then he said you can’t give me that. What do you know about this?” - line 7 P 4 Gr. D (B).

The quotations above indicate threatening behaviour to some members, rejecting them as DSG members, who are nevertheless expected to mentor and support those who reject them. Tension ultimately breeds in the workplace. Ongoing support, ethical behaviour, validity, reliability and relevance are therefore questioned. The entire IQMS process will no longer be relevant because of the other factors associated with relevance.

5.4.2.3 Practicality and cost effectiveness

Practicality means able to be done or put into action (Gillard, 2003:971). Cost effective means good value for the amount of money spent (Gillard, 2003:391). The IQMS process is not practical as schools are not ready for this and confusion about the incentives that school-based educators are to get. The following quotations question the cost effectiveness of IQMS.

“… we are only going to get 1% …” - line 29-30 P 1 Gr. D (B).

“… if we are going to get salary progression of 1%…” - lines 2-3P 3 Gr. B (D).

“But today, for 1%, somebody came to listen to me” - lines 1-2 P 4 Gr. D (A).

The quotations above question the cost effectiveness of IQMS. As indicated, cost-effective means good value for the amount of money spent. A one per cent increase is not worth the exercise of being observed in practice.
5.4.2.4 The instrument that is understood, credible, valued, constructive and used professionally

_Credible_ means that someone can be believed or trusted (Gillard, 2003:287). _Valued_ means useful and important (Gillard, 2003:1409). _Constructive_ implies useful and intended to help or improve something (Gillard, 2003:261).

_Professionally_ refers to the qualities related to trained and skilled people, such as effectiveness, skill and seriousness of manner, Gillard (2003:990).

As designed, the IQMS instrument is useful and important. Credibility and constructivity are questioned. Credibility, constructivity and professionalism are grouped together as professionalism relates to skill and seriousness of manner, which means that school-based educators are expected to be well mannered. If they are dishonest, credibility and constructive focus of the instrument are affected. The following quotations support the examples above:

“I think you should always be for your friend” - lines 24-25 P 4 Gr. D (C).

“… obviously, my friend is not going to reveal that information.” – lines 15-16 P 5 Gr. D (A).

Friendship hampers credibility, the issue of a constructive instrument. If one is not credible, it will ultimately not be possible to correct what has already been destroyed. Instead of friendship, professionalism dictates seriousness of manner and skill, where the appraisee and the DSG’s, as professionals, are expected to possess communication skills. When they differ and evaluate honestly, credibility and constructivity is possible. The DSG will help the appraisee to improve identified areas of weakness.
Now that conceptual framework has been discussed, a discussion on the validity of the research findings follows.

5.5 VALIDATION OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

Validation is a strength of qualitative research. Validity determines whether the findings are accurate from the perspective of the researcher, participants and readers (Creswell, 2003:195, Merriam, 1998:199). This means that the manner in which the researcher presents the findings, what participants said during focus group interviews and how readers view the findings can be confirmed as true. The following procedures were performed in this study to enhance validity.

5.5.1 Triangulating different data sources of information by examining evidence

Different data sources, i.e. sources of information on advocacy and IQMS were compared with the responses of four focus group participants as a way of building a coherent justification for themes (Creswell, 2003:196, Patton, 2002:559). Different sources of the phenomenon under study were compared with participant views. The consistency of participant responses in the focus group interviews about IQMS were compared to the content of official IQMS document.

5.5.2 Rich, thick description of findings to convey the findings

The researcher gathered rich and thick information from focus group interviews. This enabled the researcher to formulate rich, thick descriptions of the findings by expressing thoughts or ideas that are well understood by readers. Such expressions of ideas is a way of transporting readers to the focus group interview sessions and the readers were afforded the opportunity to share experiences (Creswell, 2003:196).
5.5.3 Mechanically recorded data

McMillan and Schumacher, (2001: 409) state that: "Tape recorders, photographs and video tapes may enhance validity by providing an accurate and relatively complete record". In this study, the focus group interviews were used to gather data. The focus group interviews were audio-taped and data analysis was based on the transcripts of the recorded material. In this study, tape recorders provided an accurate and complete record of what transpired during focus group interview sessions.

5.5.4 Member checking

Member checking requires of the researcher to take the final report to the participants to determine whether they feel that the report is accurate. Member checking is done informally. Besides taking the report to the participants, probing was done during interviews to get complete and accurate information from the participants (Creswell, 2003:196; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001:410).

Member checking was carried out both telephonically and by means of personal meetings with the participants. Participants commented honestly, which helped the researcher to consider the following:

- Updating the participants of the outcomes of the study (by giving them the final draft)
- Determining whether the researcher had reflected their perspectives accurately.
- Ensuring that nothing was omitted.
- Whether possible published sections could be problematic for either personal or political reasons.
• Developing new ideas and interpretations after considering participants’ comments (Glesne, 1999:152; Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:152).

5.5.5 Using peer debriefing

Peer debriefing is aimed at enhancing the accuracy of the research process and was used in this study. The assistant moderator and the evaluation team will be peer debriefers. The researcher used three debriefers as peers. They are expected to review and ask questions about the qualitative study to promote quality. They will be honest when they ask questions about the research process (Creswell, 2003:196).

5.5.6 Use of an external auditor

An external auditor is a person who is requested by a researcher to provide an assessment of the project throughout the process of research or at the conclusion of the study. This person should be unfamiliar to the researcher and the project (Creswell, 2003:196). It was difficult to find a neutral person to be an external auditor. The researcher then requested someone with a doctorate to be an external auditor. The role of the external auditor is the same as that of a fiscal auditor. He is expected to say:

• *How did you arrive at this?*
• *Why was this like that?* and ask many other questions related to the study (see Annexure P). He verbally responded that he was not in a position to act as internal auditor.
5.5.7 Present negative cases

Negative cases were presented in this study derived from both the facilitators and the process itself. Chapters Three and Five can be referred to (Creswell, 2003:196; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001: 410).

5.5.8 The role of the researcher

The researcher was a learner (Glesne, 1999:41). The researcher listened attentively to the participants during focus group interviews and, as a learner, did not participate in the research, but ensured that the research guide was used well.

The researcher has experience in research since a mini-dissertation was completed at master’s level. The researcher was on study leave and no funding was arranged with any organisation. The researcher utilised a university controlled merit bursary. The researcher gained access to schools by being given official approval from the province (Research Unit Section).

The researcher brought prior knowledge to the research topic and site, as she is a School Manager who was present when IQMS was advocated. As a learner and a primary research instrument, the researcher was neutral in collecting and analysing data. Data analysis was based on focus group interview transcripts (Patton, 2002:566).

Validity has been discussed. This chapter is now summarised.

5.6 SUMMARY

In this chapter, the findings were based on broad categories and sub-categories, which were grouped into the IQMS process and content. After this discussion, the validity of the findings was addressed.
CHAPTER SIX
GUIDELINES FOR ADVOCATING EDUCATIONAL REFORM WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Guidelines refer to the information that is intended to advise people on what policy should be (Gillard, 2003:557). In this study, guidelines will offer advice to stakeholders at different levels of the educational process on how Departmental policies should be advocated. The guidelines are based on broad and sub-categories associated with the IQMS process and content (as in Chapter Five, tables 5.1 and 5.2). These guidelines are presented in a practical manner, which will enable all stakeholders to gain more insight into the advocacy of policies.

6.2 THE IQMS PROCESS

The following is a presentation of guidelines for advocacy of the IQMS process.

Guideline 1: Sufficient funds needed for the advocacy of policy

Funds are indispensable for the advocacy of any programme. Funds should be clearly allocated for policy documents that are adequately meaningful to the target groups (files where policy documents are kept and brochures), catering, accommodation, and as rewards that school-based educators will receive after advocacy. Funding takes place on the following levels:
• National level

Policy advocacy is planned on a national level. The unit that is responsible for funding should ensure that there is a clear allocation of funds to provinces. The national management unit must budget for funds for policy advocacy that are adequately meaningful to the provincial heads of policy advocacy units. There should be sufficient funds for accommodation and catering for the targeted groups. If the policy heads from provinces need to stay over for more than a day, accommodation and catering must be arranged. In addition, funds should be allocated for policy documents and brochures.

It is recommended that for any policy the Department of Education (nationally) intends to advocate, sufficient funds be allocated to the provinces in which advocacy to the targeted groups will take place (Provincial Policy Heads). Policy documents and brochures should be budgeted for. School-based educators will review these files to gain a better understanding of the advocated policy. Catering arrangements must be made for the targeted groups during advocacy. If the targeted groups do not receive food, they lose interest and do not focus on the policy being advocated. If the targeted group members need to stay for longer than a day, accommodation should be provided to them as the national offices are far from the provinces. It is further recommended that the targeted groups be transported to the advocacy point, as transport costs will be high and the provinces are far from the national offices.

• Provincial levels

The provincial level has a policy unit consisting of the district managers, circuit managers, policy unit heads and the policy advocacy team. The provincial policy unit should ensure that it advocates the said policy to district policy units. Funds must be allocated for policy documents, files and brochures. The provincial
policy unit will use these documents as reference sources when advocating policy to the district policy advocating team. Catering must be arranged for the target groups.

- **District levels**

Funds must be allocated to the target groups. The target groups at district level consist of School Managers, Deputy School Managers, Heads of Departments and Senior Educators. Funds must be allocated for policy advocacy to the target groups, including policy documents, files and brochures. These policy documents should be printed professionally and be easy to read. School-based educators will be interested to read the files if they are professionally printed. Catering must be provided for the target groups (see chapter 5, table 5.1). If the targeted groups are not catered for during advocacy, they lose interest and do not focus on the policy being advocated. It is recommended that transport costs be reimbursed to targeted group members.

- **Circuit levels**

School-based educators should be invited to a common venue for policy advocacy. The policy should be advocated to educators in accordance with their phases and grades (Foundation Phase, Intermediate Phase, Senior Phase and the General Education Band). Catering should be provided. It is recommended that provision be made for transport costs.

- **School levels**

School Managers, School Management Teams, Heads of Department and Senior Educators should carry out additional advocacy at school level to ensure that all school-based educators have a common understanding of the advocated policy. They should share ideas on what the benefits are for school-based
educators, schools, learners and the system as a whole. The reasons for the adoption of the policy into the system should be discussed.

**Guideline 2: Effective training of school-based educators**

Training is part of advocacy. Advocacy focuses on why specific groups of people benefit from the advocated policy. Training deals with the manner in which the advocated policy is to be implemented.

Crosby, a quality consultant, emphasised that all supervisors should receive training on quality awareness (see chapter three for the background). Such training should be scheduled for a period of four weeks (Bank, 1992:79; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9). In a school hierarchy, supervisors report to senior educators, heads of department, deputy school managers and school managers. These categories should receive training first so that they are made aware of the advocated policy. If the targeted groups are trained, they will be confident when presenting the message to other educators at school. Supervisors should be provided with training videos and books to refer to when they encounter problems during advocacy at school (Bank, 1992:78; Beckford, 1998:56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9).

It is emphasised that training is imperative for organisational development (see Chapter Five, table 5.1). Effective training will help school-based educators to regard quality as important (Beckford, 1998:116; Ross & Perry, 1999:8). Trained educators will be aware that quality is important and will keep on improving their performance. Juran, a quality consultant, emphasises that by training everyone, all staff will be encouraged to continually improve their performance (Beckford, 1998:116; Ross & Perry, 1999:8).
Guideline 3: Cascading of IQMS information

Three members per school were invited to IQMS advocacy, i.e., the School Manager, one school management team member and one educator representing the staff. The purpose for inviting this limited number of school-based educators was for the invited members to cascade IQMS advocacy to other educators at various schools. Each School Manager cascaded IQMS information to other educators through his/her own understanding of the advocated policy. School Managers also advocated the policy at their own pace, further delaying the whole process as detailed on pages 16-17 in the flowchart, section B of the IQMS official document. Cascading of IQMS information meant that school-based educators were not empowered with the relevant knowledge and understanding of the advocated policy, thereby delaying the IQMS process (see chapter 5, table 5.1).

It is recommended that all school-based educators be involved in policy advocacy through their categorized phases at circuit level, i.e., Foundation Phase, Intermediate Phase, Senior Phase and General Education and Training Band (GET). When all school-based educators receive the same information during training, they are empowered with the relevant knowledge and understanding, enabling them to embark on the implementation phase of the advocated policy.

Guideline 4: Clarity on the roles of different structures in advocating policies

Trade unions play an important role in terms of additional advocacy to their members by empowering them with the relevant skills and knowledge of the advocated policy. Unions are party to the Education and Labour Relations Council (ELRC) and also advocate policies to encourage their members to
implement the advocated policy. It is recommended that trade unions continue with this additional advocacy to support and encourage their members to understand that they have signed an agreement reached in the ELRC, further ensuring that the implementation of the advocated policies runs smoothly.

The Development Support Group (DSG) is another structure that has a role to play in additional policy advocacy. The DSG is formed by an educator who is to be appraised (an appraisee), an immediate senior and a peer. A peer is any educator who teaches in the same phase as the appraisee and has expertise in the learning area(s) in which the appraisee has chosen to be observed in practice. The role of the DSG is to support an educator who is observed in practice to determine an appraisee’s area(s) of development and turn these into strengths.

It was found that the DSG’s were not objective when observing an appraisee in practice (see chapter 5, table 5.1). Being objective means making judgments based on real facts and not being influenced by the appraisee’s personal beliefs. The appraisee’s personal beliefs influenced the DSG’s to allocate inflated scores so that they may receive additional remuneration from the Department for grade progression (Govender, 2006:6). The inflated ratings were based on the appraisees’ negative attitude towards their DSG’s, such as appraisee cheating or rejection of the DSG’s because they lack expertise in specific learning areas, e.g., commercial subjects, mathematics and science. Rejection of the DSG’s resulted in a lack of trust, which created tension among educators.

It is recommended that when the DSG’s experience problems when observing appraisees in practice (cheating during self-evaluation, rejection and threatening behaviour), the matter is to be reported to the School Manager. Disciplinary action must be instituted against any appraisee who has conducted himself/herself in an unacceptable manner. A report must be written to the senior manager (formerly known as the district manager) through the Circuit
office. The senior manager must investigate the matter, then write a report to the school through the Circuit, denying the appraisee who behaved unacceptably the opportunity to be evaluated within a cycle. Such a report will send a clear message to other educators to conduct themselves in an acceptable manner.

Another structure that has a role to play is the DSG of the School Manager (see chapter 5, table 5.1). This DSG consists of the School Manager, a peer and an immediate senior from the School Manager’s DSG. The School Manager’s immediate senior is the circuit manager, who is generally not available because of work commitments. The role of the DSG is to support and develop the appraisee (the School Manager).

Circuit managers were also invited to the IQMS advocacy with school-based educators. The Circuit managers’ knowledge and understanding is similar to that of school-based educators. This is because of a lack of clarity by facilitators during advocacy. Total Quality Management, in which IQMS is rooted, emphasises that all supervisors receive training on quality awareness, which should last for four weeks (Bank, 1997:79; Beckford, 1998: 56; Kelemen, 2003:37; Ross & Perry, 1999:9) (see chapter 3).

It is recommended that the School Manager, as an appraisee, and two other School Managers form the School Manager’s DSG. The first School Manager will be a peer, with phase and learning area expertise. The second will be expected to possess administrative, leadership and management expertise to support the appraisee in areas where development is needed. It is further recommended that supervisors (Senior Managers, Circuit Managers and School Managers) receive training first, so that they have a better understanding of the process and content of the policy. This knowledge and understanding will help them advocate the policy in the manner it deserves.
Guideline 5: Sources of information that informed school-based educators about the IQMS process

School-based educators were invited through circulars to a venue where advocacy was to take place. Circulars are official letters written and distributed to various schools by the Education Department. Circulars could originate from the provincial department, district and/or circuit levels. When the targeted group (one School Manager, an SMT member and an educator representing staff) attended the policy advocacy, they were given verbal and written information on the IQMS process by facilitators who elaborated on the IQMS process and content. Written information was given in the form of IQMS photocopied files. Professionally printed files were sent to schools six months after advocacy.

It is recommended that the Education Department ensures that circulars still be used to invite the targeted groups to a venue where the policy is to be advocated. Original policy documents or files should be distributed to schools before advocacy. If schools receive well-printed policy documents, school-based educators will be empowered with the relevant information instead of having to decipher badly photocopied documents.

Guideline 6: Reactions of school-based educators to the IQMS process

School-based educators who attended IQMS advocacy reacted differently to the IQMS process. Some thought that inspection was being reinstated in a different form. Some of the targeted groups were surprised by the advocacy of a new policy, rejecting IQMS, as other departmental initiatives had failed, e.g., DA and WSE. Some of the members were suspicious of the advocated policy’s success and emphasised that the advocated policy would ultimately fail to be implemented, referring to it as a ‘monster’. School-based educators were both confused and excited about the process of the advocated policy. Some of the confused members wondered how they were going to advocate the policy to
other educators in various schools, as the steps in the policy were confusing and had not been made clear to them during advocacy. The school-based educators were informed of the Developmental Support Groups, which aimed at supporting and developing other educators in schools. They were also informed of the Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plan. The school-based educators were concerned about supporting and developing other educators, especially when an educator had areas that needed to be developed or improved. School-based educators were unsure of how to complete the PGP and SIP, as they were not told during advocacy what a PGP and SIP were.

School-based educators were excited about the advocated policy, as they were to be evaluated for the first time in the democratic era, and to receive pay or grade progression. The pay or grade progression would be in the form of additional remuneration to encourage school-based educators to work harder than before. It is imperative that any policy be advocated in a simple manner so that school-based educators can gain a better understanding of the benefits they are to receive. It is recommended that the facilitators state the benefits of the advocated policy during advocacy. If policy is advocated simply, school-based educators will be eager to embark on the first steps, i.e., advocating policy to other educators at schools. It is also probable that they would evaluate themselves fairly if the policy was advocated well.

Guideline 7: Monitoring the implementation process of the advocated policy

Monitoring is a procedure that ensures that an advocated policy is being implemented. Departmental facilitators wrote circulars to schools, informing school-based educators of their intended visits to schools for monitoring purposes (see Annexure Q). These follow-up sessions were aimed to help all schools that had encountered implementation problems with regard to the
advocated policy. The monitoring team did not visit all schools, but sampled some schools to get a broader picture of what was happening in the schools.

The monitoring team had expectations of the implementation of IQMS. Their expectations were however unknown to the schools. The monitoring team members were not clear on all IQMS aspects. When some of the visited schools requested assistance from department facilitators, they were asked if they had read the IQMS official document, as all the answers to their problems lay in this document.

It is recommended that the team of private service providers monitor every policy as they are generally well organized. They would design and use a monitoring form for review and proper feedback would be given. Furthermore, employees of private service providers’ are employed in accordance with their qualifications, expertise and experience, as opposed to what happens in the public sector, where it is believed that anyone can advocate policy. It is further recommended that the facilitators do not sample some schools and leave out others, as they will not gain better understanding of what is taking place in schools with regard to the implementation of the advocated policy. Schools should also be aware of the expectations of the monitoring team so that they are able to perform as expected.

6.3 THE IQMS CONTENT

Guidelines based on the IQMS process were discussed. The following discussion concerns the broad and sub-categories associated with the IQMS content (see table 5.2 for background).

**Guideline 1: The conceptual framework of IQMS**

The IQMS conceptual framework considers the protocol, a step-by-step process, when observing an educator in practice. The framework of the advocated policy
emphasises that for any educator to be evaluated, policy should have been advocated to him/her. An appraisee’s DSG should also exist. When an appraisee completes a PGP, this should be done in consultation with the DSG. In most instances, the appraisees rejected the DSG’s, because of their lack of expertise, saying that they were not familiar with the content of the learning areas on which they (the appraisees) were to be evaluated. The appraisee only requests the DSG to sign the forms, which had been completed by the appraisee alone.

It is recommended that all structures formed in each advocated policy be consulted when steps are to be followed for the implementation of such policies. The DSG should refuse to sign off the relevant forms and to inform the School Manager of the unacceptable conduct. The School Manager is expected to verify the allegations of the DSG. If there is truth in the matter, the School Manager must write a report to the circuit manager, who in turn must submit a report to the senior manager. The senior manager should investigate the matter accordingly. If the allegation is found to be true, the senior manager must direct a letter to the relevant educator who did not consult the DSG and deny him/her evaluation before the end of the cycle. The evaluation of an educator after a cycle could eliminate unacceptable practices that take place in schools.

**Guideline 2: Practicality and cost-effectiveness of the IQMS content**

IQMS content includes the completion of various forms, for example, forms requesting personal details, self-evaluation forms, the Personal Growth Plan and School Improvement Plan. When an educator is observed in practice, reference is made to the relevant Performance Standards. This results in a paper-driven system because of the number of forms that need to be completed (Alan, 1996:1). Although any quality management system is found in a manageable documentation system, IQMS was not well-managed, as the flowchart containing
clear guidelines on what, when, and by whom a specific item was to be dealt with, was not properly managed.

IQMS content is not practical because of the numerous steps that are to be followed. The respondents emphasised that they would receive 1% of their salaries after evaluation. A 1% increase to a school-based educator per pay or grade progression is not cost-effective, as all the paperwork involved in the implementation of the advocated policy (IQMS) is not worth the exercise. The effort that school-based educators put into the evaluation of an educator is more than what they will receive in terms of remuneration (a 1% increase as salary or pay progression). It is recommended that IQMS paperwork be reduced. The paperwork completed during evaluation of an educator is excessive and does not match with the salary or grade progression that school-based educators would receive. At least 5% should be given as salary or grade progression when an educator is evaluated.

**Guideline 3: An IQMS instrument that is understood, constructive and used professionally**

The IQMS instrument was not understood during advocacy, resulting in school-based educators not being empowered with the relevant knowledge to manage the flowchart, complete the PGP and SIP, and to be evaluated for salary or grade progression or appointment affirmation. Furthermore, school-based educators who attended IQMS advocacy did not understand the constructively designed content, as the exercise aims at developing educators’ potential to become the best educators by continuously improving on their performance.

The DSG’s were subjective when evaluating appraisees. Instead of developing educators’ potential, they remain the same educators as before the IQMS instrument was designed. There is no honesty, thus hindering understanding of the instrument and the constructive and professional use thereof. Professionals
are expected to conduct themselves well during the implementation phase and therefore their code of conduct is violated if this is not the case. It is recommended that educators possess the following qualities when evaluating themselves and after evaluation - honesty, trust, accountability and a sense of ownership of the implementation process. When appraisees threaten their DSG’s, this creates tension among members of the staff.

It is recommended that the Department ensures that school-based educators understand the content of the advocated policy by advocating the policy to all educators in phases. When advocating any policy, it is recommended that the facilitators emphasise that there are qualities that school-based educators should possess when they evaluate themselves, when observed in practice, and during actual teaching-learning periods.

**Guideline 4: Clarity on the IQMS content**

Clarity includes certainty, understanding and knowledge. IQMS facilitators were unsure of IQMS content. They did not show that they understood IQMS content during advocacy because advocacy was done haphazardly. If facilitators are unsure about the advocated policy’s content, they will not be in a position to empower school-based educators on the content of the advocated policy.

Facilitators did not know what a PGP was, how to compile it, and how to complete a School Improvement Plan. Lack of clarity resulted in confusion, uncertainty and a lack of knowledge of IQMS content among school-based educators. It is recommended that the Department of Education utilise facilitators who are confident and have a good understanding of, and expertise in the content of the advocated policy. It is further recommended that when facilitators are appointed to the advocacy unit, they present the content of the policy to be advocated to a team of senior managers and directors who were also trained on that particular policy. This will ensure that the facilitators are in a
position to advocate the policy to the targeted group in terms of the Department’s expectations. The Department should not take it for granted that office-based officials are able to advocate the policy.

**Guideline 5: Contextual factors that affect the implementation of IQMS**

Contextual factors are factors that hinder effective teaching in a school context. Overcrowding is an example. School-based educators have large numbers of learners in their classes. The educator-learner ratio in most secondary schools is 1:60 to 1:80 and more. School-based educators have negative attitudes towards the advocating of new policies as such policies add problems to their lives. Their negativity relates to lesson preparation that must be submitted to the SMT, the marking of exercise books, assignments and tests, as well as the completion of IQMS forms during the evaluation of educators. School-based educators regard anything as contextual factors as this will disturb their comfort zones. Furthermore, large classes affect discipline when educators are being observed in practice. When discipline is evaluated, some learners get over-excited when they see visitors in their classrooms and behave unusually.

It is recommended that School Managers keep on applying for additional posts until a ratio of 1:35 that applies in secondary schools is reached. School Managers experience that school enrolment numbers are divided by thirty-five (35) in secondary schools when they apply for additional posts. This does not solve the problem of overcrowding in schools. It is recommended that when snap surveys are completed at the beginning of each year, attention should automatically be given to overcrowded classes to enable a ratio of 1:35 in secondary schools and 1:40 in primary schools. If the educator-learner ratio is addressed, educators’ negative attitude may change, resulting in the implementation of policies.
6.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter contains the guidelines for advocating educational reform with special reference to IQMS. These guidelines were categorised into broad and sub-categories associated with the IQMS process and content during advocacy. These guidelines will assist stakeholders on strategising before embarking on policy advocacy.
7.1. OVERVIEW

This research aimed at gathering the perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in selected public secondary schools in Giyani. The main focus was on how IQMS was advocated to the school-based educators of each school (a School Manager, one school management team member and one educator representing staff). This research has seven chapters, which are summarised below.

