



**HOW SCHOOL MANAGEMENT TEAMS VIEW AND  
EXPERIENCE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED  
QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

by

**Samson Gugulethu Nkambule**

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the  
degree**

**MAGISTER EDUCATIONIS  
(Educational Leadership)**

in the

**Department of Education Management  
and Policy Studies**

**Faculty of Education**

**University of Pretoria**

**SUPERVISOR:**

**Dr C Amsterdam**

**PRETORIA**

**August 2010**

## DECLARATION

I, Samson Gugulethu Nkambule, (student no: 26497086) hereby declare that this mini-dissertation for the degree Magister of Education at the University of Pretoria entitled **How School Management Teams View and Experience Implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System** is my own work in design and execution, that it has not been submitted by me for degree purposes at this or any other university and that all sources used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of references.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the following:

- ❖ My supervisor, Dr C Amsterdam, for her invaluable support at all times, her expert guidance, constructive criticism, patience and for having confidence in me.
- ❖ Alexa Barnsby, the language specialist for editing my work.
- ❖ The principals, deputy principals and heads of department who took part in this study and provided the necessary data for my research.
- ❖ My father, Bednog, for his encouragement and moral support.
- ❖ My family, my wife, Zanele, my children, Xolisile, Malusi, Mxolisi, Nompumelelo, Nothando and Nokwazi for their patience, understanding and support when I was not able to spend quality time with them.
- ❖ My colleagues, Mr. EM Kgwete and Mr. NT Mollo, for their words of encouragement to soldier on despite all odds.
- ❖ God the Almighty – Master of the Universe – ‘With Him all things are possible’.

## ACRONYMS

IQMS	Integrated Quality Management Systems
SMT	School Management Team
HOD	Head of Department
SDT	School Development Team
DoE	Department of Education
DSG	Development Support Group
DAS	Developmental Appraisal Systems
WSE	Whole School Evaluation
ELRC	Education Labour Relations Council
ETWR	Experienced Teacher with Responsibility
L3	Western Australian Level 3 Teacher Position
SIP	School Improvement Plan
SADTU	South African Democratic Teachers Union
PGP	Performance Growth Plan
INSET	In-service Training
PPE	Pay Progression to Educators
NEEDU	National Evaluation and Development Unit
MDE	Mpumalanga Department of Education
EEA	Employment of Educators Act
OSD	Occupation Specific Dispensation

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 .....	1
BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY .....	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.2 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW .....	3
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	6
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY .....	7
1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	7
1.6 DEMARCATION OF THE STUDY .....	8
1.7 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	8
1.7.1 Evaluation .....	8
1.7.2 Professional development.....	11
1.7.3 Accountability .....	12
1.7.4 Supervision of instruction .....	13
1.7.5 Discussion.....	14
1.8 STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH.....	16
1.9 SUMMARY .....	17
 CHAPTER 2.....	 18
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	18
2.1 INTRODUCTION .....	18
2.2 PURPOSE OF TEACHER APPRAISAL .....	18
2.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEMS IN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT .....	20
2.4 IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHER APPRAISAL WITHIN A SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT.....	23
2.5 INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL FACTORS, HUMAN CAPACITY AND THE SCHOOL CONTEXT .....	24

2.6 TRAINING OF EVALUATORS FOR IMPLEMENTING TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEMS.....	26
2.7 EVALUATING PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS.....	28
2.8 INTEGRATION OF TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEMS .....	32
2.9 CONCLUSION.....	33
CHAPTER 3.....	34
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	34
3.1 INTRODUCTION .....	34
3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN .....	34
3.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	35
3.4 DATA COLLECTION .....	36
3.4.1 Sampling.....	36
3.4.2 Profile of the participants.....	36
3.5 DATA GATHERING TECHNIQUES.....	39
3.5.1 Interviews .....	39
3.5.2 Documents Retrieval .....	40
3.6 DATA ANALYSIS.....	40
3.7 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY .....	42
3.7.1 Validity.....	42
3.7.2 Reliability.....	44
3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	45
3.8.1 Voluntary participation.....	46
3.8.2 Informed consent.....	46
3.8.3 Confidentiality and anonymity .....	47
3.9 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY .....	47
3.10 CONCLUSION .....	48
CHAPTER 4.....	49
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION .....	49
4.1 INTRODUCTION .....	49