Chapter One discussed the background to and elaborated on the research problem. The statement of the problem, the aims and objectives of the study, the research methods, sampling, data collection and validity were discussed, while concepts were clarified. This chapter gives readers a better understanding of the concepts that are used throughout this research.

Chapter Two contains a literature review, where advocacy is required, the approaches to advocacy, the forms, structures and sources thereof, obstacles to advocacy and advocacy of IQMS as a department initiative were discussed. The official IQMS document was reviewed to establish what the benefits are for educators, schools and the education system as a whole. The reasons for the adoption of advocacy into the South African education system were investigated. Advocacy was linked to training, as stakeholders should receive training on any advocated policy. Policy effectiveness, factors affecting policy implementation and how policy implementation should be evaluated were discussed. Lessons learnt from other countries on policy implementation were also discussed.
Chapter Three contained a critical discussion of IQMS. Quality consultants such as Deming, Juran and Crosby were discussed in detail, to ensure that the roots of IQMS were embedded in Total Quality Management. The official IQMS document was criticised and loopholes discussed.

Chapter Four discussed the design methods used. The qualitative research method was employed and four focus group interviews were used as data gathering devices. Data gathered from these interviews were transcribed verbatim into transcripts. An assistant moderator worked hand in hand with the researcher and was expected to scan the environment where the focus groups interviews were to take place, ensuring that the participants were welcomed, and assisting them with the completion of the registration and consent forms. He also debriefed with the researcher and participants after each focus group interview session. An evaluation team evaluated the researcher’s interviewing skills.

Chapter Five contained the data analysis. The cut-and-paste and file card techniques, together with the constant comparative method were used for data analysis. The trustworthiness of the research results was discussed and the results from the four transcripts obtained from the focus group interviews analysed.

Chapter Six provides guidelines for advocating educational reform. These guidelines, on how to advocate policies, will assist the Department at provincial, district and circuit levels and at schools. If policies are advocated in accordance with the guidelines in this study, target groups will embark easily on the implementation phase of the advocated policy.

Chapter Seven focuses on the overview and conclusion of the study. The study is summarised and indicates the contributions to this study. Gaps in the research are identified.
7.2 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THIS STUDY

The following contributions were made to this study:

- Integrated Quality Management System is a new policy, which should have been given sufficient time to be advocated and for training to take place. This would have resulted in successful and uniform implementation. IQMS should have been piloted in selected schools. An observation would have been made to the document for the successful implementation of the policy.

- IQMS advocacy should have been budgeted for and include original, easy-to-read policy documents. Catering, transport and accommodation should be provided. The policy documents (files and brochures) should be distributed to schools before advocacy takes place. This will give school-based educators the opportunity to read the policy before actual advocacy takes place.

- All school-based educators should be trained to empower them with the relevant skills and knowledge for the process and content of the policy.

- The Education Department should use facilitators with expert knowledge of the policy, instead of taking just any member of its staff to advocate the policy to the target groups.

- Schools should have been clustered after advocacy, to find common ground on the way forward, but with facilitators who are familiar with the policy’s process and content. Schools have different competencies and clustering can assist educators to support each other.

- The DSG for School Managers should be peers with learning area expertise. The second School Manager will be a department representative, with managerial, leadership and administrative expertise to practically support and develop their colleague. Circuit managers should not be members of a School Manager’s DSG as they are mostly engaged in work-related activities.
7.3 FURTHER RESEARCH GAPS

The following could be further researched to close the gap in the advocacy of IQMS and to facilitate future policy initiatives:

- Re-advocating, training and successful implementation of IQMS in schools.
- A context in which rural schools could support each other during policy implementation.
- Effective monitoring strategies that could assist schools in effective policy implementation.

7.4 ASPECTS THAT NEED THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT’S ATTENTION

The following important aspects need the Education Department’s attention:

- The allocation of an IQMS budget for pay or grade progression for educators during IQMS implementation.
- Training of all school-based educators for the proper implementation of IQMS in schools.
- Re-advocating IQMS to both school-based and office-based educators for better understanding thereof.
- In-service training for staff development purposes.
- The composition of School Managers’ DSG’s.
- The Performance Standards for School Managers and deputy School Managers.

Should these areas be properly addressed, all schools will be in a better position to implement IQMS, or any other policy, successfully.

7.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS
This study provided the researcher with an enjoyable experience through her interaction with School Managers and CS1 educators, while sharing their experiences, perceptions, beliefs and feelings on advocacy. The interaction helped the researcher to develop a better understanding of the challenges that schools face with regard to advocacy, which has been linked to training and IQMS implementation.

The following quotations from Golmes, (1996) will challenge researchers and readers:

“Quality service is a top-down affair. It starts at the top or it doesn’t start”. (Golmes, 1996:143).

“If change is to occur, it must come about through hard work within the organisation itself”. (Golmes, 1996:209).

“Consistency in quality means not allowing the ordinary rush of business and even extraordinary events to slow or suspend the process” (Golmes, 1996:148).


ELRC Developmental Appraisal for educators. Pretoria: (no publisher).

evaluation guidelines and criteria for the whole school evaluation policy 2001. no city. no publishers.


Govender, P. 2006. Sunday Times Newspaper. Teachers inflate colleagues’ ratings to ensure pay increase. 6p.


ANNEXURE A
Focus Group A: With 5 School Managers  
Date: 5 September 2005

R: When first did you hear about IQMS?
A: Err.. I think, err… we heard it for the first time in 2003. Before 2003, there was something err known as Developmental Appraisal which fell off. But ultimately, in 2003 is when this thing came on.
B: We was (sic) workshopped by the department for IQMS by….
R: When were you workshopped by the department?
C: But what… I remember… first was in 2003, somewhere in September where we were called to an urgent meeting. We were supposed to have been accompanied by the members of the SMT, where we were told that we are going to start with IQMS. Where each and everyone was going to be involved there.
B: And there was no workshopping.
C: No workshopping, but they emphasised that all of us should teach learners in the classes because we were going to be evaluated.
R: What were the sources of information?
C: At first they wrote us a letter which invited us to a common venue. After that we were sent some government officials who told us verbally that we are going to start with IQMS so we must be ready for that.
D: Unfortunately the first advocacy that was conducted was at Educational Multi-purpose Centre (EMPC) – Giyani College of Education. Some of us did not get the material. We only managed to receive something from our unions. I attended the thing that advocacy, where I got something about IQMS.
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A: Errr… maybe let me indicate this that even though clarity was not that sufficient, but at least we got more information from unions than it was from the department.

R: What was your immediate reaction on the news?

A: Well, I personally doubted if it will eventually take off the ground. The reason being that the way a number of things… never took off. I firstly indicated that initially round about 1998/1999 there was developmental appraisal which ultimately failed, there was whole school evaluation which ultimately failed and my reaction was that here is another project that is coming and the end result is failure like all the others.

B: And even now we feel…

E: Ja, with IQMS, there are also many problems when we try to check because last year after the workshop it was indicated that 2005 January we shall have to start without having failure. When this year started, from the side of the department, it was not clear as to what is supposed to be done, more especially insufficient funds to run all those things, that’s why we felt threatened.

R: Why did you feel threatened?

E: Ja, because, errr… it was not clear whether they talked about salary progression, grade progression in terms of money. It was not clear whether people will be compensated after this IQMS.

D: And another thing, last year, we received circulars that we will be getting to Oasis Lodge for three days where managers will be trained, but when we were ready, we received notices that due to financial constraints that workshop has
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been cancelled. So that’s why we still doubt it because if they fail to workshop
us, where are they to get money to pay us?

C: Right, another thing which made us doubt, in the beginning we realized that
even in the case of the department, it was failing to give us enough information
saying they came that of three days saying they are workshopping us and they
left us and some of the schools were not involved. Let me say they did not
attend and at the same time we find that we do have theory but coming to
practice is a different thing, because ok many of us even now, we do not know
how to utilize the IQMS instrument for IQMS. That is why we are having a doubt
and another thing, which realized even in the past, though not in black and white,
we as managers were encouraged not to have class visit. And now if you tell a
teacher that I am going to visit you, the teacher feel threatened by IQMS. It
seems to be a monster, that is why we feel the IQMS may fail.

A: I am still not sure whether this thing, the aim of the department will come to
pass because I doubt it if the department has that financial muscle to run this
thing. Like my colleague has indicated, we were supposed to have attended a
three day workshop which never took off the ground because of financial
constraints and we ended up holding a half a day workshop at the Giyani
Science Centre where they indicated they don’t have money, that’s why it was
switched from three days to one day and understand there will be no catering.
And if the department can claim not to have money for such thing, where will the
department ultimately get money to give the teachers who will be deserving to be
given that money? I definitely am not sure whether this thing will ultimately reach
the desired goal.
B: During the workshop, I think it was a one day workshop. We were in one hall,
all the circuits were there. What I realized is that even the person who was to
workshop us was not clear about how these things should be done. So even
now, we are not clear on how to go about.
R: Can you elaborate a bit on what you said that the person who was supposed
to workshop you was not clear? What does that really mean?
B: In fact, most of the questions he did not answer. That’s why we are saying he
was not clear because we went out of that workshop like the way we get there,
because we were not well-informed. That’s why even today, if you can visit most
of our schools, most of the schools haven’t started.
E: Another problem, I understand we are secondary school principals. Our
programme is so congested that it is not even giving a room for this IQMS.
That’s why she is indicating that some of the schools have not yet started. It is
because of the programme. We have got CASS, we’ve got all those other things.
It is not giving us enough time to do justice to this IQMS.
R: Are you indicating that you are facing a challenge based on lack of time?
E: Ja, definitely. The problem of time is also there.
B: The problem of time is also there but we do not have enough…. I think that is
the most problem.
D: We only received files from the circuit and teachers were given files, but from
there, where to start and where to go was a problem. Even now some files are
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still lying there only self-evaluation was well-understood but with the baseline we
still have a problem.

E: And whenever we meet with our senior officials, they are emphasizing that
IQMS must be finished and must be submitted, otherwise you’ll be
disadvantaging your teachers. Meanwhile at the same time, as we are indicating
that we do not have enough information as to how do you…..

R: Thank you. Did you read the IQMS document?

C: I read it. And even reading it I realized that some information are not there for
example, I think I was looking to one standard where in one criterion is empty
there is nothing there. So I don’t know what do they expect me to give to an
educator where they did not fill up the information.

R: Which performance standard is that one?

C: If I can look into the book I can, sorry I don’t have that instrument. I was
suppose to give you. I think it is 7 if I am not mistaken. It’s a real thing, oh.
You’ll find it’s a real thing. There is nothing. It’s blank there.

B: So… that is the situation. Where are we going to get the information?

R: Are your seniors aware of this thing?

B: They are.

A: Errr… You wanted to know whether we went through this document or not.
Maybe let me answer it this way. The fact that the department saw the need for
workshopping us for three days. I think that is indication enough that err… they
realized on our own we may not do justice to the whole exercise. Errr, I cannot
claim to have gone through that but I think errr the blame should not solely be put
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on schools from not having gone through. I think the department also did not do its homework because initially, it saw the need for workshopping us. So, if it was meant for us to read why did the department call us for a workshop which never answered the questions in full. Errr… we never... we... I personally went through a number of documents but I may not claim to know everything. So I feel err, the question of us having gone through or not, I don’t think it is very relevant here because it is a new instrument that needs more information from the higher authorities than just passing the information to us and say go through them that and start the whole thing.

E: It is unfortunate that I heard two of my colleagues indicating that they were a bit fortunate to get the assistance of the unions so there are some of us who were not fortunate even to be workshopped by the unions only that very little information half a day that we received from the department. So that is why even, if we can go through the document it is not easy to follow some of the things. It is indicated that they need evidence, when they talk about something like preparation – it is not clear, it needs somebody to explain what this statement….

C: I wanted to say that it leaves much loopholes to reporting what one colleague was saying because ok, when we come to the preparation they said we need not worry about written preparation whereas they want an evidence. So, an evidence, you will never get an evidence by let me say by a lesson which is being offered in maybe one or two periods, say ok that this person is well prepared whereas the other things are not there. Ok. we’ve supposed to have an
evidence of what is being prepared because ok... for IQMS they stated it should not stick to what is happening just for a day but it must be a continuous thing. Whereas they stated somewhere that we should not worry about the evidence such as preparation whereas we are supposed to have preparation, so it is difficult sometimes to allocate marks for teachers because ok you might find somebody may argue that ok I am well prepared, whereas there is nothing, there is no evidence there.

R: Does it mean planning is not important as a way of proving that this and that has been done?

C: It is important that teachers were supposed to plan and use that system of writing in black and white so that we must see the evidence and read than to just listen to somebody because ok for example listening you may find that maybe language is broken and other things and you are not going to have a proof where maybe you are going to differ.

A: Errr... I may sound a bit out of this IQMS thing, but let me indicate this that our department has a culture of giving half information to very sensitive things, for instance we have had information on IQMS and we are failing to take it forward. We have a problem with OBE it’s half information that was given to us and we pick up a lot of problems. We have half information on NCS so that whatever new and sensitive things that comes into play we get half information. I think coming back to this IQMS as a topic under discussion now, I think it is necessary that the department gives it the attention it deserves because the half information that we have come December and things will still be in shambles.
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1. R: Thank you, what do you think will work and why?
2. A: What do you mean? Do you mean what will make IQMS to succeed?
3. R: Ja
4. A: Number 1. The department, you see, you cannot start a new thing without having budgeted for it. That’s the fist thing. We may talk about this and that if there is no money to fund the project, the project is bound to fail. So under that, firstly we will be comfortable if the department has budget for IQMS. I don’t think it has like we indicated before a workshop... in err... where was it? Oasis a three-day workshop it failed because of lack of funds. That’s number 1. Number two, if there is money, the department must workshop whoever is involved in this whole thing. Err... if a thing is to run for a year, I don’t think it is correct to workshop a person for three hours. It has to be a continuous thing for a year it needs much more time. So there must be emphasis on workshopping.
5. Number three. After workshopping, err, IQMS has four stages. Stage 1 is self-evaluation for the first quarter. Stage 2 and 3 is baseline. Stage 4 is summative evaluation. But let me indicate ever since we started in January, there is no follow-up on the part of the department when is the department going to see that things are not going on smoothly? Those are the three things. Budget, workshop, follow-up on a quarterly basis.
7. D: And to add on workshop, not school managers only. I’ll suggest that even Head of Departments should be workshopped because they are the ones who are going to compile the PGPs, Yes.
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C: Ja, another thing I’m supporting that it will fail for example you find that the Circuit Managers don’t know this IQMS whereas they are supposed to evaluate the school managers. So you see, you can see that ok we are running in a boat without a direction.

B: And I will suggest that in future if the department want to introduce a new thing, let us be workshopped for in the introduction of a process. You know, they have a tendency of starting to workshop us during the process. You find that you start with OBE, first quarter, first month, they start workshopping you at the end of the quarter and they have this tendency you are not workshopped in good time. They start introducing a new thing or a new curricula you’ll receive documents stating we are starting with this curriculum first January 2005. They will never workshop you until such time. And then 2005 starts, they will start workshopping you in June. You know it becomes very difficult for us as educators or managers to deal with these things.

C: Right, what I see with the department, ok the department is imposing IQMS and they are stating that the money is available so what will happen you’ll find that we would just give marks and send the evaluation and at the end you’ll find the department would be complaining that we don’t have enough funds because ok for example there is salary progression and grade progression so most of us, we are going to give our colleagues pay progression where it will be difficult for the department again.

R: After going through the IQMS document, what do you think will not work and why?
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A: what will cause failure in this process is not a document. The document is very good as far as I’m concerned. It’s only that like err.. my colleague has indicated errr… information does not reach us in time. You see it is September and by the 22nd of September we must have done the second baseline evaluation and some schools have not yet started. Today is the 5th at the end of September the second round of class visits must have been completed and some schools have not started. It is not a question of the document. This document is very good but the way in which the whole thing reached us. When did it reach us and how did it reach us the information was not enough.

R: Are you saying it was not properly done?

A: We cannot say it is not properly done. We may just say it is not done at all.

D: In some schools, I can’t say whether it is monitoring or what. The person may just come just to ask questions from educators and members of the SMT saying that he has been sent by the department to check how far we’ve gone with the IQMS. We are not so sure whether that is monitoring or is just fishing of information or what? I’m not sure.

A: In fact because this thing is new I think we need to have somebody who knows this thing, who does not only come to make a turn at the Principal’s office, who may come to find information and problems if they are there and try to help us. Err… I must be honest with you, at the school where I work no one need come. No one.

C: Right, at my school a certain official came there, I wanted help from him so he told me that didn’t you read the document? He doesn’t know anything but he
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came to find out what is happening there. So I think it will be better to utilize  
people who are knowledgeable about IQMS so that they can help us in different  
schools.

E: In case of this moving around of officials, I thought because my school is far  
from the tarred road. I never saw anybody. I only received a circular indicating  
that from such a date up to such a date they will be moving around, but none of  
them ever came to my workstation.

R: Thank you for your responses. How would you have liked to be informed  
about IQMS?

D: We can prefer the department to invite us even for a week, and try and  
introduce this thing properly so that when we come out of that workshop, we be  
well-equipped. But unfortunately the opposite happened.

A: Ja, I wanted to indicate that errr… this like other initiatives from the  
department are very important and sensitive such that if they expect something  
to kick off in January 2005, if it were possible, at least one week per quarter in  
2005. We meet one week per quarter January to March, one week. If we are not  
sure, they arrange for another meeting in the second quarter, so that by the time  
they want this thing to start, we are sure of what we should do. You see, we  
start to realise issh… there is a mistake about things that I did in January. I start  
to discover the mistake in September and that is not how things should be done.

B: We need to have lot of workshops…

A: Ja, you see. You see, errr… when, two people read one sentence, they get  
different meanings from that sentence. That’s why just giving us the document
and leave it there, that’s not reliable. We are not going to respond to the
information the same way. That’s why workshops are necessary.
B: Today, they expect us to understand this document in less than a day. It is
practically impossible. They expect you to start with a thing that they never
trained you for. With this IQMS, we are expected to facilitate without being
workshopped. And as a result, we are not in a position to move on and as he
has indicated it’s beginning of September. Some of the schools have not yet
started. So, for this thing to progress well they must give us full information
before the start of anything they want to introduce and make sure that we
understand.
C: We were supposed to use the same document if we have enough time so that
we must understand because ok now you’ll find that ok what they were doing
were just giving us an information and thereafter they tell you that go and see it
for yourself at your school. Ok, then, when you come back to the instrument, you
find that ok you are in hell because ok they didn’t touch it or sometimes ok for
example they send us after a while whereas they were supposed to have used it
when they train us. So, that is another difficulty which we have as school
managers and educators in our schools, thank you.
B: We only received files after the June holidays for the project that should’ve
started in January, we received that after the winter holidays. Can you imagine
that?
R: Do you think we left out something based on IQMS that you think is still
important for discussion?
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A: Ja, of course, though it is… I am just grumbling, and you may not be the right person to which I should grumble. Errr… you see, I think this IQMS should consider levels of educators, for instance, level 1, performance standard 1 to 4, I think they are irrelevant for a school manager. My duty there is to manage. Why do they consider me for performance standard number 1 to 5? Why do they want to see me if I know what a cell is in class? What is the value for one to come and sit in my class and see me teaching, whereas my duty is to monitor. So, it is necessary that they should consider which level of a teacher should these performance standard be directed. I want to believe performance standard 1 to 4 should be directed to CSI and CS2. I only started teaching because I was forced to teach.

C: Right, another thing, I think I did study very well all things which I wanted. I think coming to performance standard 8 or 9 somewhere, where they speak about finance for CS2 educators. Not all of them are involved in school finance. But they want us to give a mark for this financial management, whereas it is the responsibility of the SGB and the financial managers. So you become puzzled that how am I going to allocate marks for such a criteria whereas the same person is not his duty.

D: I think something positive about IQMS is if it was well introduced, then I realized that educators now are eager to get something because they had been promised salary progression, grade progression so you find that the teachers have improved when I try to assess them, but if it was well introduced.

B: In fact it is an incentive to educators.
A: But, even when it is an incentive, this thing may come back to haunt us. If next year January teachers get nothing, it will backfire. They'll say ahh, the department is lying like it always does. So there's nobody who will get anything.

R: Did you say everything you wanted to say?

R: Thanks a lot to have been part of this research study. Thank you very much.

D: When I try to get my peer, I can get somebody to come and be my peer, but when it comes to seniors, you find there are 40 schools under one person. Will it be possible for him to move around all those 40 schools when we invite him to come and be our supervisors?

B: We have already invited them and they have not yet started.

E: It seems as if this whole thing is not properly planned. Even the knowledge. Even the planning is not correct. Where you talk about so many schools after one manager, primary schools, secondary schools and all those schools. It is even very difficult for us as a school to do what one person is expected to come and be our senior. I think the planning is not well done. Even those performance standards, they are not well formulated. A revision of some kind must be done. The principal goes down to number 12, while the CSI are ending somewhere there, but you are even expected to carry out number 1.

C: And another thing, you find that even the officials who are supposed to carry on or monitor this IQMS, most of them, they are acting in their positions knowing that anytime I may leave. So you find that they are not serious knowing that ok this is not my work, I may be removed at any time.
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A: And you find that errr… that person who is acting as an inspector, in the real sense, he is your junior. He is only placed, at the circuit office, but he is your junior. You find that when you take a subject advisor to act, a subject advisor is more junior to the principal. Then who is the immediate senior for the principal?

R: Do you still have something to say? Thank you very much.
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1 R: When did you first hear about IQMS?
2 A: Last year.
3 R: When was it?
5 R: Did you all receive same information in 2004?
6 B: Yes, in 2004.
7 R: What were the sources of information?
8 B: We first received information from our principals when they came from training on IQMS.
9 C: And also from unions.
10 R: Did you all received information form unions?
11 D: Ja, I can say yes.
12 R: Did all educators got the same opportunity of being informed more about IQMS from the union’s side?
13 A: No, not all educators. Actually there were those who are serving in the Unions and just some few other individuals who were selected from various schools to go and attend. Not all of us were invited.
14 R: Thank you. What were your immediate reaction on the news based on IQMS?
15 E: Actually the news were exciting because it was just about money. So we thought it is a very good errr incentive because we were going to get some money.
16 R: What else can you say about your immediate reaction on the news?
17 D: At the same time, there were lots of fears about IQMS because people were not certain of what is going to happen as we were receiving second hand information. We did not get one information and the people who were trained or got information, they were trained for a day and they did not get enough information.
18 R: But are you now certain about what IQMS is and its implications?
19 D: Not really, because it is failing because it should have been done last year but they haven’t been done even this year.
20 R: Can you elaborate more on this – what is supposed to be done?
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D: Last year they said there were appraisal and they were not done and automatically all the educators were given one per cent (1%) and this year the process is a little bit slow. But now it’s September already and we are left with three months.

R: Did you read the IQMS document?

E: I read it from ................ the deadlines were 14 items

and all those days are long gone. Nothing has been done.

R: What do you think must be the causes?

A: Ja, I think the main cause of this is the fact that even those people who went for training are not well-equipped. They don’t understand this thing themselves. Sot it becomes difficult for them to implement this. But I think that’s the main problem why .....

B: Thank you. I think the department made a problem because you find that the principal and the teacher were trained for one day. They were trained on why IQMS and the instrument only to find that when we go to School Improvement Plan and to draw the Personal Growth Plan, we are not workshopped on that issue and the department has more work to do on workshopping the principals and the people who are concerned.

R: Thank you. Did you read the IQMS document so far?

A&D: Yes.

R: What do you think will make IQMS successful and why?

A: Ja. I think what can make IQMS successful is: When all educators, all educators can go for training because if we take only two educators – a principal and an educator for a training, I don’t think they are going to give you the feedback as it is supposed to be. Usually, according to my err… my understanding, they just report what they think is but if you go to the next one, in the other school, then they report something different, meanwhile they were at the same meeting. So, seemingly, ahh… there is a problem if you send a certain group of individuals and leave others behind. So, I think it can be successful if all educators can
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be taken for training of some kind so that they can have a clear perception of what IQMS is.

R: What are your perceptions on what makes IQMS successful and why?

C: Maybe to add on that one, is that each and every component has to be very sure as to what is expected from each component because we don't know as to who is responsible for what and what picture of each component is expected to do, what the management is expected to do. So each and every one of us tend to blame on another, whereas the issue is each and every one of us is not aware or use what is expected of.

E: Ja, already from all the things that are done already those people trained for IQMS; I think there should be cluster meetings from time to time where it is said that maybe let's say we set up a date for forming the DSG and then they go and make a cluster and identify the problem areas. The second stage be met, then third one, fourth. Then we will be sure that as a cluster, we are following the particular programme and we will find the whole group, whole province having the same things at the same time, but now up to so far, monitoring has been done but in a different fashion because they should check how far people have gone and you find that School A has done nothing, School B has gone up to the first stage, School C has done everything so we are not in par.

R: Do you think monitoring can help to ensure that IQMS is successful?

E: To some degree year, it helps but it has to be combined with something as I say I suggest clustering. But people might have problems and they need to be helped how to put up the programme if it fails.