4.2 DATA ANALYSIS.....	49
4.2.1 INTERVIEW ANALYSIS.....	50
4.2.1.1 Roles of the SMTs during the implementation of IQMS.....	50
4.2.1.2 Views of the SMTs on the implementation of IQMS.....	53
4.2.1.3 Evaluating the performance of educators.....	55
4.2.1.4 Training of evaluators.....	60
4.2.1.5 Support and mentoring (professional development).....	62
4.2.1.6 Accountability in respect of the IQMS.....	64
4.2.1.7 Challenges experienced by the SMTs during implementation of the IQMS.....	66
4.2.2 DOCUMENT ANALYSIS.....	67
4.2.2.1 IQMS Schools' Year Plans.....	67
4.2.2.2 Minutes of the SMTs and SDTs.....	67
4.2.2.3 Professional Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans.....	68
4.2.2.4 Summary of summative scores.....	69
4.3 DISCUSSION.....	69
4.4 SUMMARY.....	70
CHAPTER 5.....	71
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	71
5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	71
5.2 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	71
5.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	79
5.4 CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY.....	79
5.5 ASPECTS OF FUTURE RESEARCH.....	80
5.6 CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	81
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	82
APPENDICES.....	91

## ABSTRACT

This study explored the views and experiences of School Management Teams (SMTs) when implementing Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in three primary schools in the Nkangala Region of the Mpumalanga Province, South Africa. A qualitative research approach was adopted and the data were collected by means of semi-structured interviews and document retrieval in schools. The data were then analysed by the constant comparative method.

All the participants in this study expressed the view that IQMS is a teacher appraisal system with a potential to develop educators in schools provided both evaluators and evaluatees are honest with the evaluation process and are able to identify their areas of development. However the experience of the principals and deputy principals with the implementation of IQMS in schools reveals that educators inflate their scores and do not identify areas where they need development. The Development Support Groups (DSGs) do not conduct authentic evaluation since they serve the purpose of helping educators to qualify for salary progression. Participants recommended external evaluation as a solution to subjective ratings since external evaluators have a potential to provide objective and credible evaluation because they are unfamiliar with educators and do not experience the pressure to maintain collegiality in schools. A key recommendation is that the Department of Education should conduct effective training for the stakeholders involved with the implementation of IQMS in schools

### KEY WORDS

Integrated Quality Management System	Accountability
School Management Teams	Evaluation
Development Support Groups	Formative evaluation
Professional development	Summative evaluation
Supervision of instruction	School Development Teams



## CHAPTER 1

### BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

#### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) includes the teacher appraisal system in South Africa. The implementation of the teacher appraisal aspect of IQMS is informed by schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act (EEA) 76 of 1998 and regulates that principals, deputy principals, heads of department and post level 1 educators are required to participate in agreed upon school/educator appraisal processes in order to review their professional practice on a regular basis with a view of improving quality teaching.

The Department of Education conducted the advocacy training for the principal and some educators of all schools to introduce IQMS in South African schools (Class Act, 2007: 54). The principals and those educators were responsible for training the rest of the staff members about the implementation of IQMS in their schools. The School Development Teams (SDTs) and Development Support Groups were established in schools as the structures responsible for implementing IQMS. The SDT consists of “the principal, some School Management Team (SMT) members and must include post level 1 educators” (ELRC, 2003:12). The DSG is comprised of three individuals, namely; the educator undergoing the appraisal, the immediate senior and the selected peer (ELRC, 2003: 4).