C: Maybe another thing is that there must be a lot of consultation. It seems as if, this IQMS has just been imposed on the ground because seemingly the ideas or views of the teachers were not included when drafting all this. So I think a lot of consultation needs to be done.

R: Were teachers' ideas or views not included through unions?

C: They might be included, but I think it's not enough.
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R: Do you still have more to say on IQMS?

E: Ja, when it comes to consultation, you find unions do attend to such things, administration and other things, but they have not gone to everybody on the ground. They represent the people whom they did not consulted on the issue.

R: Do you still have more to say?

R: Thank you. Let’s go to the next question. What do you think will make IQMS unsuccessful and why?

E: Sometimes, rumours comes from people that the government doesn’t have money which was meant to be an incentive for IQMS. So this will make people to lag behind and then IQMS will fail.

R: Are you referring to the idea that there are lack of funds from the department’s side?

E: Ja, is that kind of a rumour from people that they might relax because IQMS has to ensure that they work more than ever before. There is a lot of demand that’s to be put forward. But if there are no incentives, we might relax and the programme will fail.

R: Thanks for the contribution. Something else based on IQMS being unsuccessful and why?

D: Based on that, I think the inappropriate of advocacy can lead to the failure of IQMS because so many visitations, they don’t accept the talent and I think is caused by IQMS not well-monitored. So and then the lack of proper monitoring because I heard some of the schools haven’t yet started because they learnt that IQMS should be stopped. Some of the schools are stopping IQMS and some are running the courses so it is because of lack of monitoring and some schools are visited by government officials to monitor the process and some are not visited. And lack of methods and the fact that there are marks allocated for appraisal on that instrument that can failure to the smooth running of IQMS because each and every educator is concentrating on appraisal. They do not look at the other side of being helped by the IQMS itself. Each and every educator wants the DSG to give them
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marks that will help them get money at the end of the day, because there is no monitoring. We don’t understand this thing.

R: Can you elaborate more on what you said that IQMS was inappropriately advocated?

D: Because what happens it was one educator and the principal from each school who went to the training and even those schools who went there, they don’t have enough information to help the whole school or the educators who were left at school. If you ask them some of the questions, they are not sure of what is going to happen or what is happening. Even the DSG themselves do not know what is happening because there is nobody to give them light or direction on what to do.

C: Maybe to add on that, another issue is that most of the teachers in schools are demotivated or frustrated because of the kind of incentives that we are receiving from the department. So, that’s why they are demotivated even to try to or attempt to improve through IQMS.

R: Can you say some of the factors that demotivate them not to be participating on IQMS?

C: Obviously one of them is the incentive. Secondly, maybe even the working condition.

R: Do you still have more to say on what will make IQMS unsuccessful and why?

R: Thank you, then we will be going to the last question. How would you have liked to be informed about IQMS? (What would have been the correct procedures to have informed you more about IQMS?)

A: Ja, I think if we can have people who are working in IQMS, coming from the department or whatever corner, who can come and train us as educators can assist much. Letting us understand clearly what is IQMS and the necessary procedures that we have to follow in order to make IQMS more successful.

R: Does it mean procedures were not properly clarified?

A: Ja, because err… according to my understanding, even those people who conducted advocacy-training to our principals and those CSI educators were not 100% sure of certain issues related to IQMS.
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1 R:  Can we share some information on procedures not really clarified from the workshop?
2 A:  Ja, err…, Ja, we have a lot of questions to ask, err… on this issue because for instance we have got for CSI educators, the first four performance criterion which are evaluated in the classroom, but with the rest, the others – the last three (3) which are extra-curricular activities, they are not sure. They simply give marks to each and everyone, they say this does not matter, they simply give us marks. And that is a clear indication that they do not understand this.
3 R:  Thank you. We are still on the last item. How would you have liked to be informed about IQMS?
4 D:  There should be more workshops that should have been given to all educators where there will be clarity, today no information about IQMS.
5 R:  Thank you. What else can you add?
6 E:  To add on what she has said. A number of workshops should have been arranged which should have been followed by monitoring and on the programme and then this workshop should focus on the level of introducing IQMS.
7 R:  Can you add more on that? Thanks for the contribution. What do you think we left out on IQMS? Anything on IQMS? Can we share anything on IQMS?
8 A:  Well, I can say that IQMS is a very good thing provided it is conducted in a peaceful manner because it involves money, where, because if the teachers are not getting incentives, this was a way of compensating them. It is very good, but the problem is just with the training.
9 R:  Anything to share?
10 D:  I can second him that IQMS is a good thing. The department itself must make sure that it does not failure the smooth running of the process. For example like this year we have started with the process but in the middle of the process they have given us files which they should have given us before. They said we must use these files instead of the files before. So I think the department is delaying information and materials. IQMS is a very good instrument by
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identifying weaknesses and strengths for educators starting to contribute to the smooth running of IQMS.

R: Does it mean the instrument that was introduced before differs with what was expected from the files?

D: Mmm … ja, there is a difference.

R: Can we share something on that?

D: Mhh, there is no much difference at all, but the files that they’ve given us now they are from the Department. But the files they gave us before they bought files from the shop. But the files that they have given us now are well arranged. We all have information on this instrument.

R: Do you still have something to say?

C: Maybe one other thing is that: One is not even sure as to let’s say maybe the majority of teachers can get this great possession as to whether the government will be able to compensate all the teachers because all the time they are complaining that they do not have enough resources. So I wonder as to whether will it be able to compensate each and everyone.

D: Mhh … the instrument has got an incentive part which measures teachers. How are they going to measure educators who are working in different institutions because some are disadvantaged by the places where they are working, for example, you cannot measure an educator who is working in an urban area like an educator who is working in a rural area, there are lots of differences and there are lots of ……

R: Are there no contextual factors that are to be considered when measuring their performance?

D: Mmm… they are there, but rural area teachers are more disadvantaged.

R: Anything to say based on IQMS?

A: Ja, I understand the issue of contextual factors but with rural areas, there are more of them than in urban areas, for instance I have one of my classes which was supposed to carry at least 34 learners which is having 94 and you can imagine being evaluated in that type of a class. That’s a complete mess. So, I think government has to make it a point
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that the instrument which are going to be used, this is my own personal
suggestion, the instrument to be used should at least differ.

R: Do you still have more to say?

E: Ja, I don't know how the government will react on this because the
implementation of IQMS has lagged behind, and yet they have
expectations from schools on the submissions of IQMS documents and
on the other hand it means money to the teachers. So, I don't know if
they'll come up with a set date and say how to submit this and that and
you find that schools were not ready. And on the other hand, the
reasons why the schools were not ready is because of the way they
advocated it. I would like to say that it is not possible that this be
rectified or we be given more time since the problem lies with the
department.

R: In other words, does it mean IQMS was not well advocated?

E: Exactly.

R: Can you say more on that?

E: And just now, they must put some dates like the ones somebody who
came to check the programmes of IQMS. He went to various schools
or maybe he did go to all I don't know. They are having some
expectations. In some schools he was disappointed whereas the
others he went ok. But I am saying not that the problems were in the
way they were advocated and it is the fault of the department. If they
have had many or some of the contributions we are saying, like it
should have been done in parts, maybe it could have gone well or
better as it is now. But now, instead of doing that they go on setting up
dates for submission of more work as though we have all started at the
same time and that creates problems because some teachers err... will
not be evaluated whereas it is not their fault, it is the fault of the district.
So that's why I also put it as a question: How can they do it to cover all
teachers or all the people because it is not their fault that IQMS lagged
behind?

R: Thank you for the contribution. What are the expectations that these
inspectors have?
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B: Some want us to submit the school improvement plan and they want us
to elaborate on the whole school evaluation to say the basic
functionality of the school, where the form they never brought it to us.
When we draft the School Improvement Plan we submit it to the district
they said go it is not correct, go and draw School Improvement Plan.
We don’t know how to do it.

R: Were the School Improvement Plans also advocated to School
Managers or not?

E: Thank you. All these things were done in one day. Everything was
done when IQMS was advocated. Everything was done in one day.
You see, if everything is done in one day, whereas in implementation
there is a lot of work. Setting up the DSG is a process. From there,
putting up the School Improvement Plan (SIP) can’t be done in one day
as people were saying. Perhaps I can say it was not well advocated.

R: Then how do you think it should have been advocated?

E: I said it before that it should have been done in parts, like the first
week, they should have focused on setting up the DSGs like they
should have summarised that in one day but they say now let us meet
as clusters and see as to whether you have the DSGs in your schools.
Then we go back to the schools and have the DSGs formed, the
problems we have encountered and all those things. By the second
round we say ok go and implement that until we are sure that all
schools are in par with everything and we be sure that we are on the
same phase. Every school has done its. But the way as it is done.
But the way they have done everything, people were only workshopped
in one day whereas IQMS is a process that takes a long time. Then I
am not sure if it will succeed. If it succeed then it will be pushed to
succeed but it won’t just go by itself.

R: Thank you for your contribution. Did we cover everything on IQMS?

Thanks to have been participants in this research study. Thanks a lot.
ANNEXURE B
cators make the SDT, but the district has to provide support.

Roles and responsibilities:
- Must ensure that all staff members have been trained on processes and procedures before implementation, i.e. the DSGs, management plans, PGP, etc.
- Should liaise with the Department on highly prioritized needs, like, INSET, short courses, skill programmes or learnerships.
- Should monitor effectiveness and the consistency of the IQMS implementation and submit reports accordingly.
- Should develop the School Improvement Plan (SIP), based on the findings by the self-evaluations, and submit everything in time to the district.
- Liaise with the external WSE Team to coordinate and manage the cyclical WSE process.

Term of Office:
- Although it is a prerogative of the school, it is suggested that the SDT be for a period of three years for continuity sake.
- When an individual leaves a school, they must be replaced through democratic processes.

DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT GROUPS (DSGs)

Composition and their Selection:
- For each educator there must be the immediate senior and their peer, selected by an educator on the basis of relevant learning area/subject or phase expertise.
- With regards to a one-educator school, the district must provide support and monitoring.
- Information on the DSGs must be factored into the broad planning of the STD to control clashes during evaluation.

Roles and Responsibilities:
- The main role is to provide monitoring and support of the educators in their responsibilities, including their PGP and development.
- This structure has to conduct the baseline evaluation and the summative evaluation on their educator.

**DISTRICT / LOCAL OFFICE**

- This structure has the overall responsibility to have advocacy, training and implementation to be according to the policy.
- The level is also responsible for professional development programmes as informed by the findings during evaluation.
- The District Senior Manager has a responsibility of monitoring evaluation results considering consistency.
- The District must capture and submit evaluation results, with needs, in time, to the ESD for further processing.
- The District is expected to monitor the IQMS implementation in schools and make interventions where necessary.

---

**INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

**IQMS FOR INSTITUTION-BASED EDUCATORS (IBE)**

Agreement No.8 of 2003

(27 August 2003)

For more information contact:
The Senior Manager
Education Standards Directorate
Limpopo Department of Education
Private Bag X9489, POLOKWANE (0700)
Tel: 015 297 3925 Fax: 015 297 4395
PRELUDE

Quality is one of the concerns of the Department of Education. This quality is embedded in the policy documents and all the strategies focusing on perpetual provision of improved quality education to all in South Africa.

To ensure provision of quality education, the Limpopo Province Department of Education (LPDOE) has initiated the establishment of the Education Standards Directorate (ESD) which is located within the Chief Directorate Institutional Development and Support.

Background

An agreement was reached in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) to integrate the existing programmes on quality management in education (Agreement 8 of 2003). These programmes are the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) that came into being on 28 July 1998 (Resolution 4 of 1998), the Performance Measurement System that was agreed upon on 10 April 2003 (Agreement 1 of 2003), and Whole-School Evaluation (WSE) that was launched in 2001 (Government Gazette Volume 433, Number 22512 of July 2001). The IQMS is informed by Schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act (Act 76 of 1998), where the Minister is required to determine performance standards for educators in terms of which their performance should be evaluated.

What Is IQMS

IQMS is an integrated quality management system that consists of three programmes, which are aimed at enhancing and monitoring performance of the education system, and they are the following:

Developmental Appraisal;
Performance Measurement; and
Whole School Evaluation.

The purpose of Developmental Appraisal (DA) is to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner, with a view to determine areas of strength and weakness, and to draw up programmes for individual development.

The purpose of Performance Measurement (PM) is to evaluate individual educators for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments, and rewards and incentives.

Whole-School Evaluation (WSE) has its purpose as evaluation of the overall effectiveness of a school, which includes the quality of learning and teaching.

These programmes are implemented in an integrated way in order to ensure optimal, effectiveness and coordination of the various programmes.

The Purpose Of IQMS

- To identify specific needs of educators, schools and district offices for support and development;
- To provide support for continued growth;
- To promote accountability; and
- To evaluate educator’s performance, amongst others

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The implementation of IQMS is based on the following principles:

- The need to ensure fairness; for example, there shall be no sanctions against an educator on performance before meaningful opportunities for development.
- The consistent usage of the instrument in a transparent way and discussions should aim at minimizing subjectivity.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF INDIVIDUALS AND STRUCTURES INVOLVED IN IMPLEMENTING THE IQMS

The Principal

- S/he has an overall responsibility to ensure that the IQMS is implemented uniformly and effectively in their schools
- Must ensure that every educator is provided with

the IQMS document and other relevant documentation.
- Together with SMT and SDT members they are responsible for advocacy and training at school level.
- Should ensure the democratic formation of the Staff Development Team (SDT)
- Should ensure that all IQMS documentation sent to the local office is correct and delivered in time
- S/he is responsible for the internal moderation of evaluation results to maintain fairness and consistency.

The Educator

- Must conduct self-evaluation.
- Must identify the Development Support Group (DSG) and cooperate with it.
- Must develop the personal growth plan (PGP) based on the findings of the evaluation.
- Must attend INSET and other programmes related to areas for their development.
- Must engage and participate in feedback and discussions meetings.

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAMS (SMTs)

- Should assist with the broad planning and the implementation of IQMS.
- Should inform educators about the INSET and other programmes aimed at the development of educators and they should make proper arrangements for attendance.
- In collaboration with the SDT, they must ensure that self-evaluation (educators and the school) is done according to the Agreement.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT TEAMS (SDTs)

Composition:

- The SDT is made up of the principal, the WSE coordinator, democratically elected SMT members and democratically elected PL1 educators.
- The size of the SDT is the prerogative of a school; but they are advised to have three to six members, depending on the school size.
- In schools with one or two educators, such edu-
Performance Standard: 7. EXTRA-CURRICULAR AND CO-CURRICULAR PARTICIPATION

Expectation: The educator participates in extra-curricular activities in such a way that it supplements the learning process and leads to the holistic development of the learners.

Question: Does the educator participate in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities and is he/she involved in the administration of these activities?

CRITERIA: (a) Involvement; (b) Holistic development; (c) Leadership and coaching; (d) Organisation and administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The educator is not involved in extra-curricular or co-curricular activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Makes no attempt to use these activities for the holistic development of the learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Leadership and coaching is inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Organisation and administration is poor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Not fully involved in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Makes some effort to use these activities for the holistic development of learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Leadership and coaching is at an acceptable level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Organisation and administration is at an acceptable level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Educator is fully involved in extra-curricular and co-curricular activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Educator skillfully involves learners in all activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Evidence of good leadership and coaching at a pleasing standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Administration and organisation is conducted professionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Educator plays a leading role and encourages learners and staff to arrange and participate in activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Educator is most successful in using these activities for the holistic development of learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Leadership and coaching is at an exceptional standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Administration and organisation is outstanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating

Unacceptable = 1  Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2  Good = 3  Outstanding = 4

Performance Standard 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Max 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating.
Performance Standard: 8. ADMINISTRATION OF RESOURCES AND RECORDS

Expectation: The educator administers resources and records in an effective and efficient manner to enable the smooth functioning of the institution

Question: Does the quality of administration contribute to building an effective institution?

CRITERIA: (a) Utilisation of resources; (b) Instructions; (c) Record Keeping; (d) Maintenance of infrastructure; (e) Circulars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>• Does not utilise resources (human, physical or financial) optimally or abuses these resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>• No clear instructions or guidelines are provided. Staff members are unsure what is expected of them. There is no mentoring or support of staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>• Financial and other records are not kept or are incomplete and do not comply with the departmental requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>• Premises, buildings and equipment are not properly maintained or are abused. There are no proper control measures or systems in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>• Departmental circulars are not brought to the attention of staff members. No proper record is maintained and circulars are often lost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations

| (a)                   | • Uses resources appropriately. |                                 |                   |
| (b)                   | • Gives clear instructions and provides guidelines with regard to administrative duties to be performed. Staff are able to meet expectations. |                                 |                   |
| (c)                   | • Records (financial & otherwise) are kept in accordance with accepted practices and/or departmental requirements. |                                 |                   |
| (d)                   | • Ensures that the premises, buildings, equipment and learning and teaching materials are properly used and maintained. Exercises proper control of their usage. |                                 |                   |
| (e)                   | • All Departmental circulars (and other information received) in respect to things that affect them, are brought to the attention of staff members. |                                 |                   |

3. Good

| (a)                   | • Uses resources effectively and efficiently. |                                 |                   |
| (b)                   | • Gives clear instructions and provides sound guidelines in respect of administrative duties. Staff know what is expected of them and, through mentoring, supports staff in those duties. |                                 |                   |
| (c)                   | • Full and complete records are kept not only in terms of departmental requirements but also of important events and other aspects that are of interest to the institution. |                                 |                   |
| (d)                   | • Premises, buildings, equipment are used and maintained well. There is evidence of improvement in this regard. |                                 |                   |
Performance Standard 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Max 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating

Performance Standard 9: PERSONNEL

Expectation: Manages and develops personnel in such a way that the vision and mission of the institution are accomplished.

Question: Does he/she manage staff by applying the principles of democracy?

CRITERIA: (a) Pastoral care; (b) Staff development; (c) Provision of leadership; (d) Building commitment & confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>• No evidence of any pastoral care for personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>• Does not contribute to or participate in staff development programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>• Does not provide any professional leadership within the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>• No evidence of building commitment and confidence of staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>• Provides pastoral care to staff members but infrequently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>• Some evidence of staff development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>• Offers professional advice to staff when necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>• Motivates staff members when necessary but not regularly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Standard 9

**Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Satisfies Minimum Expectations</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Max 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating

---

### Performance Standard: 10. DECISION MAKING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

**Expectation:** The educator establishes procedures that enable democratic decision-making and accountability within the institution.

**Question:** Does the educator establish structures that enable/ensure active participation by all stakeholders in decision making processes and are there to clear lines of accountability?

**CRITERIA:** (a) Stakeholder involvement; (b) Decision making; (c) Accountability/responsibility; (d) Motivation; (e) Objectivity/Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1. Unacceptable       |           |                                |                    |
| (a)                   |           |                                |                    |

- Makes little or no attempt to involve all stakeholders in decision making processes. There is little or no evidence of continuous decision making.

| (b)                   |           |                                |                    |

- Lacks decision-making skills, makes autocratic decisions without consultation or is reluctant to make any decisions or decisions are frequently illogical and not the best option.

| (c)                   |           |                                |                    |

- Does not take responsibility for any decisions that are made often tries to put the blame on someone else if decisions are proved to be wrong.

| (d)                   |           |                                |                    |

- Is not decisive. Is unable to earn the respect of staff members with regard to the quality of decisions made and is not motivated to take a leadership role.

| (e)                   |           |                                |                    |

- Decisions are seldom taken and where they are it is apparent that objectivity and fairness were not considered important.
2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations

| (a) | Establishes structures and procedures that enable the involvement of stakeholders. |
| (b) | Has decision making skills, takes different views into account when making decisions. |
| (c) | Takes responsibility for decisions made in most instances. Sometimes to justify decisions that have been proved wrong. |
| (d) | Is decisive, earns the respect of staff members and is able to motivate staff to participate in decision making. |
| (e) | Decisions taken reflect that objectivity and fairness were considerations. |

3. Good

| (a) | Ensures that all stakeholders are actively involved in decision making and that the necessary procedures are followed. |
| (b) | Has good decision making skills: is able to take different points of view into account and to base decisions on sound logic. |
| (c) | Is prepared to be held accountable for the decisions made. |
| (d) | Staff members are willing to participate in decision making processes and respect the decisions taken. |
| (e) | Objective and sound decisions take contextual factors into account in order to arrive at decisions that are fair. |

4. Outstanding

| (a) | Ensures that wherever possible and appropriate decisions are arrived at by consensus. |
| (b) | Decisions, based on wide consultation with all relevant parties and based on sound logic, are made in good time. Creative solutions are found when necessary. Is decisive without being authoritarian. |
| (c) | Is prepared to be held accountable for the decision making process as well as taking responsibility for the decisions. Does not pass on the blame for wrong decisions. Ensures accountability from staff members as well as being accountable to them. Decisions are frequently proactive rather than reactive. |
| (d) | Staff recognise that their opinions are valued and taken into account. They are motivated to participate in decision making. |
| (e) | Staff members trust the decisions made by the educator as the process has been transparent and participatory. Decision are always objective and fair. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory = 1</th>
<th>Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2</th>
<th>Good = 3</th>
<th>Outstanding = 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating
Performance Standard: 11. LEADERSHIP, COMMUNICATION AND SERVICING THE GOVERNING BODY

Expectation: The educator demonstrates / has well-developed leadership qualities.

Question: Is the educator able to take the lead and act decisively in terms of priorities and opportunities?

CRITERIA: (a) Leadership; (b) Support; (c) Communication; (d) Systems; (e) Commitment and confidence; (f) Initiative, creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Demonstrates poor (or no) leadership qualities. Is reluctant to take the lead and/or has not earned the respect of colleagues; often feels threatened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Is unable to provide support; does not mentor or provide guidance; may often undermine colleagues; is not approachable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Does not communicate with colleagues, parents or the School Governing Body; does not share information or ideas. Is not prepared to listen to alternative points of view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Does not work to any particular system; is disorganized and is unable to manage or control specific projects or initiatives. Productivity is low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Lacks commitment and confidence. Is easily swayed when challenged. Does not follow through on tasks and is easily distracted. Time management is weak/poor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Lacks initiative and is not creative. Will not attempt tasks without clear directives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations

| (a)                   | Takes the lead in encouraging teamwork and empowers colleagues. |                   |                   |
| (b)                   | Provides guidance and support to enable colleagues to improve. |                   |                   |
| (c)                   | Consults with colleagues, parents and the Governing Body, shares information and provides reports back, is transparent and listens to alternative points of view. |                   |                   |
| (d)                   | Works to basic systems, is organized and productivity is acceptable. |                   |                   |
| (e)                   | Is confident and is committed to serving the learners, parents and the SGB. Is focused and persistent. Will follow through on tasks until completed. |                   |                   |
| (f)                   | Implements systems and structures in a familiar environment. Is prepared to attempt to improve existing systems. |                   |                   |

3. Good

<p>| (a)                   | Provides strong leadership and direction to enable colleagues to realise strategic objectives. |                   |                   |
| (b)                   | Values colleagues as individuals, acknowledges their ideas, provides ongoing support and is available to guide and advise them. |                   |                   |
| (c)                   | Consults with colleagues, parents and the SGB; shares ideas and information; takes alternative points of view into account. |                   |                   |
| (d)                   | Has improved systems that are appropriate for specific circumstances; is organized and is able to track progress. Productivity is above average. |                   |                   |
| (e)                   | Has built up experience which is the basis for confidence; is not easily distracted; supports colleagues in order to achieve goals. Time management is good; tasks are completed with deadlines. |                   |                   |
| (f)                   | Is innovative and is prepared to try out new ways of doing things, refines and improves existing systems and processes. |                   |                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Unacceptable = 1</th>
<th>Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2</th>
<th>Good = 3</th>
<th>Outstanding = 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Performance Standard 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating

### Performance Standard: 12. STRATEGIC PLANNING, FINANCIAL PLANNING AND EMD

**Expectation:** The educator displays competence in planning and education management development.

**Question:** Does the manager administer the different management processes efficiently and effectively?

**CRITERIA:** (a) Strategic planning; (b) Financial planning; (c) Project management; (d) Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) No evidence of strategic planning and EMD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) No or little evidence of financial planning and budgeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) No pre-planning / management of specific projects / interventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Does not consult with stakeholders on decisions that affect them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Has some evidence of EMD and strategic planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Basic financial records are in order and some evidence of budgeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Some evidence of attempt to plan and monitor specific projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Some communication with stakeholders takes place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COMPOSITE SCORE SHEET FOR USE IN PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FOR PAY PROGRESSION AND GRADE PROGRESSION FOR Level 1 Educators (28 CRITERIA)**

**EDUCATOR:**

**PERSAL NUMBER:**

**SCHOOL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARDS</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a positive learning environment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Planning, preparation and presentation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Assessment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development in field of work/career and participation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations and Contribution to school development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-Curricular &amp; Co-Curricular participation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE**

112

THE ABOVE-MENTIONED EDUCATOR'S SCORE has been/has not been ADJUSTED

**COMMENTS/REASONS FOR ADJUSTMENT**

To qualify for salary progression the educator needs to obtain: 56 (2)
To qualify for grade progression the educator needs to obtain: 78 (3)

I agree/do not agree with the overall performance rating.

**EDUCATOR:**

**DSG:**

**DATE:**

**PRINCIPAL:**

**DATE:**
### COMPOSITE SCORE SHEET FOR USE IN PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FOR PAY PROGRESSION AND GRADE PROGRESSION FOR Level 2 Educators (42 CRITERIA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARDS</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a positive learning environment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Planning, preparation and presentation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Assessment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development in field of work/career and participation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations and Contribution to school development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-Curricular &amp; Co-Curricular participation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of resource and records</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making and accountability</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE ABOVE-MENTIONED EDUCATOR'S SCORE has been/has not been ADJUSTED**

**COMMENTS/REASONS FOR ADJUSTMENT**

To qualify for salary progression the educator needs to obtain: 84 (2)
To qualify for grade progression the educator needs to obtain: 118 (3)

I agree/do not agree with the overall performance rating.

**EDUCATOR:** ____________________________ **DSG:** ____________________________
**DATE:** ____________________________ **DATE:** ____________________________

**PRINCIPAL:** ____________________________ **DATE:** ____________________________

---

### COMPOSITE SCORE SHEET FOR USE IN PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FOR PAY PROGRESSION AND GRADE PROGRESSION FOR Level 3 & 4 Educators (52 CRITERIA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE STANDARDS</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a positive learning environment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Planning, preparation and presentation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Assessment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development in field of work/career and participation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations and Contribution to school development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-Curricular &amp; Co-Curricular participation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of resource and records</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making and accountability</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership, communication and servicing the Governing Body</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning, financial planning and education management development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE ABOVE-MENTIONED EDUCATOR'S SCORE has been/has not been ADJUSTED**

**COMMENTS/REASONS FOR ADJUSTMENT**

To qualify for salary progression the educator needs to obtain: 104 (2)
To qualify for grade progression the educator needs to obtain: 146 (3)

I agree/do not agree with the overall performance rating.

**EDUCATOR:** ____________________________ **DSG:** ____________________________
**DATE:** ____________________________ **DATE:** ____________________________

**PRINCIPAL:** ____________________________ **DATE:** ____________________________
PERSONAL DETAILS
### PERSONAL DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employing Depart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank/Post Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal Date of Appointment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUALIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification(s)</th>
<th>Where obtained (Institution)</th>
<th>When obtained (Year)</th>
<th>Major learning Area(s)</th>
<th>Secondary learning Area(s) (at least second year courses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period (Dates)</th>
<th>Department/Institution/School/Other</th>
<th>Nature of experience (Primary/Secondary/Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period (Dates)</th>
<th>Department/Institution/School/Other</th>
<th>Nature of experience (Primary/Secondary/Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEARNING AREA AND GRADE CURRENTLY BEING TAUGHT

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELEVANT CERTIFICATES/DIPLOMAS/CREDITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificates/Credits</th>
<th>Where obtained</th>
<th>When obtained</th>
<th>Content and nature of qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period (Dates)</th>
<th>Department/Institution/School/Other</th>
<th>Nature of experience (Primary/Secondary/Other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL GROWTH PLAN
PERSONAL GROWTH PLAN

NAME OF SCHOOL: ____________________________

NAME OF EDUCATION: ____________________________ DATE: ____________________________

1. The following criterion/criteria need/s urgent attention:
   a. ____________________________
   b. ____________________________
   c. ____________________________
   d. ____________________________
   e. ____________________________
   f. ____________________________
   g. ____________________________
   h. ____________________________

2. I am in full control of the following areas for development:
   a. ____________________________
   b. ____________________________
   c. ____________________________
   d. ____________________________
   e. ____________________________
   f. ____________________________

3. Guidance is needed to be provided for the following: i.e. Mentoring, professional support, etc.:
   a. ____________________________
   b. ____________________________
   c. ____________________________
   d. ____________________________

4. The following actions need to be undertaken in order to bring about improvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME FRAMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I need the following resources to bring about improvement:
   __________________________________________________________

6. The following contextual factors are hampering my progress:
   __________________________________________________________

7. Improvement has been effected in the following areas:
   __________________________________________________________

8. The following did not provide the necessary support and assistance:
   __________________________________________________________

9. Further improvement/s is/are required in the following areas:
    _________________________________________________________

10. My progress has been monitored: regularly/rarely/not at all

DATES: ____________________________

SIGNATURE DSG: ____________________________

SIGNATURE EDUCATOR: ____________________________
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SIP)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT NEEDS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>TARGET GROUP</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>TIME FRAMES</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified needs for development</td>
<td>Activities that will address needs in the previous column</td>
<td>Plans that will be used to achieve results</td>
<td>E.g. learners, educators, SGB, etc.</td>
<td>Registers, documents, policies, etc.</td>
<td>If money is involved</td>
<td>Starting date and end date</td>
<td>What will show your plans were successful</td>
<td>Person or persons responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal: .........................  Date: .........................
ANNEXURE D
The Senior Manager  
Mopani District  
Department of Education  
Private Bag x578  
GIYANI  
0826

Sir

RE-APPLICATION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN SELECTED PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GIYANI

1. I am a University of Johannesburg’s Doctoral student number 909601557.

2. My research topic is: The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in selected public secondary schools in Giyani.

3. These schools were purposively sampled. The researcher used her judgement that the participants were workshopped on IQMS. The purpose of the study is to get the participants’ perceptions on the advocacy of IQMS.

4. The selected schools are ten in number, and they are:

   - Famandha
   - Hanyani-Thomo
   - Hawuka
   - Jim-Rhangani
   - Macema
   - Mafumani
   - Nhluvuko
   - Nkami
   - Risinga
   - Skhunyani

5. One School Manager and one CS1 educator who can voice out their perceptions, will form focus group interviews. There will be two groups of five for school managers and CS1 educators.

6. The researcher is going to comply with ethical standards as stipulated by the University of Johannesburg, Academic Ethics Committee guidelines. Participants will be provided with the following information:

   - The purpose of the research, the procedure that will be followed and the time that will
be required to interview them.

- The composition of the sample.
- Participants are expected to respond verbally on questions based on advocacy and IQMS.
- Permission has been granted from the Provincial Education Department to have access to selected schools.
- Letters will be written to individual participants, stressing that:
  - Participation is voluntary
  - This study involves no risks (tapes will be used to record responses).
  - Withdrawal from participation is allowed.
  - Consent will be negotiated per phase.
  - Confidentiality is stressed (identities will not be revealed).
  - Participants are expected to respond in writing if they withdraw.
  - This study will be conducted in English. The participants are intellectuals and are competent in English.
  - Participants will not face any physical, psychological, legal or social discomfort.
  - The researcher did research at a Masters' level and is competent in conducting research.

7. The general aim of this study is to determine how IQMS was advocated to educators. The district will benefit from this study when there is a need for school reform initiatives. The participants will get feedback from this study (findings and recommendations).

8. Attached, is a letter from my supervisor, Prof.TC Bisschoff.

9. Hoping that my application will be considered.

Yours Faithfully

AK Mathye (Ms)

Persal No. 81068972
Dear Student

Application For Permission To Conduct Research


2. The Department wishes to inform you that your request to conduct research at ten schools in Giyani area, Mopani District is approved. The title of the research is ‘The perception of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System in selected public secondary schools in Giyani.’

3. However, the following conditions must be adhered to:

3.1. The research should not have any financial implications for Limpopo Department of Education.

3.2. You make arrangements with the District Office concerning the conduct of the study and the research is not conducted during the fourth term of the calendar year, as schools would be making final preparations for the end of year examinations.

3.3. You should make arrangements with the schools in such a way that there will be minimal disruption of the academic programme.

3.4. You share with the Department, the final product of your study upon completion of the research assignment.

3.5. The research is conducted in line with ethics in research.

4. It is expected of you to produce the accompanying letter at institutions where you will be conducting your research, as evidence that permission for this activity has been granted.

5. The Department appreciates the contribution that you wish to make and wishes you success in your investigation.

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT  

DATE: 12/1/2005

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
HEAD OFFICE
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Sir/Madam

The bearer, Mathye A K, has been given permission by Limpopo Department of Education (LDoE) to conduct research at schools in Giyani area, Mopani District. The title of the research is 'The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System in selected public secondary schools in Giyani.' This research will be conducted during the first three terms of the calendar year.

The Department requests learners, managers and educators to cooperate with the researcher when research activities are conducted.

It is envisaged that the research report will assist LDoE in many ways.

Thank you

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

DATE: 13/1/2023

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
HEAD OFFICE
ANNEXURE F
The School Manager

Sir / Madam

FEEDBACK ON NEGOTIATING ENTRY AT YOUR SCHOOL

1. The above matter bears reference.
2. I have been granted permission to conduct research at a Doctoral level. The research topic is: The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System in selected public secondary schools in Giyani.
3. May I please interview you (a school manager and a CS1 educator)?
4. Your responses and identities will be anonymous.

Yours Faithfully

A.K. Mathye (A Researcher)
The School Manager

Dear Sir / Madam

A SELECTION OF A CS1 EDUCATOR WHO IS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW

1. The above matter bears reference.
2. You are requested to select an educator who is going to participate in the focus group interview.
3. This educator should have the following:
   - Knowledge of IQMS.
   - An ability to voice out his / her perceptions, feelings and beliefs about IQMS.
   - Be either a SDT or DSG member.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours Faithfully

A.K. Mathye (A Researcher)   Cell no. 082 667 9797
ANNEXURE G
# Whole School Evaluation

Form A (Information on the school to be completed by the school Principal).

## 1 School Information Form

### 1.1 Basic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School’s Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circuit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type (Primary, Secondary):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School’s postal address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School’s physical address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School’s telephone number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School’s Fax number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School’s E-mail address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson of Governing Body:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of Self-evaluation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates of External evaluation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 SCHOOL INFORMATION FORM

1.1 Basic Information

School's Name: ..........................................................

EMIS Number: ..........................................................

Province: ..............................................................

District: ...............................................................

Circuit: .................................................................

Type (Primary, Secondary) ...........................................

Principal: ..............................................................

School's postal address: ............................................

..............................................................................

..............................................................................

School's physical address: ..........................................

..............................................................................

..............................................................................

School's telephone number: ......................................

School's Fax number: ..............................................

School's E-mail address: ...........................................

Chairperson of Governing Body: ..............................

Dates of Self-evaluation: .......................................... 

Dates of External evaluation: ....................................
1.3.2 Educators information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of permanent educators</th>
<th>Number of temporary educators</th>
<th>Number of full-time educators</th>
<th>Number of part-time educators</th>
<th>Number of educators who are professionally qualified</th>
<th>Number of educators who are unqualified</th>
<th>Number of educators who are under-qualified</th>
<th>Total number of educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.3.3 Total number of educators and learners in respect of RACE and DISABILITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>EDUCATORS</th>
<th>DISABLED PEOPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>INDIAN</td>
<td>AFRICAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNERS</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>INDIAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Supplying the above information will give the Department a clear picture of the diversity, as well as the needs of the school.

1.3.4 Post Structure: Total number of educators in respect of posts at the school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSTS:</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL</th>
<th>HEADS OF DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>EDUCATORS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of posts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in terms of Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of educators</th>
<th>Number of full-time educators</th>
<th>Number of part-time educators</th>
<th>Number of educators who are professionally qualified</th>
<th>Number of educators who are unqualified</th>
<th>Number of educators who are under-qualified</th>
<th>Number of male educators</th>
<th>Number of female educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.3.1 Ring the area in which the school is situated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburbs</th>
<th>Inner City</th>
<th>Small Town</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Rural Area</th>
<th>Deep Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.3.2 Grade your estimate of the socio-economic status of the area from which the majority of your learners come on a five point scale by ringing the appropriate number (5 is very high socio-economic conditions; 1 is very deprived socio-economic conditions)

1.3.3 Grade your estimate of the academic standards of the majority of your learners on entry to the school by ringing the appropriate number. (5 is very high academic standard; 1 is very low academic standard)

1.3.4 Does the school have a policy for remedial intervention regarding major learning difficulties?

1.4 Rates of Attendance

1.4.1 Give the percentage of learners who attended school on the days of the week before you completed this form:

Week beginning date: ..............

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.2 Give the percentage of educators who attended school on the days of the week before you completed this form:

Week beginning date: ..............

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Organization of the school day

1.5.1 What time does the school day normally start for learners?

1.5.2 What time does the school day normally start for educators?

1.5.3 What time does the school day normally finish for learners?

1.5.4 What time does the school day normally finish for educators?

1.5.5 Do you have a shift system in school?

1.5.6 If you have a platoon system, what time does the first cycle start?

1.5.6 Start

1.5.6 Finish

1.6 The School's Curriculum

List the subjects/learning areas taught per grade in the boxes below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form B: Nine (9) Areas for Evaluation.

(To be filled in by the school Principal in consultation with the school Management Team, learners and educators to assess the effectiveness of the school and the nine areas for evaluation).

- The intentions for each evaluation area are given at the top of the evaluation box
- Using the questions in the Guidelines and Criteria document, you are required to evaluate accordingly each area for evaluation
- Identify the areas where your school is doing well and those areas that may need to be developed
- Provide responses in the given boxes and available evidence against each response.

1. AREA FOR EVALUATION: BASIC FUNCTIONALITY OF THE SCHOOL

| PURPOSE: To evaluate whether the school can function efficiently and effectively, and realise its educational and social goals. |
| INSTRUCTION: To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 16). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATINGS</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.B: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. AREA FOR EVALUATION: LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

PURPOSE: To assess the effectiveness of the leadership and management of the school.
INSTRUCTION: To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT: | |
|------------------------| |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATINGS 5 4 3 2 1

N.B.: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.

3. AREA FOR EVALUATION: GOVERNANCE AND RELATIONSHIPS

PURPOSE: To assess the effectiveness of the governing body in giving the school strategic direction.
INSTRUCTION: To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT: | |
|------------------------| |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATINGS 5 4 3 2 1

N.B.: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.
4. AREA FOR EVALUATION: QUALITY OF TEACHING AND LEARNING AND EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT

**PURPOSE:** To estimate the quality of teaching and learning, and educator development.

**INSTRUCTION:** To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

N.B: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.

| RATINGS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

5. AREA FOR EVALUATION: CURRICULUM PROVISION AND RESOURCES

**PURPOSE:** To evaluate the quality of the curriculum and how closely it matches the needs of learners and any national or local requirements, as well as an evaluation of the range of other activities that enhance the curriculum.

**INSTRUCTION:** To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

N.B: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.

| RATINGS | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
6. **AREA FOR EVALUATION: LEARNER ACHIEVEMENT**

**PURPOSE:** To assess the knowledge, skills, attitude and values that the learners have required.

**INSTRUCTION:** To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.

---

7. **AREA FOR EVALUATION: SCHOOL SAFETY, SECURITY AND DISCIPLINE**

**PURPOSE:** To evaluate the extent to which the school knows about legislation and implements it, to check that the school is secure and the learners are safe and to evaluate the effectiveness of the school disciplinary procedures.

**INSTRUCTION:** To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.
8. AREA FOR EVALUATION: SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE

PURPOSE: To assess to what extent the school has sufficient staff, resources and accommodation for its purpose.

INSTRUCTION: To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

N.B: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.

---

5. AREA FOR EVALUATION: PARENTS AND THE COMMUNITY

PURPOSE: To gauge the extent to which the school encourages parental and community involvement in the education of the learners and how it makes use of their contribution to support learners' progress.

INSTRUCTION: To complete the form, refer to Guidelines and Criteria documents (page 24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS:</th>
<th>SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS: (REASONS THAT ACCOUNT FOR THE ABOVE JUDGEMENTS):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

N.B: The District Support Teams monitoring the process and members of the School Governing Body responsible to formulate perceptions on the school performance and school improvement planning may also provide individual comments as evidence in the allocated slot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Reasons that Account for the Above Judgments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including and Engaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance and Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table for Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Details**

- The School Governing Body is responsible for the school's performance and is accountable to the Minister for Public Service and Administration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School: ..................................................</th>
<th>Subject: ..................................................</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date: ..................................................</td>
<td>Date: ..................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator: .............................................</td>
<td>Educator: .............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator: .............................................</td>
<td>Q/ UnQ (ring)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Time In lesson: ...................................... | Grade: ..................................................
| No In class: ......................................... | Boys: .......... | Girls: .......... |
| No present: .......................................... | Boys: .......... | Girls: .......... |

Describe content/ context of lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1

RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning and response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1

RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1

RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other significant evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1
### LESSON OBSERVATION FORM - Number:..............

**School:** 

**Date:** 

**Evaluator:**  

**Educator:** Q/UnQ (ring)  

**Time in lesson:**  

**Grade:** 

**No in class:**  

**Boys:**  

**Girls:**  

**No present:**  

**Boys:**  

**Girls:**  

---

#### Describe content/ context of lesson

**Topic/ Activities/ Organisation**

**Quality of teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Use of time</th>
<th>Use of resources</th>
<th>Class control</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluation and review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

#### Learning and response

**RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

#### Achievement

**Outcomes**

**RATINGS: 5 4 3 2 1**

---

#### Other significant evidence

---

---

### SCHOOL RATING FORM

**Ratings:** 5 – 1 and 0 (insufficient evidence), as appropriate

**Rating 5**  

**Outstanding**

**Rating 4**  

**Good**

**Rating 3**  

**Acceptable**

**Rating 2**  

**Needs Improvement**

**Rating 1**  

**Needs urgent support**

**Circle the appropriate rating**

---

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Learner attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Learner socio-economic background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### HOW WELL THE SCHOOL IS DOING?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Learner attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Learner socio-economic background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### OVERALL RATINGS FOR KEY AREAS FOR EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Learner achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 School safety and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 School discipline procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 School infrastructures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Links with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Links with the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### BASIC FUNCTIONALITY OF THE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 The smoothness with which the school runs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Learners' attendance rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Educators' punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Educators' punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 The effectiveness of the school's procedures for dealing with attendance, truancy and lateness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Clarity of direction for the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Quality of school development/improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 The quality of the school policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The effectiveness of the Principal's leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Effectiveness of other leaders in leadership roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### GOVERNANCE AND RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 The constitution of the governing body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Extent to which the governing body members give strategic direction to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 The contribution that governing body members make to the formulation of policies and the improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The extent and effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of the school's performance by members of the governing body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Educators' knowledge and understanding</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educators' expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educators' short term planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educators' methods and organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educators' management of learners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educators' use of time and resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educators' use of everyday assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educators' marking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educators' use of homework</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUALITY AND RANGE OF THE CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

| 5  | Time allocation for subjects in the curriculum | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|-----------------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|
|    | Quality of schemes of work and educators' medium-term planning | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Equality of access and opportunity for all learners | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Provision of learners with SEN                | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Procedures for assessing learners' attainment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Use of assessment to inform curricular planning | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Quality of reporting to parents              | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Procedures for monitoring progress and personal development of learners | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### OVERALL RATING FOR KEY AREAS FOR EVALUATION

| 6  | Standards of achievement                   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|---------------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|
|    | Progress made by learners                   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Progress of learners with SEN               | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### SCHOOL SAFETY, SECURITY AND DISCIPLINE

| 7  | The quality of care and welfare provided by the school for learners | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|
|    | The effectiveness of the school’s disciplinary procedures          | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | The quality school’s provision for health and safety of the learners | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | The appropriateness and effectiveness of child protection policies and procedures | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | The quality of boarding arrangements                              | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE

| 8  | Match of number, qualifications and experience of educators to the demand of the curriculum | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|
|    | Adequacy of school funding                                                              | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Adequacy of school’s resources                                                          | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Adequacy of accommodation                                                               | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Efficiency with which total resources of the school are used                            | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Quality of systems for monitoring and evaluating the school’s effectiveness and efficiency | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

### RELATIONSHIPS WITH PARENTS AND THE COMMUNITY

| 9  | Links with parents                                                                    | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|
|    | Impact of parents’ involvement with the school                                       | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Links with other schools                                                               | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|    | Links with the community                                                               | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

The school with the help of the District Support Teams must draw up a school improvement plan within five working weeks showing how the recommendations that are made below will be tackled. The improvement plan must be supplied to parents/guardians of learners at the school and to the appropriate authorities. It will form part of the next whole-school evaluation.

Main Recommendations:
ANNEXURE H
EVALUATION GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR THE WHOLE-SCHOOL EVALUATION POLICY

QUALITY ASSURANCE DIRECTORATE

DECEMBER 2001
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: Introduction

1.1. The Guidelines ................................................. 1
1.2. The Evaluation Criteria and Descriptors .................. 1
1.3. Areas for Evaluation ........................................ 1
1.4. School Self-Evaluation and Improvement .................. 2

Section 2: The Evaluation Process

2.1. Sampling – The choice of schools ............................ 3
2.2. Pre-evaluation activity ....................................... 3
   2.2.1. School Self-Evaluation .................................. 3
   2.2.2. Evaluation team ......................................... 3
   2.2.3. The School ............................................... 4
   2.2.4. The Professional Support Teams ....................... 4
2.3. On-site Evaluation ............................................ 4
   2.3.1. Scrutiny of relevant school & district records ...... 4
   2.3.2. Lesson observation .................................... 4
   2.3.3. Other activities ....................................... 5
   2.3.4. Interviews .............................................. 5
2.4. Questionnaires ............................................... 5
2.5. Findings ...................................................... 6
2.6. Post Evaluation Activity – Reporting and Improvement Strategies 6
   2.6.1. Oral Reports to the School ............................. 6
   2.6.2. The Written Report and dissemination of findings .... 6
   2.6.3. Recommendations for school improvements and support 7
   2.6.4. Levels of performance .................................. 7
1. The Guidelines

The guidelines are designed to lead to a fair national evaluation system for schools, public and independent. They have to be used in order to ensure that schools are evaluated according to the national framework. The guidelines must be strictly followed, though supervisors may need to develop additional indicators to make judgments rather than simply provide descriptions of what happens in the schools.

1.2. The Evaluation Criteria and Descriptors

The evaluation criteria seek to ensure that supervisors make sound judgments and measure success by how well learners do. This is far more important to determine what is common to all schools and what is specific to each. The criteria are arranged in groups, but the same aspect of management, teaching and learning and student participation must be assessed. The criteria are by no means exhaustive, though they are designed to provide a sound basis for making judgments.

1.3. Areas for Evaluation

The areas for evaluation constitute the major aspects of the school's work. They reflect the areas identified in the National Framework. The main function of the supervisor is to report on the quality of provision in these areas and any other that he/she may consider relevant. The function of the role team is to consider the quality of the school's work in terms of the areas of work identified within the National Framework.
The areas for evaluation are:

i. Basic functionality of the school.
ii. Leadership, management and communication.
iii. Governance and relationships.
iv. Quality of teaching and learning and educator development.
v. Curriculum provision and resources.
vi. Learner Achievement.
vii. School safety, security and discipline.
viii. School infrastructure.
ix. Parents and the community

1.4. School Self-Evaluation and Improvement

The Guidelines should also provide an important resource to schools when they are carrying out self-evaluation. The Guidelines will enable schools to measure their performance against national criteria and so judge how well they are doing. They will also enable schools to prepare effectively for the external evaluation, as the criteria and descriptors are the same. The Guidelines should form the basis of a national framework for school self-improvement. Other stakeholders will also have access to the Guidelines and be able to judge how well the school is providing for its learners.

SECTION 2 THE EVALUATION PROCESS

2.1 SAMPLING

The choice of schools

The number of schools to be evaluated will be decided at national level against agreed criteria. The Department of Education will inform the Provinces of the number and sample of schools to be evaluated. Once the sample has been made known to the Provinces, the supervisory units will begin with all their preparations and pre-evaluation activities. The Provinces will inform the schools, arrange the date for the evaluation and decide on the supervisor(s) to be involved. They will send the school appropriate forms for completion and a list of documentation required by supervisor.

2.2. PRE-EVALUATION ACTIVITY

2.2.1. School Self - evaluation

With the democratisation of education and the associated decentralisation of authority, schools are increasingly being held accountable for their performance. This implies that school improvement is the responsibility of the schools as much as it is of the national and provincial departments of education. In order to meet the demands for improved quality and standards, schools need to establish appropriate strategies for the monitoring and evaluation of their work. They need to find a practical means of organising a program of self-evaluation that is supported by audits and evaluations by external teams. The audit/evaluation process outlined above seeks to provide a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation model that is highly participatory.

2.2.2. Evaluation team

The evaluation teams need to prepare for the supervision. Each team will have a team leader whose responsibility will be to:

i. agree on dates with the school for a pre-evaluation visit, for collecting the school's documentation, and for post-evaluation feedback to appropriate personnel.
ii. visit the school before the evaluation in order to discuss the evaluation arrangements with the Principal and to explain to the staff the evaluation procedures and answer any of their questions.
iii. decide, in consultation with team members, on the nature of the evaluation and how the evaluation responsibilities are to be shared.
iv. provide the school with a brief supervisors' profile of the team members, the length of time they will be in the school and the subjects/learning area/programme and areas for evaluation they will be evaluating.
v. timely inform the schools of any changes if such arise.
vi. draw up a programme in consultation with the team members to ensure that an appropriate sample of data is collected in order to inform discussions and lead to agreed judgements regarding the effectiveness
of the school.

vii. produce a pre-evaluation commentary for team members on the basis of the documentation provided by the school.

2.2.3. The School

The school must:

i. prepare and make available any documentation required by the supervisor.

ii. complete a self-evaluation document and school information form and provide supervisors with a copy.

iii. co-operate with the supervisors so as to ensure that preparations for the evaluation run smoothly.

2.2.4. The Professional Support Teams

The professional support teams in the districts must:

i. be available to provide the school with advice and help in preparing for the evaluation.

ii. provide any information about the school required by the supervisors

2.3. ON-SITE EVALUATION

2.3.1. Scrutiny of relevant school and district records

During an evaluation the supervisors must collect evidence through reading and analysing any of the school's documents that have not been seen previously. Supervisors must also see any district documentation that they require in order to help them reach fair judgements about the school. These documents should include educators' and learners' attendance registers, educators' records of learners' performance, educators' curriculum plans, learners' personal record files, learners' notebooks.

2.3.2. Lesson Observation

Because school evaluation aims to bring about change in the teaching-learning processes, it is important for the evaluation to focus on what happens inside classrooms. Lesson observation leads to judgements on:

i. the classroom environment and the activities that take place;

ii. systematic observation of the quality of learning and teaching;

iii. the progress learners make and the standards they reach in the subject/learning area/programme they are studying;

iv. the development of learners self-confidence, creativity, speaking and listening skills, leadership qualities and their ability to co-operate with others.

Supervisors must observe sufficient lessons across the age and ability range to ensure that they see a fair sample. In order to achieve this, at least 50% of a supervisor's time in the school should be spent observing lessons.

When in lessons, supervisors must:

i. not intervene to disrupt the educator's work or to distract the learners unnecessarily but discuss with them their work whenever opportunities occur;

ii. take note of any display of learners' work;

iii. record their observations of the lesson on the appropriate form;

iv. give educators some feedback on what they have seen whenever possible.

2.3.3. Other activities

Supervisors must:

i. spend time observing learners outside the classroom so as to be able to comment on the quality of relationships, behaviour and respect for school property.

ii. arrange to evaluate the school's accommodation and premises, and the resources available for teaching and learning.

2.3.4. Interviews

Supervisors should arrange interviews with:

i. a group of parents about their views of the school;

ii. groups of learners about their experiences at school;

iii. educators in order to learn about management procedures, policy formulation and planning;

iv. non-teaching staff in order to learn about administrative procedures and the effectiveness of the school's support systems;

v. the Principal. (meetings between the Principal and the team leader should be held regularly to ensure that the evaluation runs smoothly and that any anxieties staff may have can be quickly dealt with).

N.B. These interviews may be formal or informal.

2.4. QUESTIONNAIRES

Questionnaires will be used to help gather information when it would take too long to interview a fair sample of appropriate personnel. They may be used with educators and learners, but are more likely to be used with parents who are usually too numerous to interview. For parents, questionnaires will be administered in an appropriate language. Any questionnaires that are distributed should be in line with the national instruments and be confidential to the supervisors. They must not include the names of the respondents.

2.5. FINDINGS

i. Meetings will be convened during the week of the evaluation at which the supervisors will discuss and reach consensus on findings.
ii. Supervisors must make sure that they collect a representative sample of data that will enable them to reach a consensus.

iii. The findings will be rated against a five point scale - outstanding, good, acceptable, needs improvement, needs urgent support.

iv. Findings will be made known to the Principal, followed by the representatives of the school governing bodies, before being published.

2.6. POST-EVALUATION ACTIVITY • REPORTING AND IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

2.6.1. Oral Report to the School

At the end of the evaluation, and before they leave the school, the supervisors must provide:

i. a brief oral feedback to individual educators on the quality of their work;

ii. recommendations as to how the school might improve its practice;

iii. a brief oral feedback to heads of each subject evaluated on the quality of work in that subject/learning area/programme;

iv. a brief report to the Principal on the main judgements.

N.B.: At a subsequent date, but normally no longer than a week after the evaluation, the team leader must return to the school to provide a more detailed oral report to the Principal, School Governing Body, School Management Team and the professional support teams.

2.6.2. The Written Report and dissemination of findings

Within four weeks of the evaluation, the team leader must provide a written report that:

i. follows an agreed format, is written in clear language and fully reflects the oral report already made to the school;

ii. enables the school to identify the key priorities which the supervisors judge need to be addressed if it is to make further progress;

iii. contains a summary written according to an agreed format.

Within two weeks of receiving the written report the school must:

i. send the summary of the report to all parents or guardians of learners at the school;

\checkmark ii. send copies of the report to the District. The district must ensure that the report is sent to the Province and the Department of Education.

The report shall be retained by the district, school and the supervisory unit for at least six months, and be available to the Minister on request.

2.6.3. Recommendations for school improvements and support

i. The district support services are responsible for supporting the school in carrying out the recommendations of the report;

ii. The school must produce an improvement plan in response to recommendations made in the evaluation report within four weeks of receiving the written evaluation report. It should include a timeframe, and performance indicators;

iii. The improvement plan should be sent to the District Head for approval;

iv. The District Head must approve and/or amend the plan within two weeks;

v. The school must carry out the improvement plan within the time stipulated in order to become more effective.

The findings of reports should naturally lead to district, provincial, and national improvement plans that address areas needing improvements, within specified time frames. The findings also form the basis for future evaluations of the school's work and also serve as an important tool for self-evaluation.

2.6.4. Levels of performance

i. Schools that are performing well above expected standards or social expectations will be recognised. Recognition, for example, may consist of a diploma of excellence from the Minister of Education and publication in the educational and general press.

ii. The under-performing learning sites, which are those learning sites performing well below national expectation, will be included in special programmes provided by either the Department of Education or the Province for the recovery and development of schools.
SECTION 3  THE PLAN OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

3.1. INTRODUCTION

A description of the main characteristics of the school

Supervisors must report on the nature and implications for learners' learning.

The evaluation report will start by outlining the main features of the school. These include:

i. The number of learners and educators;
ii. The type of school;
iii. The socio-economic circumstances of its learners referring to advantages and disadvantages;
iv. The number of learners with special educational needs;
v. The range of different languages spoken;
vi. The attainment of learners on entry to the school and at the end of each key Rating;

3.2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE FINDINGS AND THE MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of the main findings and recommendations

Supervisors must state clearly their main judgements and the recommendations they have formulated in order to help the school improve.

3.3. AREAS FOR EVALUATION

Sections on each of the main focus areas as outlined below:

3.3.1. Basic functionality of the school

The evaluation is designed to judge whether the basic conditions exist in the school to enable it to function efficiently and effectively and realise the educational and social goals set for it by the local and national community.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. The school's policies and procedures;
ii. The level of absence, lateness and truancy and the procedures for dealing with them;
iii. Learners' response to the school's provision;
iv. The behaviour of the learners.

3.3.2. Leadership, management and communication

The key purpose is to assess the effectiveness of the leadership and management of the school at the various levels in the management structure.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. The school's vision and mission statement, aims, policies and procedures;
ii. The leadership at various levels in the staffing structure, for example the Principal and school management teams.
iii. The extent to which the staff and school community as a whole understand those intentions and carry them out;
iv. The extent to which the policies and procedures help the school attain its aims and improve.

3.3.3. Governance and relationships

The key purpose is to assess the effectiveness of the governing body in giving the school clear strategic direction in line with the South African Schools Act (SASA), the National Education Policy Act (NEPA) and other related legislation.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. The constitution of the governing body and any terms of reference;
ii. The organisation of the governing body and its committees;
iii. The membership of the governing body;
iv. The part played by the governing body in the formulation and implementation of the school's aims and policies;
v. The suitability and effectiveness of the policies;
vi. Systems the school governing body has for monitoring and evaluating the quality of education provided by the school.

3.3.4. Quality of teaching and learning and educator development

The first purpose is to evaluate the overall quality of teaching throughout the school and how well it helps all learners to learn and raise their levels of performance and attainment. The second is to judge the quality of in-service professional development enjoyed by educators as highlighted by reports and the professional growth plans of the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) and other related initiatives.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. Educators' planning and schemes of work/work programmes;
ii. Educators' expectations of the learners;
iii. The educator's subject/learning area/programme knowledge;
iv. The teaching strategies the educators use;
v. The educators use of resources, including books, equipment, accommodation and time;
vi. The way educators control and manage the learners;
vii. The arrangements made by the educators for learners of different abilities, especially the most able and those with learning difficulties;
viii. The methods used by educators to assess learners’ progress and levels of achievement;
ix. The use of homework;
x. The methods educators use to gauge the success of their lessons and what they do as a result of the findings.

3.3.5. Curriculum provision and resources

The purpose is to evaluate the quality of the curriculum and how closely it matches the needs of learners and any national or local requirements. A judgement has also to be made on the range and quality of other activities which enhance the curriculum.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. The balance between the national and local curriculum.
ii. The structure of the curriculum.
iii. The planning process.
iv. How suitable the curriculum is for learners of different ages and different abilities.
v. The school’s assessment policies and practices and their relevance to the curriculum.
vi. The provision for extra-curricular activities.

3.3.6. Learner achievement

The main purpose is to assess the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that learners have acquired. Particular attention must be paid to levels of performance in communication skills, problem solving skills and the ability to work in groups and to make responsible decisions.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. Learners’ achievements by end of Ratings 3, 6, 9 and 12 in public examinations and in work seen;
ii. Learners’ achievements in reading, speaking and writing in the language of teaching and learning and one other additional language;
iii. Learners’ standards in numeracy and in all other subjects/learning areas/programmes;
iv. The progress made by learners in light of their known prior achievements, especially the most able and those with learning difficulties.

3.3.7. School safety, security and discipline

One purpose is to evaluate the extent to which the school knows about legislation which concerns learners’ rights and the effectiveness with which it implements it. Another is to ensure that the school is secure and the learners are safe. The third purpose is to evaluate the effectiveness of the school’s disciplinary procedures.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. The school’s procedures for safety, security and discipline and their implementation;
ii. Safety regulations in laboratories and workshops and other areas of the school;
iii. Emergency procedures and how well they are known by learners and staff;
iv. The provision for any boarders;
v. The support and care for learners;
vi. The school’s disciplinary procedures.

3.3.8. School Infrastructure

The main objective is to assess to what extent the school has sufficient staff, resources and accommodation for its purpose. Particular attention must be paid to their state of repair and how well these are organised and used in the interests of the learners. Supervisors need to note how closely the school monitors the efficiency and effectiveness with which they are used.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. The sufficiency of suitably qualified and experienced educators and support staff;
ii. The amount of accommodation and its state of repair and the suitability of the school’s premises;
iii. The sufficiency and suitability of books and equipment for learning;
iv. The efficiency with which all the school’s resources are used;
v. The methods by which the school and the school governing body ensure that they get value for money.

3.3.9. Parents and the community

One purpose is to gauge the extent to which the school encourages parental and community involvement in the education of the learners and how it makes use of their contributions. Another is to estimate the value to learners’
education of the exchange of information between parents and school about them. The third purpose is to ascertain the response of parents. The fourth is to evaluate the links between the community and the school.

Supervisors must make judgements and report on the effectiveness of the following:

i. The school's communication with parents and the way the school responds to the complaints and suggestions that come from the parents.
ii. The systems for reporting to parents about the progress their children are making and the standards they are reaching.
iii. The contribution that parents make to the school and to learners' education through any committees or support for the school's resources.
iv. The school's guidance for parents to help them in their understanding of the work their children are doing;
v. The school's involvement with the local community and how this affects learners educational experience and curricular activity;
vi. The methods the school uses to educate learners in the use of the local environment;
vii. The range of joint activities undertaken by the school and community in the interests of the learners.

3.4. THE SUBJECTS/LEARNING AREAS/PROGRAMS

A report on each of the subjects/learning areas/programs evaluated.

Supervisors must report their judgements on:

i. Standards reached by learners in public examinations;
ii. Standards reached by learners in work seen;
iii. The progress made by learners in lessons over a period of time;
iv. The attitudes of learners to their studies and their behaviour in lessons
v. The quality of teaching and learning;
vi. The effectiveness of leadership and management in the subject/learning area/programme;

vii. The breadth and balance of the curriculum offered in the subject/learning area/programme and the quality of associated planning
viii. Assessment practice;
ix. Any other important features of the subject/learning area/programme.

SECTION 4

CRITERIA AND DESCRIPTORS

Supervisors must observe the prescribed criteria and descriptors when evaluating a school.

The prescribed data and criteria are used to make evaluative judgements on the quality of a school's performance and the achievements of its learners.

These criteria and descriptors should also provide an important resource to schools when they are carrying out self-evaluation.

A five-point performance rating is used when grading judgements:

Rating 5 = outstanding
Rating 4 = very good
Rating 3 = acceptable
Rating 2 = needs improvement
Rating 1 = unsatisfactory
GUIDELINES ON THE SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND THE CRITERIA TO BE USED BY SUPERVISORS, WITH DESCRIPTORS FOR EXEMPLIFICATION

1. The Supervisors’ code

The following descriptors, based on the Supervisors’ Code of Practice, are designed to help Supervisors carry out their work in a professional way.

Descriptor for Rating 4

The supervisor operates in a way that does not affect the normal process of education in schools. The supervisor is competent, objective and behaves professionally in the school. The supervisor respects the educators and learners and treats them with sensitivity. The Evaluation Guidelines and Criteria are used effectively during evaluations and the supervisor has clear and comprehensive communication with those being evaluated. The supervisor is able to explain why judgements have been reached and does so willingly. The supervisor gives clear and unambiguous oral reports to the school, and these will be accurately reflected in the final written report. The final report, based on clear evidence, will be well written, will cover the aspects designated in the Evaluation Framework fully, will contain balanced judgements and will pay attention to the opinions of those evaluated. The supervisor keeps information confidential and is at all times impartial.

Descriptor for Rating 3

The supervisor does not deliberately affect the normal process of education in schools. The objectives of the evaluation and the way it will be carried out are outlined to the school, but they are not explained in detail. The supervisor communicates with the school staff but does not keep them fully informed of what evidence is being collected or how judgements are being reached. The oral feedback to the school is hesitant and although the judgements are reported, they are not explained clearly. The final report is mainly based on objective evidence, but sometimes the writing is ambiguous and barely pays attention to the opinions of those evaluated. Although the evaluation is carried out in line with the Evaluation Framework, the supervisor rarely distinguishes between important and minor points. The supervisor keeps information confidential, and seeks to be impartial and objective.

Descriptor for Rating 2

The supervisor interferes with the normal educational process in schools. The supervisor is often not professionally competent to judge a subject/learning area/programme or an area for evaluation. Judgements lack objectivity and are based on questionable evidence. Those evaluated are not kept informed about the evaluation process or its progress. Educators and learners are sometimes treated with disrespect. The oral feedback is disjointed and confused, and the supporting evidence is not always secure. The final report is full of ambiguities. It is based on doubtful evidence, and disregards opinions expressed by those evaluated. The supervisor does not follow the Evaluation Framework properly. The supervisor does not always respect confidentiality.

3. The following criteria and descriptors must be used when a school when a school evaluates itself internally or when externally evaluated by the supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school’s policies and procedures</td>
<td>Are these policies appropriate and are there mechanisms in place to evaluate the implementation of the policies?</td>
<td>Does the school have appropriate policies and procedures in place to enable it to run efficiently? The supervisor is to look at the policies, procedures, regulations etc. in order to judge whether they are appropriate and implemented correctly. The effectiveness of the implementation of policies and procedures would determine whether or not the policies are followed and the impact on the learners. Does the school have effective procedures for dealing with absenteeism, learners and incidents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s systems for checking on attendance and progress</td>
<td>The school’s systems for checking on attendance and progress need to be effective and efficient so that learners can be monitored and their performance can be assessed. The school needs to ensure that learners are on track and that the school needs to be investigated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal's statement</td>
<td>How well do learners get along with each other?</td>
<td>The behavior of learners is to be evaluated. The supervisor needs to monitor the impact learners show their colleagues. The supervisor monitors the behavior of learners in the positive learning environment in the school needs to be considered, along with the respect for the school environment, materials, furniture and premises. For example, the level of graffiti and damage to school property caused by learners needs to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptors Rating 4:</td>
<td>The school has well-structured policies that are clearly explained to learners and their parents. Many are in display and readily accessible in the learners. Absenteeism and learners are followed up and appropriate sanctions and rewards are used in accordance with the appropriate response from learners. Attendance is barely below 94 per cent and learners are mostly on track. Learners are known and well monitored. Behavior is good and learners are involved in the learning activities. They show initiative in their approach to their work and are keen to make progress in the school. Transport arrangements are satisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptors Rating 3:</td>
<td>Policies, procedures are in place. On occasions, they are drawn up in the absence of teachers and learners. They appear more through learners’ familiarity with what is expected by the school than through clearly established procedures, applied consistently and fairly. The school is concerned about absenteeism and learners have a sense of pride that does not put sufficient pressure on learners to avoid their absence. The school’s procedures are regularly monitored. The school is assisted by about 95 percent attendance rate. Behavior is satisfactory, but there are some problems when learners challenge their decisions and make minor disruptions. Learners have a sense of pride in being learners. They are involved in their work, though they do not take beyond what they are asked. They participate in extracurricular activities in moderate numbers. Generally, they respect equipment and furniture but have no concept of damage and graffiti. They respect the rules and school regulations, but do not always abide by them. Most learners contribute to an ethos characterized by support for one another and a willingness to do so as school. Transport arrangements are satisfactory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptors Rating 2:</td>
<td>The school has few well-structured procedures and regulations and they are difficult to implement. There is confusion as to what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior and learners are not sufficiently checked when they go beyond the rules. Attendance is poor, often below 95 per cent and learners are generally out. Learners often miss the classes that are skipped. Learners show limited interest. They show no interest in their own development and the participation in extracurricular activities. Learners display violent behavior to one another, show no respect for their educators and damage the school’s furniture. A good deal of graffiti is about the school. The ethos is characterized by a lack of care and urgency to learn. Transport arrangements are poor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Governance and Relationships

**Purposes:** To assess the effectiveness of the governing body in giving the school clear strategic direction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school's aims and mission statement</td>
<td>The school's aims and mission statement is clear and relevant. The governing body has taken these into account in its planning and decision-making.</td>
<td>The school's aims and mission statement are stated clearly and are relevant to the educational needs of the pupils. The aims and mission statement are the foundation of all the school's activities. They guide the school in its decision-making and planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school's budget and financial plan</td>
<td>The school's budget is prepared in a way that ensures that all the necessary funds are available to support the aims and mission of the school.</td>
<td>The school's budget is prepared in a way that ensures that all the necessary funds are available to support the aims and mission of the school. The budget is also used to plan for future development and expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with selected school governing body members and leaders</td>
<td>The governing body members and leaders have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. They are committed to the aims and mission of the school.</td>
<td>The governing body members and leaders have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. They are committed to the aims and mission of the school. The governing body members and leaders are also effective in their decision-making and planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school development plan</td>
<td>The school development plan is clear and relevant. The governing body has taken into account the needs of the pupils and the school community.</td>
<td>The school development plan is clear and relevant. The governing body has taken into account the needs of the pupils and the school community. The development plan is also used to plan for future development and expansion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description for Rating 4:**

The governing body has full membership. It has appropriate committees to help carry out its work and to make regular meetings. Meetings are properly noticed and decisions recorded. The governing body is involved in formulating policies in cooperation with the school's management and supporting the school management team in implementing them. The school governing body members do not interfere in the day-to-day running of the school but do have sound systems in place for monitoring and evaluating how well the school is doing. For example, some school governing body members visit the school, talk with learners and educators, and observe some of the school's activities. They usually report what they have seen and at the school governing bodies' meetings. They help draw up the budget. Relationships with the Principal are good. Together, they seek to ensure that the school's policies and resources are used efficiently and in the interests of the learners. There is a clear policy on language and approaches to multiculturalism.

**Description for Rating 3:**

The school governing body has appropriate aims and policies, but they play only a limited role in their formulation or implementation, for example, in drawing up the budget. They rely greatly on the leadership of the principal and other staff in formulating policies. They support the principal and the school's and the principal's staff, but do not get closely involved in monitoring or evaluating their work. They rely on reports from the principal more than on their own observations and evidence. They do not stand out as strong leaders, but can be called upon by the principal to offer support at critical times. They carry out most of their legislative responsibilities and do not knowfully break the law. The governing body has more or less full membership and meetings are held and properly recorded. They make themselves available to the local community and parents if there are any concerns about the school. The policy on language and multiculturalism is satisfactory.

**Description for Rating 2:**

The school governing body has not been involved in establishing the school's aims or policies and shows little interest in directing the school's development. The governing body does not have a full complement of governors and often has difficulty motivating new governors. One or two governors may be highly committed and supportive of the principal, but the governing body as a whole has little interest in carrying out its responsibilities properly. Management of the school's resources is not efficient and some of the key problems at the school are not tackled. The school governing body has few or no systems in place to monitor the school's work and they provide only very limited support to direction. They neglect important aspects of their role, such as the rapid and maintenance of the buildings and rely on others to ensure that efforts are made to improve the educational environment for educators and learners. They do not provide the clear direction the school probably needs and do not ensure that resources are used in the interests of the learners. There is no policy on language and multiculturalism.
### Quality of teaching and learning and educator development

**The Purpose:** To evaluate the quality of teaching and the educator development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Lesson observation</td>
<td>- Do the teachers provide a balanced curriculum that has appropriate elements of the national and local curriculum? The design of the curriculum takes into account the previous experience of the school and the needs of the learners, though it is not always planned systematically. The effectiveness of the curriculum is occasionally evaluated, but the basis of any revision is not always sufficiently justified or articulated. The whole-school programming is satisfactory and implements the planned curriculum. Educators have appropriate plans for the long, mid- and short-term, though these have not always been agreed with colleagues and so good continuity and progression is not assured. There are extracurricular activities, but their contribution to the curriculum is not exploited and only a few learners are involved. Resources are usually suitable for whole-school learning and teaching, and may reflect diverse cultures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Curriculum provision and resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The school curriculum is well designed and contains the core elements of the curriculum.</td>
<td>- The school provides learners with a well-balanced curriculum, observing the ratios of the different subjects/learning area programmes. The curriculum is well designed and contains the core elements of the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A judgement has also to be made on the range and quality of other activities that enhance the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The school curriculum</td>
<td>- The school curriculum provides a well-balanced curriculum, observing the ratios of the different subjects/learning area programmes. The curriculum is well designed and contains the core elements of the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: VI. Learner achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are learners reaching the expected outcomes for their age and ability in the different learning areas and different phases of the school system?</td>
<td>Learners are making steady progress in all their learning areas and phases of the school system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors should seek to establish learners' performance indicators, which will be judged on the basis of the expected level of performance.</td>
<td>Supervisors will be assessing learners' performance indicators based on the expected level of performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learners and teachers should be able to compare their progress against these indicators.</td>
<td>Learners and teachers can compare their progress against the established performance indicators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: VI. School safety, security and discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose: To evaluate the extent to which the school ensures that the learners are safe and to evaluate the effectiveness of the school's disciplinary procedures.</td>
<td>The school ensures that the learners are safe and the effectiveness of the school's disciplinary procedures is evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The school provides and enforces rules and regulations concerning the welfare and safety of learners.</td>
<td>The school enforces rules and regulations pertaining to the welfare and safety of learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The procedures for dealing with learners in difficulties and those who are causing difficulties.</td>
<td>The school has procedures in place to deal with learners in difficulties and those who are causing difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Records of all accidents, breaches of security and any emergency procedures.</td>
<td>The school maintains records of all accidents, breaches of security, and emergency procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The procedures used in relation to learners.</td>
<td>The school uses procedures in relation to learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any codes of conduct for learners.</td>
<td>The school has a code of conduct for learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health and safety measures and those named as being responsible.</td>
<td>The school implements health and safety measures and assigns responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulations concerning the supervision of learners or school visits.</td>
<td>The school has regulations that govern the supervision of learners or school visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any regulations and procedures related to child protection.</td>
<td>The school has regulations and procedures related to child protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The procedures and regulations associated with boarding if relevant.</td>
<td>The school has procedures and regulations associated with boarding, if relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrangements with learners, staff, parents and other welfare services associated with the school.</td>
<td>The school has arrangements with learners, staff, parents, and other welfare services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The school's security systems are good.</td>
<td>The school's security systems are effective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description for Rating 4: Learners are meeting the criteria for reaching the expected outcomes for their age and ability. The school ensures that the learners are safe and the school's disciplinary procedures are effective.
### School Infrastructure

**Purpose:** To assess to what extent the school has sufficient and appropriate staff, resources and accommodation for its purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school has sufficient resources e.g. finance, staff, accommodation, learning materials, equipment and access to support services. Are they used efficiently?</td>
<td>The school needs to ensure that it has adequate resources to support its educational goals. If not, it should consider how to allocate resources more efficiently.</td>
<td>The school should assess its current resource usage and make changes as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of books in the library and their availability</td>
<td>The school should ensure that it has a good selection of books available for students to use.</td>
<td>The school should review its library collection and purchase additional books as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount and suitability of equipment, including computers and audio-visual aids</td>
<td>The school should ensure that it has the necessary equipment for teaching and learning.</td>
<td>The school should purchase additional equipment as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parent and the community

**Purpose:** To ensure that the school encourages parental and community involvement in the education of the learners and how it makes use of their contributions to support learners' progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How actively does the school communicate with parents?</td>
<td>The school should actively communicate with parents to ensure that they are engaged in the education of their children.</td>
<td>The school should hold regular parent-teacher meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the school provide any education for parents?</td>
<td>The school should offer education sessions for parents to help them understand how to support their children's learning.</td>
<td>The school could offer workshops on literacy and numeracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the school do to improve its links with the community?</td>
<td>The school should work to develop positive relationships with the community.</td>
<td>The school could organize community events such as book fairs or art exhibitions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description for Rating 4:**

The school does not publish the financial resources of the school in a transparent way. The school has a genuine concern to educate all learners, but it must work on improving transparency in this area. It should consider providing a detailed financial report to the community, including how resources are allocated and used.

**Description for Rating 3:**

The Principal uses the school's financial resources according to legal requirements and in a satisfactory transparent way. She seeks to provide sufficient basic material and equipment for learners and educators. The school has enough facilities to effectively accommodate the learners and educators. She has met with the parents and stakeholders to discuss the school's financial management and resource allocation. She has ensured that the school's financial resources are used efficiently and in the interests of the learners, and this contributes to the learners' progress.

**Description for Rating 2:**

The Principal needs to establish a better relationship with all stakeholders, including learners, parents, and community members. She should ensure that the school's financial resources are used efficiently and in the interests of the learners, and this contributes to the learners' progress.

**Description for Rating 1:**

The Principal needs to improve transparency in the school's financial management. She should establish better relationships with all stakeholders, including learners, parents, and community members. She should ensure that the school's financial resources are used efficiently and in the interests of the learners, and this contributes to the learners' progress.

---

### Additional Notes

- The school's financial management needs improvement. The Principal should work on establishing better relationships with all stakeholders, including learners, parents, and community members. She should ensure that the school's financial resources are used efficiently and in the interests of the learners, and this contributes to the learners' progress.
- The school's financial management needs improvement. The Principal should work on establishing better relationships with all stakeholders, including learners, parents, and community members. She should ensure that the school's financial resources are used efficiently and in the interests of the learners, and this contributes to the learners' progress.
- The school's financial management needs improvement. The Principal should work on establishing better relationships with all stakeholders, including learners, parents, and community members. She should ensure that the school's financial resources are used efficiently and in the interests of the learners, and this contributes to the learners' progress.
ANNEXURE I
REGISTRATION FORM USED DURING THE FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SESSIONS

DATE: 2005.09.05 & 2005.09.06

VENUE: Giyani Community Hall (Boardroom)

******************************************************************************

Guidelines: You are requested to do two things: to fill in, and
to circle the right answer.

1. Level: School Manager; CS1 Educator
2. Gender: ......................
3. Age: ......................
4. Educational level: Teaching Diploma; B.A; B.A.(Hons); B.ED; M.A.; M.ED; Dr; Prof.
5. Present project: .................................................................

******************************************************************************
CONSENT FORM

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY: UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG

TITLE OF PROJECT: The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System in selected public secondary schools in Giyani.

RESEARCHER’S NAME(S) AND TELEPHONE NUMBER(S): I have been requested to participate in a research study conducted by Annah Khetani Mathye, Cell Number 082 667 9797.

INTRODUCTION

Below is a description of the research procedures and an explanation of my rights as a research participant. In accordance with the University of Johannesburg’s ethical committee, I have been asked to read this information carefully. If I agree to participate, I will sign in the space provided to indicate that I have read and understood the information furnished on the consent forms.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this research study is to gather the perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of IQMS in selected Public Secondary Schools in Giyani.
DURATION AND LOCATION OF STUDY

My participation in this study will last for approximately two hours and will take place at Giyani Community Hall [Boardroom]

PROCEDURES

The researcher will address the participants, stating the aim of the study, which is to gather the perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of IQMS. As participants, you will be requested to:-

- Talk, freely since your views will not be openly criticized
- Confidentiality and anonymity is assured
- One person will speak at a time, and everyone will get a turn to speak
- Set ground rules as a group
- Give a researcher, permission to audio-tape participants' responses. The audio-taped data will be transcribed and will form the basis for data analysis. The researcher will write the findings based on the transcribed data. Other researchers will have access to the transcribed data.
- Ask questions before and after the interview sessions
- The interview session will take one to two hours

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

I understand that the research procedures described above may not involve any potential risks or physical, psychological, legal or sociological discomforts.

Or

I understand that there are no known anticipated risks associated in this study.
BENEFITS

The possible benefits to me for participating in this study are to:-

- Voice out my perceptions based on advocacy and IQMS in public secondary schools in Giyani.
- Have access to the research draft when member checking or returning to the field of study is done.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Anonymity means that no identification information such as name or identity number is collected, as a result, the privacy of participants is assured. Because I will not be providing any clues to my identity, the data I provide will be anonymous.

Or

Confidentiality means that the researcher [or perhaps the Supervisor] will have a record of who participated but the data will be kept private.

I understand that the data collected in this study will be kept confidential unless disclosure is required by law. [The participants’ names will be replaced by school manager and CSI educator]. The only person who can have access to these records is my supervisor. If there is a master list that includes the participants’ names and codes linking the name to the data, the master list must be kept secure and separately from the collected data. These consent forms will be kept for three years. Those consent forms will be destroyed as a way of destroying anyone’s ability to link the participant’s data to identifying information.
ANNEXURE J
AN APPLICATION THAT YOU BE MY ASSISTANT MODERATOR DURING THE FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SESSIONS

1. I am a University of Johannesburg student number 909601557. I am conducting research at a Doctoral level. The research topic is: The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in selected public secondary schools in Giyani.

2. I am applying that you be my assistant moderator during focus group interview sessions. Your roles will be:

   - scanning the interview room.
   - setting and testing the recording equipment.
   - taking comprehensive notes during the focus group interview sessions.
   - handling environmental conditions and logistics.
   - responding to unexpected interruptions.
   - summarizing briefly the main points of view and ask if the perception is accurate (this will happen after each focus group interview session).
   - leading the debriefing sessions.

3. The focus group interviews will take place as follows:

   Date: 2005.08.29 & 30

   Time: 11H00 - 13H00 (first session) and 14H00 - 16H00 (second session)

   Venue: Giyani Community Hall (Board room)

4. Are you ready to participate?

Yours Faithfully

A.K. Mathye (A Researcher cell no. 082 667 9797)
The Evaluating Team


Sir

AN APPLICATION THAT YOU CRITICALLY EVALUATE THE RESEARCHER’S INTERVIEWING SKILLS DURING FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SESSIONS

1. I am a student at the University of Johannesburg. My student number is 909601557. I am conducting research at a Doctoral level. The research topic is: The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System in selected public secondary schools in Giyani.

2. I am applying that you critically evaluate my interviewing skills during focus group sessions. There are guidelines that you are expected to to use as per Arksey and Knight, (1999:108). These guidelines are:

- How well is the interview schedule or guide working?
- Is the interview taking too long?
- Do the interviewees understand the questions?
- Which questions work? Which questions fail?
- Does the researcher misses places where he / she could probe for more detailed information or examples?
- Does the researcher misses places where he / she could ask follow-up questions?
- Does he / she talks too much instead of listening?
- Does he / she builds up good relationships with the interviewees?
- Is there anything to indicate that he / she is gaining participants' trust and confidence?
- Is he / she able to encourage interviewees to talk freely and openly?
- Do you feel that he / she leaves interviewees in a relaxed and untroubled condition?
- Are data shedding light on the research questions that you are trying to answer?

I hope you will help in this regard.

Yours Faithfully

A.K. Mathye (A Researcher – Cell no. 082 667 9797)
ANNEXURE L
Madam

A REPORT ON THE CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCHER'S INTERVIEWING SKILLS

1. This report is based on the focus group interview sessions that took place on the 5th of September 2005. The guidelines as per Arksey and Knight, (1999:108) were followed.

• How well is the interview schedule or guide working?
The interview guide worked well with two sessions. The first session started at 11H00 and the second one at 15H00. Five participants / interviewees were present in each session.

• Is the interview taking too long?
No. The first session lasted for 40 minutes, whereas the second one lasted for 35 minutes.

• Do the interviewees understand the questions?
Yes. They understood the questions as they could give correct and relevant answers.

• Which questions work? Which questions fail?
Question five nearly failed and the others worked perfectly. Question five needed a brief clarification.

• Does the researcher misses places where she could probe for more detailed information or examples?
No. She probed for more information as in the transcripts.

• Does the researcher misses places where she could ask follow-up questions?
Follow-up questions were mostly used.

• Does she talks too much instead of listening?
No. Talking was limited to follow-up questions and short introductions to clarify questions to encourage participation.

• Does she builds up good relationships with the interviewees?
Yes. Good relationships were built from the start and could be maintained throughout the interview sessions.

• Is there anything to indicate that she is gaining participants' trust and confidence?
Participants were more relaxed. They wanted to talk more and more.
- Is she able to encourage interviewees to talk freely and openly?
  Yes. She successfully achieved to encourage the interviewees to talk freely.

- Do you feel that she leaves interviewees in a relaxed and untroubled condition?
  Yes. She asked the participants if there was anything to say, thus promoting a relaxed and untroubled condition.

- Are data shedding light on the research questions that you are trying to answer?
  Yes. This shed light as positive and negative aspects of Integrated Quality Management System were raised and debated.

Yours Faithfully

..............................................................

The Evaluating Team
ANNEXURE M
The Circuit Manager

Dear Sir

AN UPDATE ON THE RESEARCH PROJECT

1. The above matter bears reference
2. I, Mathye A.K, is a University of Johannesburg student number 909601557.
3. I am conducting research on: The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in selected public secondary schools in Giyani
4. Some of your schools are sampled, where I will be using focus group interviews as data gathering devices. Attached are copies of letters from the Provincial Education Department, granting me permission to conduct research in Giyani.

Yours faithfully

A.K. Mathye (A Researcher)
ANNEXURE N
The School Manager and a selected CS1 educator

Sir / Madam

CONFIRMATION ON THE DATES FOR THE FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SESSIONS

1. The above matter refers.
2. This is a confirmation that the dates and time still stands as per an invitation dated the 4th of August 2005.

I hope to see you there.

Yours Faithfully

A.K. Mathye (A Researcher)
ANNEXURE 0
Dear The School Manager,

Giyani
0826

Sir / Madam

THANKING YOU TO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN THE FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW

1. The research team heartily thank you to have participated in the research project based on IQMS (focus group interviews) which took place at Giyani Community Hall (Boardroom) on the 5th of September 2005.

2. We are encouraging you to support other researchers in future.

Yours Faithfully

The Research Team
An Educator who participated in
the focus group interview

Giyani
0826

Sir / Madam

THANKING YOU TO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN THE FOCUS GROUP
INTERVIEW

1. The research team heartily thank you to have participated in the research
project based on IQMS (focus group interviews) which took place at Giyani
Community Hall (Boardroom) on the 6th of September 2005.
2. We are encouraging you to support other researchers in future.

Yours Faithfully

The Research Team
ANNEXURE P
Sir

AN APPLICATION THAT YOU BE AN EXTERNAL AUDITOR IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT

1. The above matter bears reference.
2. I am a University of Johannesburg's Doctoral student number 909601557, who is engaged in a research project. The title of the research topic is: The perceptions of school-based educators on the advocacy of Integrated Quality Management System(IQMS) in selected public secondary schools in Giyani.
3. An external auditor in research is someone who is requested by a researcher to provide an assessment of the project throughout the research process or at the conclusion of the study (Creswell, 2003:196).
4. The role of the external auditor is the same as that of the fiscal auditor, who uses the following questions:

   • How did you arrive at this?
   • Why was this like this, and many other questions that are related to the study.
5. You are also expected to write a report after the assessment.

I hope you will help in this research project.

Yours Faithfully

A.K. Mathye (A researcher – Cell no. 082 667 9797)
ANNEXURE Q
Ref: IQMS  
Enq. Baloyi DR  
Ext: 2250  

24/05/2005  

From: Performance Monitoring Mopani District  

TO: ESD POLOKWANE  

ATT: PROJECT MANAGER  

MONITORING PROGRAMME: IQMS IMPLEMENTATION

1. The Mopani District Education Standards Division has taken a decision to embark on the IQMS monitoring programme.

2. Eight (08) district officials will be involved in the above stated exercise. Circuits are grouped together for easy access. The teams intend visiting all the schools in the district.

3. The monitoring/support team will be divided into four groups of two officers, to be in a position to assess/monitor/support as many schools as possible per day. The following officers form the Mopani IQMS monitoring team:
   - Baloyi DR
   - Baloyi BH (Dr)
   - Warmenhoven E
   - Mabunda MC
   - Khosa TC Giyani EMPC
   - Zwane DM Giyani EMPC
   - Machumele M* Giyani EMPC
   - Letsoalo NS* Tivumbeni EMPC

4. You are kindly requested to make accommodation arrangement for the first two weeks viz., Phalaborwa 30/05/2005 – 02/06/2005 and Tzaneen 06/06/2005 – 09/06/2005. See attached programme.

5. Thanks

DISTRICT SENIOR MANAGER: MOPANI

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
MOPANI DISTRICT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>CIRCUIT</th>
<th># OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED PROJECTION OF # OF SCHOOLS TO BE VISITED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/06/2005 – 08/06/2005</td>
<td>LULEKANI</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAMAKGALE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GROOT LETABA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/06/2005 – 17/06/2005</td>
<td>KHUJWANA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAFARANA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THABINA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2005 – 23/06/2005</td>
<td>MODJADJI</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOLOTOTSİ</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOTUPA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAKWADU</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N'WANEDZI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/08/2005 – 04/08/2005</td>
<td>NKOWANKOWA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHILUVANE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TZANEEN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIHOKO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEKGOSESE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/08/2005 – 18/08/2005</td>
<td>GROOT LETABA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KLEIN LETABA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAMAILA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/2005 – 25/08/2005</td>
<td>MAN'OMBE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEXURE C - IQMS OFFICIAL DOCUMENT
COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT
NUMBER 8 OF 2003

27 August 2003

INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
EDUCATION LABOUR RELATIONS COUNCIL
RESOLUTION NO 8 OF 2003:
INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

1. PURPOSE OF THIS AGREEMENT
The purpose of this agreement is to align the different Quality Management programmes and implement an Integrated Quality Management System, which includes Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation.

2. SCOPE OF THIS AGREEMENT
This agreement applies to and binds:

2.1 The employer, and

2.2 All the employees of the employer as defined in the Employment of Educators Act, 1998 (as amended) whether such employees are members of trade union parties to this agreement or not.

3. THE PARTIES TO COUNCIL NOTE AS FOLLOWS:

3.1 Schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act, 1998 as amended.

3.2 The provision on core duties and responsibilities of educators as contained in the Personnel Administration Measures (PAM).

3.3 Chapter C of the Personnel Administration Measures.


3.5 Education Labour Relations Council Resolution No. 3 of 2003.

4. THE PARTIES TO COUNCIL THEREFORE AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

4.1 That the Integrated Quality Management System, as attached in Annexure A, be adopted for institution-based educators.

5. DISPUTE RESOLUTION
Any dispute about the interpretation or application of this agreement shall be resolved in terms of the dispute resolution procedure of the Council.

6. DEFINITIONS

6.1 "constitution" means the constitution of the Education Labour Relations Council.

6.2 "Council" means the Education Labour Relations Council.

6.3 "employee" means an educator as defined in the Employment of Educators Act, 1994, as amended.

6.4 "employer" means the employer as defined in the Employment of Educators Act, 1994, as amended.

6.5 "Labour Relations Act" means the Labour Relations Act No. 66 of 1996, as amended.

6.6 "workplace" means the registered scope of the Council.

Thus done and signed at Centurion on this 27th day of August 2003 by:

ON BEHALF OF THE STATE AS EMPLOYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON BEHALF OF THE EMPLOYEE PARTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE UNION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPTOSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAOU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM

PARTIES TO THE COUNCIL HEREBY AGREE TO THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS/ADDITIONS TO SECTION A OF COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT 8 OF 2003 ON AN "INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM"

1. Page 5, paragraph 3, bullet number 1: addition of the words "An educator may request additional DSG members to be appointed".

2. Page 6, paragraph 3, bullet number 6, add the words: "for example, there can be no sanctions against individual educators before meaningful development takes place".

3. Page 7, paragraph 4.3, bullet number 1, last sentence, add the words: "as represented in the Education Labour Relations Council".

4. Page 7, paragraph 4.3, bullet number 2, the second last sentence should read: "Provincial unions, as represented in the PELRC, should also be included in the PTTs".

5. Page 7, paragraph 4.3, bullet number 3, the first sentence should read: "Training in schools (clusters of schools) should be led by Regional/District/ Area officials and supported by the Provincial departments and trade unions".

6. Page 7, Item 5, paragraph 2, to add the word "Provincial" Departmental offices to the first sentence.

7. Page 10, at paragraph 7, the entire wording is removed and replaced by the words:

"A consolidated report on the quality of teaching and learning is to be incorporated into the final WSE report of the school"

8. Page 11, paragraph 10, bullet number 4, the sentence should read: "The Grievance Committee will make a recommendation to the Head of Department, who shall make a decision within 5 working days of receiving the recommendation".

THUS DONE AND SIGNED AT CENTURION ON THIS 5TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2003 BY:

ON BEHALF OF THE STATE AS EMPLOYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADE UNION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SADTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPTOSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAOU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This document consists of four parts:

Section A: This contains information on the Integrated Quality Management System.

Section B: This consists of the Implementation Plan in the form of a flow diagram with a supporting narrative.

Section C: This consists of the instrument to be used for Performance Measurement, Development Appraisal and Whole School Evaluation.

Section D: Forms (Annexure A, B, C: PM for salary or grade progression)
SECTION A
PROCEDURE MANUAL

SECTION A

INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

1. PREAMBLE

For the Department of Education - and for all educators - the main objective is to ensure quality public education for all and to constantly improve the quality of learning and teaching, and for this we are all accountable to the wider community.

The Department has the responsibility of providing facilities and resources to support learning and teaching. Successful educational outcomes also depend upon empowering, motivating and training educators. Quality Management seeks to monitor and support these processes.

Evaluation of programmes and practices is essential to any ongoing effort to improve any profession. Evaluation is not apart from but is a part of the educational process.

However, sound evaluation practices must be based on a set of beliefs and principles that are congruent with the outcome desired.

There are three programmes, which need to be in place in order to enhance and monitor performance of the education system. These are:

- Developmental Appraisal:
- Performance Measurement:
- Whole School Evaluation,

Each of these programmes has a distinct focus and purpose, and there should be no contradiction between any of them.

The purpose of Developmental Appraisal (DA) is 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 purpose of Performance Measurement (PM) is to evaluate individual teachers for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments and rewards and incentives. The purpose of Whole School Evaluation (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.

All Quality Management initiatives, should be planned for together in schools, and aligned in a coherent way to avoid duplication, repetition and an unnecessary increase in workload.

The philosophy underpinning the integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is based upon the fundamental belief that the purposes of QMS are fivefold:

- To determine competence;
- To assess strengths and areas for development;
- To provide support and opportunities for development to assure continued growth;
- To promote accountability and
- To monitor an institution's overall effectiveness.

These tenets and the Norms and Standards for educators have informed the development of a single instrument for evaluating the performance of institution-based educators.

2. PURPOSE OF ALIGNMENT

The main purposes of the alignment process are as follows:

- To enable the different QMS programmes to inform and strengthen one another;
- To define the relationship among the different programmes of an Integrated Quality Management System;
- To avoid unnecessary duplication in order to optimise the use of Human Resources,
- To assure that there is ongoing support and improvement.
- To advocate accountability.

Features of the Integrated Quality Management System

The following are features of this model for the implementation of an Integrated Quality Management System, which includes Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation programmes:

- Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement inform and strengthen one another without duplication of structures and procedures.
- Performance Measurement and Development Appraisal must be linked to an annual cycle, which must be completed within a calendar year (a period when the staff at a school is likely to be most stable).
- Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement inform and strengthen internal Whole School Evaluation.
- The separate purposes of DA, PM and WSE remain intact.
• The structures needed in the school are:
  - The Senior Management Team (SMT), which consists of the principal,
    deputy principal and education specialists (heads of department).
    Their function is to ensure that the school is operating efficiently and
effectively.
  - The Staff Development Team (SDT), which plans, oversees
    coordinates and monitors all Quality Management processes.
  - The Development Support Group (DSG), which, for each educator
    consists of his/her immediate senior and one other educator. An
    educator may request additional DSG members to be appointed. Their
    function is primarily mentoring and support.
  - Self-evaluation (by educators for DA) and (by the school for WSE
    purposes) enables sustainability in the long term.
  - Lines of accountability between educators and their DSGs, between
    the educators (and their DSGs) and the SDT, between the SDT and SMT, and
    between the SMT and Regional/District/Area Office are clear.
    Accountability is less achievable if the QM programmes are implemented
    separately.
  - Two developmental cycles are built into the annual programme: in the
    second and third terms. The first term is therefore mainly used for planning
    and the first evaluation of educators (baseline evaluation) and the
    fourth term is reserved for summative evaluations and the internal WSE.
  - Whilst it is acknowledged that there could be significant pressure towards
    the end of the year when all educators in the school will need to be
    evaluated (summatively) for pay progression (PM), there is no way of
    avoiding the necessity for a summative evaluation at this stage - after
    development has taken place. Performance Measurement must be based
    on the work (and progress) that an educator has done during a calendar
    year. After verification and moderation data must be submitted to Persal by
    the end of the school year in order to effect pay progression in the following
    year.
  - The external WSE can take place at any time in the year, as the WSE team
    will be evaluating different schools almost every week. The WSE team
    leader must inform the Regional/District/Area Office of the intended
    external evaluation and Regional/District/Area officials must inform
    schools at least four working weeks in advance of the dates for the external
    WSE. The external WSE learn will, in most instances, be able to complete
    their work within a working week.
  - For WSE, there are additional Focus Areas (in the WSE instrument). These
    include: Basic Functionality; Governance and Relationships; School
    Safety Security and Discipline; School infrastructure: Parents and
    Community.

3. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The alignment of the Quality Management System programmes is informed by
the following principles:

• The recognition of the crucial role of the delivery of quality public education.
• That all learners have equal access to quality education.
• The need for an Integrated Quality Management System, which is
  understood, credible, valued and used professionally.
• That the system’s focus is positive and constructive even where performance
  needs to improve.
• That the system includes a process of self-evaluation and discussion of
  individual expectations.
• The need to minimise subjectivity through transparency and open
  discussion, and quality controls to ensure validity, reliability and relevance
• The need to ensure fairness by affirming the rights of educators, for example,
  there can be no sanctions against individual educators before meaningful
  development takes place.
• That the system promotes individual professional growth of educators, and
  ongoing support for educators and the school.
• That the system provides a clear protocol governing the interaction of the
  parties.
• The need for the IQMS to provide for and encourage diversity in teaching
  styles.
• The system meets professional standards for sound quality management,
  including propriety (ethical and legal), utility (useable and effective),
  feasibility (practical, efficient and cost effective), and accuracy.
• Development takes place within a national Human Resource Development
  strategy and Skills Development.
• The need for all schools to look for ways to continually improve.

4. ADVOCACY AND TRAINING

Advocacy and training are different. Both are necessary. Advocacy focuses on
achieving a large scale buy-in to the process and answers the questions: What?
and
Why? Training focuses on capacitating all involved to ensure successful
implementation and answer the question: How?

4.1 ADVOCACY

Advocacy should relate to what the Integrated quality Management System
(IQMS) is and what the benefits will be for educators, schools and the system as
a whole. It should explain why this particular approach was adopted.
4.2 TRAINING

Training must specifically address issues relating to how the IQMS should be implemented in all schools. All officials and educators must have a thorough understanding of the principles, processes and procedures. Training must enable officials and educators to plan and administer this IQMS in a uniform and consistent manner.

4.3 RESPONSIBILITIES

- The National Training Team (NTT) must clarify all the relevant issues and questions in the process of training. They must develop the necessary guidelines for training and must train the Provincial Training Teams (PTTs). The NTT will consist of officials from the National Department of Education, Provincial Departments of Education and officials from the three national unions as represented in the Education Labour Relations Council.

- Provincial Training Teams (PTTs) should consist of Provincial officials including officials from Regional/District/Area Departmental offices. It should include those officials who will work directly with schools in their regions/districts/areas as well as Education support services personnel. Provincial unions, as represented in the PELRC, should also be included in the PTTs. Depending on numbers, advocacy and training could be done in the provinces.

- Training in schools (clusters of schools) should be led by Regional/District/Area officials and supported by the Provincial Departments and trade unions. Since advocacy and training must precede implementation in schools, the Staff Development Teams (SDTs) will not yet have been identified. If Regional/District/Area officials are unable to train all the educators in schools within their areas, then the School Management Teams (SMTs) and nominated senior teachers from each school must be trained so that they will be able to do advocacy and train all the educators in the school.

5. PLANNING AND TIMING

Schools will have to factor in to their planning the cycles of evaluation and development in terms of this procedure manual.

It is imperative that Regional/District Area/Provincial Departmental offices plan well in advance in order to ensure that the necessary support is provided and to enable this system to be implemented.

6. PROTOCOL

The Protocol is a set of step-by-step processes and procedures, which are to be followed in any instance where an educator is observed in practice.

This protocol should be read and applied within the context of an integrated QMS.

Process A: Internal appraisals and evaluations

Step 1
The Regional/District/Area Manager and the principal of a school should facilitate the establishment of QM structures i.e. SDT and DSG in the school and its implementation.

Step 2
Self-evaluation by individual educators should take place before any lesson observation of educators in practice.

Step 3
Lesson observation of educators in practice is for purposes of DA, PM and external WSE. The Principal, the School Management Team and the Staff Development Team, in consultation with staff members, develop an implementation plan for all QM programmes including DA, PM and WSE (external?) lesson observation of educators in practice as required by these two processes. This implementation plan must indicate clearly who should be evaluated, by whom and when. This information must be reflected in the school composite timetable well in advance of implementation.

Step 4
The DSG observe the lesson using the prescribed instrument and discuss the outcomes of the lesson observation with the educator observed / appraisee. The appraisee may request copies of the lesson observation records.

Step 5
The DSG will make the information on lesson observation available to the SDT for planning the SIP.

Process B: External evaluations for WSE

Step 1
The WSE team draws an external evaluation plan and informs the Regional/District/Area Office. The WSE team leader consults with the Principal, SMT and SDT of the school. Schools to be informed timely (at least 4 weeks in advance - excluding recess) of the dates of a forthcoming visit for the purpose of conducting the external WSE.
Step 2
If the I-QMS structures are not in place, the WSE team leader to request the Regional/District/Area Manager to provide advocacy and training around QMS. The Regional/District/Area Office to make the necessary arrangements with the school principal to do so. The WSE team leader to inform the principal of documentation required before the visit, including assessment reports, learner profiles, learning programmes, timetables, school policies, DA and PM documentation. The school management should also inform parents, educators and learners of the forthcoming evaluation, and its purpose.

Step 3
Pre-evaluation visit by team leader to the school, to meet with SMT and SDT and:
- Collect documentation
- Finalise arrangements for on-site visit.
- Confirm the appointment of a school-based WSE coordinator (should be a member of SDT - does not need to be the principal) in accordance with WSE Policy
- Discuss the process to be followed, and impress the need to maintain the normal routine of the school.

Step 4
On the basis of documentation received, and their own priorities, the team leader and supervisors to identify a representative cross-section of educators for observation in practice, and communicate this to the school as soon as possible, preferably two days prior to the external evaluation. The WSE team should consist of supervisors with appropriate knowledge of learning areas to be evaluated.

Step 5
Observation of the educator in practice
- School Management Team to introduce the WSE Team to the staff, and remind them of the purpose of the visit,
- The supervisors to confirm which educators are to be observed and finalise a timetable for the week with the SMT and SDT.
- Evaluation of the other seven focus areas goes on simultaneously with the lesson observations.
- Supervisors involved in observations to meet with DSGs and appraisees to consider/complete the pre-evaluation educator profile checklist and collect other significant information on the individual educator, including the professional growth plans;
- A member of the DSG with appropriate learning area knowledge to accompany the supervisor in relevant lesson observations;
- Member of DSG and WSE supervisor to observe the lesson using the same instrument (each completing a separate form): compare findings and discuss these with the appraisee. The appraisee may request copies of evaluation forms.

- A member of the DSG with appropriate learning area knowledge to accompany the supervisor in relevant lesson observations;
- Member of DSG and WSE supervisor to observe the lesson using the same instrument (each completing a separate form): compare findings and discuss these with the appraisee. The appraisee may request copies of evaluation forms.

Step 6
The supervisor prepares a written report which must include:
- WSE evaluation of the quality of learning and teaching
- WSE evaluation of the quality of DA and PM processes

7. A consolidated report on the quality of teaching and (earning is to be incorporated into the final WSE report for the school.

8. CONFIDENTIALITY AND CONTROL OF INFORMATION

The control of information is an important issue in evaluation practices and procedures. The degree and nature of the control of information as well as the collection and distribution of information needs to be negotiated between all parties involved. Different schools depending on the purpose for which information is being collected may need different degrees of control and different control mechanisms.

Staff Development Teams will need to address this issue in their planning in order to ensure that personnel feel adequately protected.

9. QUALITY OF THE PROCESS: RESPONSIBILITIES

The Staff Development Team (SDT) is responsible for managing the process and for ensuring the consistency and fairness of the process as well as the accuracy of specific, as well as overall, ratings of educators.

The principal and relevant regional/district/area manager must sign all documents being submitted to the Department. Principals and the relevant regional/district/area managers must verify that the information provided is accurate.

The Regional/District/Area Manager (or his/her delegate) will review a sample of the evaluations to ensure their consistency, fairness and relevance to the school plan and other stipulations.

It is only during the cyclical external evaluations by the Whole School Evaluation Team that it will be possible to validate evaluations of the sample of educators identified for the purpose of observing educators in practice for the external WSE.
In instances where there are discrepancies or where the process has not been satisfactory, the WSE Team must make recommendations, in the WSE report, to address these shortcomings.

10. RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES AND/OR GRIEVANCES

- It is anticipated that most differences of opinion between an educator and members of his/her Development Support Group (DSG) in respect of performance ratings will be resolved by discussion at that level.
- Where agreement cannot be reached, the matter will be referred to the school’s Staff Development Team (SDT) within a week.
- If there is still no resolution within five working days, and where there are:
  - Serious breaches of the guidelines of the process
  - Serious grounds for challenging the overall performance rating
- Either party may request a formal review by the Grievance Committee. Such a request must be in writing and must state reasons why the educator believes that there are grounds for challenging the process or the results.

The Grievance Committee shall consist of a peer (Senior Manager), observers from Trade Unions admitted to Council and a neutral person appointed by the Regional or District Manager (or his/her delegate).

- The Grievance Committee will make a recommendation to the Head of Department, who shall make a decision within 5 working days of receiving the recommendation.

11. STRUCTURES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND RECORDS

11.1 STRUCTURES

The structures operating within the school that will play significant roles in the implementation of the QMS are:

11.1.1 The Staff Development Team (SDT)

Each institution must elect a staff development team consisting of the principal (head of the institution) and democratically elected staff members. These may include all or some of the School Management Team (SMT), but must also include post level 1 educators.

The institution must decide for itself on the size of the SDT taking into account the size of the school, the number of educators and the work that needs to be done. An institution may decide to re-elect a new SDT annually or to decide on a specific term of office (2 years/3 years?) to enable continuity.

The Role and Responsibilities of the SDT

- Ensures that all educators are trained on the procedures and processes of an integrated QMS.
- Coordinates activities pertaining to staff development.
- Prepares and monitors the management plan for the integrated QMS.
- Facilitates and gives guidance on how DSGs have to be established.
- Prepares a final schedule of DSG members.
- Links Developmental Appraisal to the School Improvement Plan (SIP).
- Liaises with the department, through the SMT, in respect of high priority needs such as INSET, short courses, skills programmes or learnerships.
- Monitors effectiveness of the integrated QMS and reports to the relevant persons.
- Ensures that all records and documentation on IQMS are maintained.
- Oversees mentoring and support by the DSGs.
- Together with the SMT, develops the School Improvement Plan (SIP) based on information gathered during Developmental Appraisals.
- Coordinates ongoing support provided during the two developmental cycles each year.
- Completes the necessary documentation for Performance Measurement (for pay or grade progression), signs off on these to assure fairness and accuracy and submits the necessary documentation in good time to the Principal.
• Deals with differences between appraisees and their DSGs in order to resolve the differences.
• Provides all the necessary documentation (e.g. SIPs) to the Principal for submission to the Regional/District/Area Manager in good time.
• Coordinates the internal WSE processes.
• Liaises with the external WSE Team and SMT to coordinate and manage the cyclical external WSE process.
• Ensures that the QMS is applied consistently.

11.1.2 Development Support Group (DSG)

For each educator this should consist of the educator's immediate senior and one other educator (peer) selected by the educator on the basis of appropriate phase/Learning Area/subject expertise.

The Role and Responsibilities of the DSG

The main purpose of the DSG is to provide mentoring and support. If the immediate senior is the Education Specialist (Head of Department) in the school, then mentoring and support fall within the job description. The DSG is responsible for assisting the educator to develop a Personal Growth Plan (PGP) and to work with the SDT to incorporate plans for development of the educator into the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The DSG is responsible for the baseline evaluation of the educator (for development purposes). The immediate senior is responsible for the summative evaluation at the end of the year for Performance Measurement (pay or grade progression). The DSG must verify that the information provided for PM is accurate.

11.2. RECORDS AND DOCUMENTATION

11.2.1 Personal Growth Plan (PGP)

The PGP should be an outcome (or consequence) of the Strategic Plans of the relevant department of education and Developmental Appraisal (DA). The educator in consultation with members of the DSG develops it. It must be used to inform the School Improvement Plan (SIP) - which, in turn, will be submitted to the regional/district/area office to inform their planning and deployment of support staff.

Along with self-evaluation, the baseline evaluation and the performance measurement (at the end of each calendar year) the PGP forms an important record of needs and progress of individual educators.

11.2.2 School Improvement Plan (SIP)

The School Improvement Plan enables the school to measure its own progress through a process of ongoing self-evaluation. This must happen continuously, especially in the years in between the cyclical external WSE. The SIP is developed by the SMT and SDT (and is submitted to the Regional/District/Area Manager) and enables the SMT and SDT to monitor progress and improvement. The SIP must be based and linked to the Strategic Plans of the relevant department of education. The PGP of individual educators as well as the other seven Focus Areas included in the WSE policy, also, inform the SIP.

11.2.3 Regional/District/Area Improvement Plan

The Regional/District/Area Improvement Plan enables the officials to plan, coordinate and monitor the delivery of support and development opportunities in the schools in their areas. The plan is informed by the Strategic Plan of the relevant department of education and the SIPs submitted by schools under its jurisdiction.
SECTION B
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
SECTION B
THE FLOW CHART
12. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM WHICH INCLUDES DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL, PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND WHOLE SCHOOL EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Advocacy, Training, Discussion and Clarification</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>1. Advocacy, Training, Discussion and Clarification</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>DA + PM</td>
<td>FIRST YEAR Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Broad Planning by area managers, circuit managers, Preparation and allocation of responsibilities, Await receipt of &quot;SIP's&quot;</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>2. Establish structure (Staff Development Team/SDT)</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>DA + PM</td>
<td>Feb - March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Information from schools (SIP's) to Local offices. Co-ordinate planning and deployment of support staff: &quot;District&quot; Improvement Plan (DIP)</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>3. Planning for implementation in schools</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>End March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. INSET and other programme</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>5. Development and monitoring</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>End June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Self evaluation against &quot;DIP&quot;</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>10. Self evaluation against DIP (revise)</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2 SUBSEQUENT YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Review planning and process. Revise if needed. Feedback and Discussion with schools</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>10. Review planning and process by (SDT)</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>DA + PM</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self evaluation against &quot;DIP&quot;</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>12. Self evaluation against &quot;DIP&quot;</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Summative evaluation for year 1 becomes baseline evaluation for year 2. Therefore no observation needed. ONLY NEW TEACHERS FOLLOW PROCESS AS FOR YEAR ONE</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Oct - Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repeat year 1 process for years 2 to 3/5 or until external WSE takes place.

Data to be fed to Departments for pay or grade progression (Annexure A)

December
12.3 EXTERNAL WSE YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. External WSE; Supervisor Team Leader and Team Contact Local Office to make arrangements</td>
<td>(ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Review planning and process. Feedback and Discussion with schools</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WSE Team reviews documents and reports from district office, and schools for years 1 to 3 (or 5)</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Reports and records from local offices and schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Report to local office</td>
<td>WSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. (Normal cycle continues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM WHICH INCLUDES DEVELOPMENTAL APPRAISAL, PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND WHOLE SCHOOL EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.4.1 PREAMBLE

The induction of an integrated quality management system, which replaces three separate systems: Developmental Appraisal System (DAS), Performance Management and Development System (PMDS) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE) will have implications for educators, schools and regional/district/area offices.

Clearly, the three systems DAS, PMDS and WSE should inform and strengthen one another but this only becomes possible if they are reconceptualised within an integrated quality management system and within which the original purpose of each is preserved but where the process of implementation is streamlined and their interrelationships are made explicit.

The flow diagram illustrates how a single integrated system will operate in schools and regional/district/area offices.

12.4.2 Interpreting the flow-diagram

The flow diagram comprises seven columns. Three of these: Educator, School, Regional/District/Area Office explain the logical sequence of events that affect each of these parties. There are two columns headed: “Programme” These indicate which of the three programmes are in operation at what stage. The timeline provides an indication of the time allocated to each stage and proposed deadlines for completion. The extreme left hand column shows where these processes will link up to the cyclical external whole school evaluations.

For example:

- An educator will read down the “Educator” column (E) to see what needs to be done, which programmes (F) (Developmental Appraisal (DA) and Performance Measurement (PM)) apply at various stages along the timeline (G) and how what the educator is doing links up to the information the development planning of the school (D).

- The school will read down the “School” column (D) to see what needs to be done, which programme will apply at different stages (C), to see how the school's planning needs to inform planning at District/Local office level (B) as well as how the school’s planning is linked to the development programme of educators (E). The timeline in column (G) also applies.
The Regional/District/Area office will read down column (B) and be able to see where their planning links to that of schools (D). Columns C and F indicate which programmes are applicable in terms of the time line (G).

For this implementation plan, the focus is on educators, schools and regional/district/area offices and the sequence of events that affects them.

12.4.3 FIRST YEAR OF IMPLEMENTATION

D.I Schools/Educators: Advocacy and Training

Educators, principals and management of schools will receive training immediately after advocacy.

Advocacy must address the issues relating to the purposes of the three programmes, the objectives and outcomes for Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation. The focus should be on quality education for all, transformation and the advantages for educators, schools and the system as a whole. It should also address the relationships between these three programmes and how they should inform and strengthen one another in an integrated system.

Training should focus on implementation in the school, i.e. on self-evaluation, planning for the whole year and the roles and responsibilities of the structure(s) that will be involved in planning, coordinating, monitoring, reporting and keeping the appropriate records. Training needs to ensure that everyone (appraisees and appraisers) is familiar with and understand the single instrument that will be used.

D.2 Schools: Establish the Staff Development Team

Immediately after the advocacy and training, the principal must establish the Staff Development Team (SDT). This could include the principal, senior management and educators. The school should decide for itself on the size of the SDT and how many educators should be included.

The Staff Development Team

The SDT, together with the SMT, will be responsible for liaising with educators as well as regional/district/area offices to coordinate the provision of developmental programmes for educators (for Developmental Appraisal). The SDT must monitor the process of Developmental Appraisal (self-evaluation by the educator, mentoring and support by the educator's personal Development Support Group (DSG), must coordinate the observation of educators in practice and the appraisals for Performance Measurement and must keep the records of these processes. The SDT and SMT must also develop the school's own "School Improvement Plan" (SIP), incorporating strategic objectives of the Strategic Plan of the department and the Personal Growth Plans (PGPs) of individual educators (D4).

The SIP must set targets and time frames for school improvement using the Whole School Evaluation instruments and must monitor and measure progress against these targets. The SIP should be revised periodically, setting new goals/priorities, which reflect the progress already made. Records of WSE processes should also be kept by the SDT.

The SIP must be submitted to the Regional/District/Area office. SIPs from different schools must inform their planning so as to enable the Regional/District/Area office to coordinate provision of in-service training (INSET) and other programmes that are aligned to the needs that have been identified by schools.

D.3 Schools: Planning for Implementation (Broad Planning)

The intention is that this initial, broad planning by the SDT must incorporate all the processes and will have to be designed to take the schools' year plan into account. For example, to avoid the possible "bottle-neck" (and excessive pressure) at the end of the year when all educators will need to be observed in practice and evaluated for pay-progression purposes, secondary schools will have to ensure that educators who mainly teach Grade 9 or 12 classes (where there are external assessments of learners) are evaluated before the external assessments/examinations commence. By the end of February, the educators in a school could be provided with a timetable indicating more-or-less when they can expect to be evaluated.

E.2 Educators: Self Evaluation

Immediately after the initial advocacy and training, each educator should evaluate her/himself using the same instrument that will be used for both Developmental Appraisal (DA) and Performance Measurement (PM). This enables the educator to become familiar with the instrument. Educators also familiarise themselves with the Performance Standards, the criteria (what they are expected to do) as well as the levels of performance (how well they are expected to perform) in order to meet at least the minimum requirements for pay progression. This self evaluation forms part of both Developmental Appraisal (DA) and Performance Measurement (PM).

Since Performance Measurement (PM) will be used for determining pay and/or grade progression (notch increases) it must be used to evaluate the performance of educators within the period of a calendar/school year even though the award will only be made in the -following year. Note: The award will therefore always be based on the previous year's work, i.e. in 2005 the award will be made for work done in 2004.

The emphasis on self-evaluation (in an integrated quality management system) serves the following purposes:

- The educator becomes familiar with the instrument that will be used for Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement.
The educator is compelled to reflect critically on his/her own performance and to set own targets and time frames for improvement. The educator takes control of improvement and is able to identify priorities and monitor own progress.

Evaluation, through self-evaluation, becomes an ongoing process which is more sustainable in the long term because fewer "outside" evaluations (involving other people) are required thereby reducing the investment of time and of human resources.

The educator is able to make Inputs when the observation (for evaluation purposes) takes place and this process becomes more participatory.

The educator is able to measure progress and successes and build on these without becoming dependent on cyclical evaluations (recommendations for development and interventions that are also only cyclical).

E.3 Educators: Identification of the personal support group - Development Support Group (DSG)

After having completed a first self-evaluation and having reflected on strengths as well as areas in need of development, each educator needs to identify his/her own support group within the school. This must include the educators immediate senior (Education Specialist/Head of Department/"Subject Head") and one other educator (peer) - selected by the educator - and who has the phase/Learning Area/Subject experience/expertise and is able to provide the necessary guidance and support. Each educator will therefore have a different DSG although some individuals (e.g. HODs (Education Specialists)) will be involved in several DSGs (for different educators). Once educators have determined who their DSGs are, this information will have to be factoried into the broad planning (DS) of the SDT to ensure that there are no "clashes" with Education Specialists (HODs) having to evaluate different teachers at the same time and to ensure a reasonable spread and pace of work for evaluators.

E.4+5 Educators: Observation of educator in practice

After identifying the personal DSG the educator needs to be evaluated, for the purpose of determining a "baseline" evaluation with which subsequent evaluation's) can be compared in order to determine progress. By this time the educator will have completed a self-evaluation and will have determined strengths as well as areas in need of development. This evaluation must be preceded by a pre-evaluation discussion. The evaluation (including the observation of the educator in practice) can be done by either one or both of the DSG members. The purpose of this evaluation by member(s) of the DSG is;

- To confirm (or otherwise) the educator's perception of his/her own performance as arrived at through the process of self-evaluation.

To enable discussion around strengths and areas in need of development and to reach consensus on the scores for individual criteria under each of the Performance Standards and to resolve any differences of opinion that may exist.

To provide the opportunity for constructive engagement around what the educator needs to do for him/herself, what needs to be done by the school in terms of mentoring and support (especially by the DSG) and what INSET and other programmes need to be provided by, for example, the department.

To enable the DSG and the educator (together) to develop a Personal Growth Plan (PGP) which includes targets and time-frames for improvement. The educator must primarily develop the PGP with refinements being done by the DSG.

To provide a basis for comparison with the evaluation for PM purposes and, since it includes data gathered during the pre-evaluation discussion and will result in the development of a PGP, this information can be used, in instances where there is little or no improvement, to adjust the ratings upwards (for the purposes of awarding pay or grade progression) where the DSG, school and/or department has not provided the necessary support or appropriate opportunities for development.

Note that it is only in the first year of implementation (that this evaluation/observation of an educator in practice will be carried out for all educators. In subsequent years the summative evaluation (for PM) becomes the baseline evaluation for the following year.

E.6 Educators: Personal Growth Plan (PGP)

The educator, with refinements suggested by one or both members of the DSG, needs to develop a Personal Growth Plan (PGP). It is anticipated that this will take place soon after the observation of the educator in practice and the evaluation on which consensus was reached.

The PGP should address growth at four "levels" where these are applicable:

1. Those areas in need of improvement about which the educator him/herself is in full control (e.g. punctuality).
2. Those areas for which the DSG (immediate senior and/or mentor) or someone else in the school is able to provide guidance (e.g. record-keeping).
3. Those areas for which the Department should provide INSET or other programmes (e.g. Outcomes Based Assessment).
4. Where the educator is un- or underqualified or needs reskilling in order to teach a new Subject/Learning Area (e.g. Technology), this information needs to feature in the Workplace Skills Plan (WSP) of the Department.

The educator's PGP (along with copies of the completed instruments) need to be sent to the Staff Development Team (SDT) of the school. This process needs to be completed by the end of March each year.

D.4 School: Development of School Improvement Plan (SIP)

(The development of a School improvement Plan has already been referred under "The Staff Development Team").

The Staff Development Team (SDT) must receive, from all the DSGs, the completed instruments (and agreed-upon ratings) as well as the Personal Growth Plans (PGPs) of each educator by the end of March each year. From this, and other information pertaining to school management and administration, they must compile the School Improvement Plan (SIP) which groups teachers (with similar developmental needs) together in order to identify specific programmes which are a priority for the school (and the educators in the school).

B.1 Regional/District/Area Office: Advocacy and Training

The Regional/District/Area Officials must receive training, preferably before schools receive training. The advocacy will be the same as for schools but, clearly, since their responsibilities will be different, the training that these officials receive will have to focus on their role(s) in an integrated quality management system.

B.2 Regional/District/Area Office: Broad Planning

Once the officials have received training and have an overview of what needs to be done, they can begin their broad planning of how they will manage the process.

B.3 Regional/District/Area Office: Development of an Improvement Plan

Once the Regional/District/Area office receives, from each school, a School Improvement Plan (in which each school highlights its specific developmental needs) by the end of March each year, the relevant Office must incorporate it in its own improvement plan for the Region/District/Area. In this plan, schools that have identified similar needs and/or similar aspects in need of development can be "clustered" together for the purposes of providing INSET and other programmes. Coordination of different programmes, which can run concurrently in different areas, and the optimal deployment of officials (Education Support Services and/or management officials) should be included in these plans.

B.4 Regional/District/Area Office: INSET and other programmes

Once they have developed coordinated improvement plans, the officials need to make the necessary arrangements and inform schools of the venues, dates and times at which INSET and other programmes will be offered.

D.5 Schools: Development

Schools inform educators of the INSET and other programmes that will be offered and make the necessary arrangements for educators to attend.

E.7 Educators: Development, Support and Mentoring

Educators attend INSET and other programmes and, at the same time receive the necessary support from the member(s) of the DSG. Mentoring needs to take place to assist educators to improve. The mentoring must be ongoing (in terms of the responsibilities of the immediate senior). Peer mentoring and support should also be ongoing but are likely to be less formal and less structured interactions.

B.5 Regional/District/Area Office

Self-Evaluation

D.6 School

E.8 Educator

By the end of June/end of the second term the Regional/District/Area offices must have organised and managed the first "Developmental Cycle". Schools will have participated and educators will have undergone appropriate training which was aligned to their specific developmental needs. Regional/District/Area Offices, Schools (SDTs) and Educators (with their DSGs) must now evaluate their own progress against the Improvement Plans that they developed. Plans should be reviewed in the light of progress made and, if necessary, plans can be revised and new priorities identified. This should not be a formal, structured process.

B.6+7 Regional/District/Area Office

Second Developmental Cycle

D.7+8 School

E.9+10 Educator

Between the end of the second term and the end of the third term, Regional/District/Area offices plan, organise and manage a second round of developmental opportunities for educators and schools (see B4 + 5; D5+6 and E7+8). This "cycle" again culminates with self-evaluation by Regional/District/Area offices, schools and Educators in order to monitor progress.
E.11 Educator: Observation of educator in practice for Performance Measurement

By the end of the third term, Regional/District/Area Offices should have managed at least two developmental cycles in which various needs of different schools have been addressed. Through their schools, educators would have participated in these opportunities. Areas in need of development which were identified in the first term will have been addressed: perhaps not fully, but enough to enable educators to make sufficient progress in order to be able to qualify for pay-progression.

For pay or grade progression purposes, it will be necessary to carry out a summative evaluation at the end of the year - using exactly the same instrument that has been used for the self-evaluation, the baseline evaluation and all subsequent self-evaluations during the year. The DSG will have been involved in mentoring and supporting the educator during the year in addition to assisting with the development of the PGP. The DSG should therefore have a clear idea of the progress that the educator has made. The summative evaluation, or Performance Measurement, is the validation/verification of earlier evaluations. This must be done by the educator's DSG. The pre-evaluation discussion (and completion of the pro-evaluation form will be used to determine what contextual factors (if any) have impacted negatively on the progress that was expected: for example, a Regional/District/Area office that was unable to provide appropriate INSET. These observations/evaluations must take place between the end of September and end of November.

E.12 Educator: Feedback and Discussion

The DSG must discuss their evaluation with the educator and must provide feedback. Differences (if any) need to be resolved. The completed instrument and report must be submitted to the Staff Development Team (SDT).

D.9 School: Record and Report

The SDT must keep all these records and, from them, compile a report (for WSE purposes) on progress that has been made in the school during the year. The SDT and principal should complete the necessary documentation for submission to the Provincial Department (those teachers that meet the requirements for pay progression).

B.8 + 9 Regional/District/Area Offices: Receive Reports from Schools

Reports, reflecting the progress made in the schools, must be submitted to the Regional/District/Area office by the time that schools close. These reports should include recommendations in respect of how the Regional/District/Area office can improve on the delivery of developmental INSET and other programmes.

Regional/District/Area offices should evaluate their own performance against their Improvement Plan in order to improve on this performance in the following year.

All reports received from schools (including the Composite Form: Annexure C) are retained at the Regional/District/Area office and must be made available to the external Whole School Evaluation teams.

12.4.4 SECOND AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS OF IMPLEMENTATION

In all subsequent years (after 2004) the process that will be followed is exactly the same with only one exception.

E.13 Educator: Observation of Educator in Practice

Teachers will need to be evaluated by their DSGs only once per annum. The "summative evaluation" at the end of the previous year becomes the "baseline evaluation" for the next year. It is therefore necessary to do only the summative evaluation at the end of each year (for PM purposes) and to compare this with the summative evaluation of the previous year in order to determine progress. Only new teachers, entering the system for the first time will need to be evaluated at the beginning of the year.

D.10 + B.10 Repetition on the process that B.11 + D.11 was followed in the first year of E.14 implementation

Note: The broad and specific planning by schools will involve revising and improving existing plans that were followed in the previous year. It is anticipated that from the second year onwards the planning and monitoring will be less time consuming and that it could be completed before the end of March, which would enable schools to complete the final summative evaluations of educators a little earlier in the year. The internal self-evaluation of the school, using the WSE instruments needs to be ongoing until such time as the cyclical external WSE takes place.

12.4.5 IN THE YEAR OF THE EXTERNAL WHOLE SCHOOL EVALUATION (WSE)

Notes

- For some schools this may take place in the first or second year. However, for the majority of schools this will take place in a 3 or 5 year cycle. The intention is that secondary schools will be evaluated more or less every three years and primary schools every 5 years (because of the greater number of schools).
- Clearly, cyclical external evaluation should also serve to validate findings from the internal WSE and will serve to measure progress over the period of the cycle (3 or 5 years). The process of internal evaluation in the years in between provides important documented evidence of progress.
• External WSE enables the Provincial Education Departments and the National Department to measure and evaluate the performance of schools in order to make judgements about the level of functioning of individual schools as well as schools as part of the public education system. In addition to measuring performance, the approach for WSE (external) is developmental and the evaluation should include highlighting strengths as well as specific areas in need of further development for each school that is evaluated.

• The self-evaluations done by schools in the ongoing process of internal WSE and the measuring of progress against the targets for improvement that the school sets itself (in the School Improvement Plans) are evidence of progress that must be taken into account for the external evaluation.

• Schools will use the same instrument for the internal Whole School Evaluations (linked to and informed by the process Developmental Appraisal and Performance Measurement) and the external WSE, which includes the evaluation of a sample of educators.

• The external a WSE Team, including supervisors appointed by the provincial departments for this purpose, will carry out WSE.

• Up to the time when the WSE team arrives at a school, the school should continue with the normal DA, PM and internal WSE processes. The normal ongoing processes are “interrupted” by external WSE for a limited time only.

A.1 Whole School Evaluation Team: Making Arrangements, Setting the Dates

The external WSE can take place at any time in the year as the WSE team will be evaluating different schools almost every week. The external WSE team will, in most instances, be able to complete their work within a working week. Their time at a school is therefore very limited. Schools are unlikely to be informed of the intended external WSE at the beginning of the school year. However, the WSE Team leader must inform the Regional/District/Area Office of the intended evaluation and Regional/District/Area officials must inform schools at least four working weeks in advance of the dates for the external WSE.

B.14 Regional/District/Area office: Coordination of External WSE

The Regional/District/Area office coordinates the external WSE in a school and must inform the school in good time (4 weeks) and must provide the school with a list of documents, records and reports that must be made available.

D.13 School: Coordination and Managing the external WSE

The principal and SDT must inform educators, parents, learners about the external WSE that will be taking place. The school must make all the documents that have been requested available to the WSE team. These must be collected from the school by the relevant Regional/District/Area officials.

B.15 Regional/District/Area office: Documentation

The Regional/District/Area office makes the reports and records (including the School Improvement Plans and reports of measured progress) available to the WSE Team.

The school must be informed of the sample of educators that will be evaluated as part of the external WSE process. The relevant educators are informed in good time (5 days) that they will be observed in practice.

A.2 WSE Team: Review of Documentation

The WSE reviews all the relevant documents received from the school. These must include reports (from Staff Development Team (SDT)), on the Implementation of Developmental Appraisal, the annual Performance Measurement process, internal WSE and the progress made by the school in terms of its own School Improvement Plan as well as the support (INSET and other programmes) received from the Regional/District/Area office.

D.14 School: The External Evaluation

The WSE Team carries out the external WSE including the evaluation of a sample of educators. Note: The agreed upon protocol must be adhered to by the WSE Team. The WSE Team for the external WSE must use the same WSE instrument that is used by the school for internal WSE.

E.16 Educator: Observation

The sample of educators is evaluated. The agreed upon protocol, for observing educators in practice, must be adhered to. One (or both) member(s) of the educator’s DSG must accompany the external evaluator(s), i.e. the supervisor and subject/phase specialist during the observation of the educator in practice. This observation and evaluation will be used to verify the DA and PM of the educators concerned and will serve to validate the PMs of other educators. The same instrument, used for both DA and PM, must be used for the external WSE.

E.17 Educator: Discussion and Feedback

The WSE Team/supervisor must discuss the findings of the evaluation with the educator concerned and his/her DSG. Feedback must be given and differences must be resolved. Contextual factors must be discussed and taken into account. Progress that the educator has made since the first, baseline evaluation and all subsequent summative evaluations (PM) must be taken into account. Once the evaluation and the evaluators have reached agreement, the completed instrument and report is submitted to the Principal, SMT and SDT.
D.15+16  School: Discussion, Feedback and Report

The WSE report, including the evaluations of the sample of educators, must be discussed with the school (principal, SMT and SDT). The report should include recommendations for further development. Any differences need to be resolved before the report can be accepted as being final. The school then receives the final report which is kept as part of its quality management records.

B.16  Regional/District/Area office: Report Received

A copy of the report is made available to the Regional/District/Area office and discussed with them. Support and provision of appropriate INSET and other programmes (in respect of recommendations made in the report for further development needed by the school) must be highlighted.

A.3  WSE Team: Final Report

The WSE Team must submit its final report to the relevant directorate(s) in the provincial department as well as the Chief Directorate: Quality Assurance at the National Department of Education.

B.17  Regional/District/Area Office

C.17  School  

E.18  Educator  

Normal Quality Management processes continue after the external WSE has been completed.
12. THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument is in two parts. One part (made up of 4 Performance Standards) is for observation of educators in practice and the other part (made up of 8 Performance Standards) is related to aspects for evaluation that fall outside of the classroom.

12.1. THE LESSON OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

This part of the instrument is designed for observation of educators in practice for Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School-Evaluation (external).

12.1.1 This part of the instrument consists of four Performance Standards:

1. The creation of a positive learning environment
2. Knowledge of curriculum and learning programmes
3. Lesson planning, preparation and presentation
4. Learner assessment

12.1.2 Each of the Performance Standards asks a question:

- Does the educator create a suitable environment for teaching and learning?
- Does the educator demonstrate adequate knowledge of the learning area and does s/he use this knowledge effectively to create meaningful experiences for learners?
- Is lesson planning clear, logical and sequential, and is there evidence that individual lessons fit into a broader learning programme?
- Is assessment used to promote teaching and learning?

12.1.3 Criteria

Each Performance Standard includes a number of Criteria. For each of these criteria there are four descriptors which are derived from the four point rating scale.

12.2 THE INSTRUMENT FOR ASPECTS OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM

This part of the instrument is designed to evaluate the performance of educators with regard to aspects outside classroom observation.

12.2.1 This part of the instrument consists of eight Performance Standards:

5. Professional development in field of work/career and participation in professional bodies.
6. Human relations and contribution to school development.
8. Administration of resources and records.
10. Decision making and accountability.
11. Leadership, communication and servicing the governing body.
12. Strategic planning, financial planning and EMD.

12.2.2 Each of the Performance Standards asks a question:

- Does the educator participate in activities, which foster professional growth?
- Does the educator demonstrate respect, interest and consideration for those with whom he/she interacts?
- Is the educator involved in extra and co-curricular activities?
- Does the educator use resources effectively and efficiently?
- Does the educator manage and develop personnel in a way that the vision and mission of the institution are accomplished?
- Does the educator display sound decision making skills and does he/she take responsibility for the decisions made?
- Is he/she a visionary leader who builds commitment and confidence in staff members?
- Is the educator proficient in planning and education management development?

12.2.3 Criteria

Each Performance Standard includes a number of Criteria. For each of these Criteria there are four descriptors which are derived from the four point rating scale.
12.3 RATING SCALE

- Rating 1: Unacceptable. This level of performance does not meet minimum expectations and requires urgent interventions and support.
- Rating 2: Satisfies minimum expectations. This level of performance is acceptable and is in line with minimum expectations, but development and support are still required.
- Rating 3: Good. Performance is good and meets expectations, but some areas are still in need of development and support.
- Rating 4: Outstanding. Performance is outstanding and exceeds expectations. Although performance is excellent, continuous self-development and improvement are advised.

12.4 APPLICATION OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

- Standards 1 to 7 apply to all Level 1 educators.
- Standards 1 to 10 are applicable to HoDs (Education Specialists).
- Standards 1 to 12 are applicable to Deputy Principals and Principals

12.5 A GUIDE ON HOW TO USE THE INSTRUMENT

- The Performance Standard appears at the top of the instrument and is followed by a broad statement of what the expectation is.
- The question to be answered from the observation is given.
- Each performance standard consists of a number of criteria each of which is described by 4 performance level descriptors or performance indicators. The criteria are labelled (a), (b),(c), etc. and these labels correspond to the performance descriptors/indicators which are also labeled (a), (b),(c), etc. Whilst all the criteria are grouped together under each level of performance (e.g. Performance Level 1: (a), (b), (c), etc.) to provide an overall picture of that particular level of performance, progression (in terms of each of the criteria) is described by, for example 1(a), 2(a), 3(a) and 4(a) or, for criterion (b), by 1(b), 2(b), 3(b) and 4(b). Please note that educators can be scored differently for each of the criteria under a Performance Standard, for example, for PS1 an educator might be scored 2 for (a), 4 for (b), 3 for <c) and 1 for (d).

- For each of the criteria, record the performance rating in the space allocated for this purpose.
- Adjustments for ratings: see annexure A.
- The appraiser is required to record observations as clearly as possible in the appropriate columns:
  - In the column "Strengths", record the strengths that have been taken into account in the assessment rating; high ratings are indicative of strengths.
  - Make recommendations in the column "Recommendations for Development". These are based on the ratings obtained for each of the criteria under each Performance Standard. Low ratings are indicative of areas in need of development.
  - In the column 'Notes on contextual factors', record the contextual factors that have influenced the assessment rating. These can consist of personal, social, economic and political factors. The assessment of contextual factors is intended to assess not only their effect on performance, but also the manner in which the educator addresses these issues. The comments should, therefore, reflect the following:
    * To what extent do contextual factors influence performance?
    * To what extent does the educator attempt to overcome negative influences in their teaching?
  - If observations and comments are recorded clearly in each of the columns then it will not be necessary to write a separate report. The completed instrument will serve as the report.

12.6 USING THE SCALE FOR AN INTEGRATED QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

12.6.1 For Developmental Appraisal

No overall ratings or totals are required. The baseline evaluation done at the start of the first year of implementation (and for new educators entering the system for the first time in subsequent years), and all self-evaluations are strictly developmental. However, in order to make comparisons, and to track progress, educators and/or their DSGs may wish to arrive at overall scores or totals. The ratings for each of the criteria under each Performance Standard are indicative of strengths (high scores) as well as specific areas in need of development (low scores). The completed...
instrument, which clearly indicates areas in need of development must be used by the educator (and his/her DSG) to develop a Personal Growth Plan (PGP) that enables the educator to develop and improve in the areas that have been identified. The completed instrument forms the report for DA as well as the baseline evaluation.

12.6.2 For Performance Measurement

For purposes, of pay or grade progression total scores must be calculated. The final score (total) is used to arrive at an overall rating. The rating can be adjusted upwards taking contextual factors into account such as the lack of opportunities for development, lack of INSET provided by the District/Local Departmental office or lack of support and mentoring within the school. A scoring sheet is attached at the end of the instrument (annexure A) to be used for this purpose. The completed score sheet should be submitted to Persal for data-capturing after the sum native evaluation at the end of the year in order to qualify for salary progression and grade progression respectively the following minimum scores must be attained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post level 1 educators: (Teachers and Senior Teachers)</th>
<th>Salary progression</th>
<th>Grade progression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post level 2 educators: (Education Specialists)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post level 3 and 4 educators: (Principals and Deputy Principals)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.6.3 For Whole School Evaluation

For the purposes of Whole School Evaluation (WSE) (both internal and external) it is not necessary to make judgments about the performance of individual educators. The names of educators therefore do not need to be recorded, especially for external WSE. It will be necessary to evaluate the school's overall performance in respect of each of the Performance Standards in order to enable the school to plan for appropriate programmes that will ensure improvement in those areas that are identified.

13. OBSERVATION OF LESSON IN PRACTICE: DATA SHEET

Name ........................................................................... (NB: Name recorded only for DA and PM)

School ..........................................................................

Address ......................................................................

Emis No ......................................................................

Persal No ......................................................................

Date of Observation .................................................

Names of Evaluator/s ................................................

Signature of Evaluatee ..............................................

Signature(s) of Evaluator(s) .......................................
14. PRE-EVALUATION PROFILE CHECKLIST

The pre-evaluation profile checklist should be used for establishing the profile of any person who is being evaluated. The questions should be used as a framework for a professional discussion between the evaluator and the evaluatee. A record must be kept of the answers provided.

In arriving at a final assessment, the evidence that the evaluatee provides in answering these questions as well as the information obtained from the application of the rating instrument may be used to effect an upward adjustment of the Performance Measurement score.

Wherever appropriate additional documentary evidence should be provided.

14.1 The following should be used for level 1 educators only:

- Have you been appraised for developmental purposes?
- Do you have a projected Personal Growth Plan (PGP) and to what extent have you achieved its objectives?
- Have you received any assistance from your Development Support Group (DSG)?
- To what extent have you managed to acquire new knowledge and additional skills to address your professional needs?
- Do you stay informed regarding policies and regulations applicable to your position?
- Do you receive support from your colleagues, school managers, governing body, the Staff Development Team (SDT) and departmental officials?
- Do you share information with colleagues?
- Is there anything you need that could help you develop and become more effective?
- How do you contribute to extra-curricular activities at the school?
- Do you participate in professional activities, e.g. conduct workshops, attend INSET courses, seminars, union programmes, etc.?
- What type of community activities are you involved in?
- What role do you play in formulating and implementing the school's policies?
- Are there any other matters you would like to bring to the attention of the supervisor before you are observed in practice?

14.2 The following should be used for level two, three and four educators:

- Do you have a projected Personal Growth Plan (PGP) and to what extent have you achieved its objectives?
- Have you received any assistance from your immediate senior or DSG?
- What kind of support have you received with regard to leadership, management and administration?
- Do you make an active contribution to the policies and aspirations of the school?
- Do you inspire trust and confidence in learners and colleagues?
- How do you go about communicating the school's vision, goals and priorities to appropriate constituencies?
- Do you give direction to your team in realising the institution's objectives?
- Are you able to secure the co-operation from colleagues and team members?
- How do you ensure effective utilisation of financial resources?
- How do you go about allocating resources to established goal and objectives?
- What is your role with regard to financial planning, budgeting and forecasting?
- Do you create mechanisms and structures for sharing of knowledge within the institution?
- Do you consult with clients and stakeholders on ways to improve the delivery of services?
- Do you demonstrate objectivity, thoroughness, insightfulness, and probing behaviours when approaching problems?
- Do you delegate and empower others to increase their contributions and level of responsibility?
- Do you display personal interest in the well-being of colleagues?
- Do you manage conflict through a participatory transparent approach?
- Are you receptive to alternate viewpoints?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Unacceptable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>No effort to create a learning space that is conducive to teaching and learning; Organization of learning space hampers teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Educator and learners appear uninterested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>No discipline and much time is wasted. Learners do not accept discipline or discipline is experienced by learners as humiliating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Educator is insensitive to racial culture and/or gender diversity; does not respect dignity of individual learners or groups of learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>There is evidence of an attempt at creating and organizing a suitable learning environment, which enables individual and/or group learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Learners are engaged in appropriate activities for most of the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Learners are disciplined and learning is not interrupted unnecessarily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Learning environment is free of obvious discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **3. Good** |           |                                 |                   |
| (a)         | Organization of learning space enables the effective use of teaching resources and encourages and supports individual and group activities |                   |                   |
| (b)         | The environment is stimulating and the learners participate actively |                   |                   |
| (c)         | Learners are encouraged; there is positive re-enforcement. Learners accept discipline without feeling threatened. |                   |                   |
| (d)         | Educator acknowledges and respects individuality and diversity |                   |                   |

| **4. Outstanding** |           |                                 |                   |
| (a)               | Organization of learning space shows creativity and enables all learners to be productively engaged in individual and cooperative learning |                   |                   |
| (b)               | Learners participate actively and are encouraged to exchange ideas with confidence and to be creative |                   |                   |
| (c)               | Learners are motivated and self-disciplined |                   |                   |
| (d)               | Educator uses inclusive strategies and promotes respect for individuality and diversity |                   |                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Unacceptable = 1</th>
<th>Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2</th>
<th>Good = 3</th>
<th>Outstanding = 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard 1</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Max 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating
## Performance Standard 2: KNOWLEDGE OF CURRICULUM AND LEARNING PROGRAMMES

**Expectation:** The educator possesses appropriate content knowledge which is demonstrated in the creation of meaningful learning experiences.

**Question:** Does the educator demonstrate adequate knowledge of the Learning Area or subject and does he/she use this knowledge effectively to create meaningful experiences for learners?

### CRITERIA: (a) Knowledge of learning area; (b) Skills; (c) Goal Setting; (d) Involvement in learning programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Unacceptable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>- Educator conveys inaccurate and limited knowledge of learning area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>- No skill in creating enjoyable learning experiences for learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>- Little or no evidence of goal-setting to achieve curriculum outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>- Makes no attempt to interpret the learning programmes for the benefit of learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>- Educator’s knowledge is adequate but not comprehensive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>- Has some skill in engaging learners and relating the learning programme to learners needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>- Evidence of some goal setting to achieve curriculum outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>- Makes some attempts to interpret the learning programmes for the benefit of the learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Good</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>- Educator is able to use knowledge and information to extend the knowledge of learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>- Educator skillfully involves learners in learning area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>- Makes every endeavour to set realistic goals to achieve curriculum outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>- Displays great enthusiasm in interpreting learning programmes in the interests of the learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Outstanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>- Educator uses knowledge to diagnose learner strengths and weaknesses in order to develop teaching strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>- Educator sees learning as a dynamic process that provides for acquisition of basic skills and knowledge and promotes critical thinking and problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>- Curriculum outcomes are always achieved by being creative and innovative in the setting of goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>- Excellent balance between clarity of goals of learning programmes and expression of learner needs, interests and background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rating

| Unacceptable = 1 | Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2 | Good = 3 | Outstanding = 4 |

### Performance Standard 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>(a) Little or no evidence of lesson planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Lesson not presented clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) No records are kept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Learners are not involved in lessons in a way that supports their needs and the development of their skills and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</td>
<td>(a) Lesson planning not fully on a professional standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Lessons are structured and relatively clearly presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Evidence of essential records of planning and learner progress is available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Evidence of some learner involvement in lessons in a way that it supports their needs and the development of their skills and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Good</td>
<td>(a) Lesson planning is generally clear, logical &amp; sequential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Lessons are well structured and fit into the broader learning programme building on previous lessons and anticipating future learning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Evidence of essential records of planning and learner progress is maintained at a high level of proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Good involvement of learners in lessons in such a way that it supports their needs and the development of their skills and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outstanding</td>
<td>(a) Lesson planning is abundantly clear, logical, sequential and developmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Outstanding planning of lessons that are exceptionally well structured and clearly fits into the broader learning programme with evidence that it builds on previous lessons as well as fully anticipating future learning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Outstanding record keeping of planning and learner progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Excellent involvement of learners in lessons in such a way that it fully supports their needs and the development of their skills and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable = 1</td>
<td>Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2</td>
<td>Good = 3</td>
<td>Outstanding = 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Standard 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Max 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating
Performance Standard: 4. LEARNER ASSESSMENT / ACHIEVEMENT

Expectation: The educator demonstrates competence in monitoring and assessing learner progress and achievement.

Question: Is assessment used in order to promote teaching and learning?

CRITERIA: (a) Feedback to learners; (b) Knowledge of assessment techniques; (c) Application of techniques; (d) Record keeping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) No evidence of meaningful feedback to learners, or feedback irregular and inconsistent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Does not demonstrate an understanding of different types of assessment e.g. only uses tests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Assessment results do not influence teaching strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) No evidence of records, or records are incomplete and irregular.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Some evidence of feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Has a basic understanding of different types of assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Some evidence of corrective measures and remedial activity based on assessment results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Maintains essential records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3 Good | | | |
| (a) Feedback is regular, consistent and timeously provided. | | | |
| (b) A variety of assessment techniques are used, allowing learners to demonstrate their talents. | | | |
| (c) Lessons are appropriately tailored to address learners’ strengths and areas of weakness. | | | |
| (d) Records are systematically, efficiently and regularly maintained. | | | |

| 4. Outstanding | | | |
| (a) Feedback is insightful, regular, consistent, sequenced and built into lesson design. | | | |
| (b) Different assessment techniques used to cater for learners from diverse backgrounds, with multiple intelligences and learning styles. | | | |
| (c) Assessment informs multiple intervention strategies to address specific needs of all learners and motivates them. | | | |
| (d) Records are easily accessed and provide insights into individual learners progress. | | | |

Rating
Unacceptable = 1  Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2  Good = 3  Outstanding = 4

Performance Standard 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+4 to determine rating.
Performance Standard 5. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN FIELD OF WORK/CAREER AND PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL BODIES.

Expectation: The educator engages in professional development activities which is demonstrated in his willingness to acquire new knowledge an additional skills.

Question: Does the educator participate in professional growth activities?

CRITERIA: (a) Participation in professional development; (b) Participation in professional bodies; (c) Knowledge of education issues; (d) Attitude to professional development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>• Little or no evidence of professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>• Makes no attempt to participate in professional bodies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>• Displays no, or superficial knowledge on educational issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>• Exhibits negative attitude towards development, seminars, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>• There is evidence of some attempt to develop oneself professionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>• Evidence of some participation in professional bodies e.g., trade union learning area association, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>• Shows some knowledge of educational issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>• Seeks further professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Good

- (a) Participates eagerly in professional development programmes to improve on performance.
- (b) Plays a role in professional bodies and involves colleagues.
- (c) Demonstrates clear awareness of current educational issues.
- (d) Stays informed in their field by reading or participating in conferences and training opportunities.

4. Outstanding

- (a) Takes a leading role in initiating and delivering professional developmental opportunities.
- (b) Takes up leading positions in professional bodies and involves colleagues.
- (c) Is informed and critically engages with current educational issues.
- (d) Participates in activities which foster professional growth and tries new teaching methods/approaches and evaluates their success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Unacceptable = 1</th>
<th>Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2</th>
<th>Good = 3</th>
<th>Outstanding = 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Performance Standard 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 4 to determine rating
**Performance Standard 6: HUMAN RELATIONS AND CONTRIBUTION TO SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT**

**Expectation:** The educator engages in appropriate interpersonal relationships with learners, parents and staff and contributes to the development of the school.

**Question:** Does the educator create and maintain sound human relations with colleagues and learners?

**CRITERIA:** (a) Learner needs; (b) Human relations skills; (c) Interaction; (d) Co-operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Performance</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Recommendations for Development</th>
<th>Contextual factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unacceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>The educator is insensitive to learner needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>No evidence of human relation skills in communicating with learners, staff and parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Interacts inappropriately with learners, staff and parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Lacks tact and courtesy and is not co-operative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfies Minimum Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Some evidence of the educator being sensitive to learner needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Some evidence of positive relationships with individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Interacts appropriately with individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Co-operates with learners, staff and parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Designs internal work processes to cater for learner needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Establishes trust and shows confidence in others and supports school regulations, programmes and policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Demonstrates understanding and acceptance of different racial, ethnic, cultural and religious groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Shares information openly, whilst respecting the principle of confidentiality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Adds value to the institution by providing exemplary service in terms of learner needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Demonstrates respect, interest and consideration for those with whom he/she interacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Conducts self in accordance with organisational code of conduct and handles contacts with parents and/or guardians in a professional, ethical manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Supports stakeholders in achieving their goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating**

Unacceptable = 1  Satisfies Minimum Expectations = 2  Good = 3  Outstanding = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Raw Scores</th>
<th>Final Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max 16

+ 4 to determine rating