The School Management Team is one of the three structures responsible for implementing IQMS in South African schools. The SMT comprises of the principal, deputy principals and heads of department (HODs) in a school appointed in terms of the Employment of Educators Act of 1998. In schools

where both deputy principals and HODs are part of the SMT, HODs, as the immediate supervisor of the post level 1 educator, are members of the DSG by default and potential members of the SDT. Thus, they could form part of all the structures responsible for implementation of the IQMS in schools. In general, the principal is both SMT and SDT member by default but will only be a DSG member in schools where no deputy principals or HODs have been assigned. The deputy principal is an SMT member by default but potentially an SDT member or in schools where no HODS are assigned, a potential DSG member.

The roles and responsibilities of the SMTs, SDTs and DSGs are delineated in the IQMS Manuals (DoE, 2003; DoE, 2005). The roles of these structures range from planning and coordination of IQMS at a broader level to mentoring, training and support at micro level. The main role of the DSG, as set out in the Educator's Manual (DoE, 2005: 5) is to provide mentoring and support to educators. The SDT "plan, oversee, coordinate and monitor all Quality Management processes," according to the Training Manual (DoE, 2003: 5). The Educator's Manual (DoE, 2005: 2) describes the main role of the SMT as "to assist in planning and implementation of IQMS in schools." In addition, the ELRC Collective Agreement 9 of 2002 states that, "[i]t is essential that the SMT co-ordinate the management plan for implementation" (ELRC, 2002: 2). The Educator's Manual (DoE, 2005: 3) states that the SMTs contribute to the professional development of educators by liaising between schools and the Department of Education in respect of in-service training (INSET) programmes.

The main role of the DSG is to provide mentoring and support to educators (DoE, 2005: 5). The SDT "plan, oversee, coordinate and monitor all Quality Management processes" (DoE, 2003: 5). The SMT "assist in planning and implementation of IQMS in schools" (DoE, 2005: 2). In addition, the ELRC Collective Agreement 9 of 2002 states that, "[i]t is essential that the SMT co-ordinate the management plan for implementation" (ELRC, 2002: 2). Class Act (2007) and NEEDU (2009) affirmed that the duties of the SMT and SDT are not

clearly delineated. The IQMS Manual (DoE, 2005: 3) advised that both the SMT and SDT should “work together and mutually support(s) one another on matters relating to IQMS.”

It is for the first time in the history of teacher appraisal in South Africa that a teacher appraisal system is managed by teams and involves post-level 1 and peer educators. Few studies have been conducted on team evaluation of educators. Amsterdam, Johnson, Monrad and Tonnsen (2005: 239), in their study of principal evaluation support the use of more than one evaluator for the purpose of interrater reliability. South Africa adopted team evaluation following an outcry from the teacher unions that individual inspectors were autocratic, subjective and judgmental when evaluating the performance of teachers (Class Act, 2007: 82). Team evaluation is perceived to be democratic and developmental compared to the previous inspection system. This study explores the views and experiences of the SMT; one of the structures participating in team evaluation of educators in schools.

## **1.2 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

During the apartheid era teacher appraisal in South Africa was conducted by the “inspectorate system”. The inspectorate system had no transparency in the sense that educators had no say about the way inspections were carried out and the criteria used for evaluating their performance (Le Roux, 2002: 131). It was strongly influenced by a judgemental approach and it did little to develop a climate of support and collegiality in schools. The inspectors were responsible for evaluating teachers and they overtly focused on accountability and neglected teacher development and school improvement (Class Act, 2007: 82). In most cases, inspectors would conduct a classroom visit to observe teachers teaching in class, but did not provide the recommendations for teacher development despite identifying the mistakes. The inspectorate system became unpopular with teachers throughout the country because teachers were dissatisfied with the

manner it was carried out in schools. The unpopularity of the inspectorate system and its work led to widespread neglect and resistance to performance appraisals in education (Le Roux, 2002: 131).

The “inspection system” collapsed in the early 1990s in South African schools when members of the South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) throughout the country embarked on various forms of mass action to protest against inferior working conditions, poor conditions of service, inspection and apartheid injustices in general (Hartshorne, 1992: 322ff; Heese and Badenhorst, 1992: vii–viii). Chisholm (1999: 114) found that the “[p]rotests in 1990 ... took the form of stayaways, chalk-downs, marches to regional offices, submissions of lists of grievances, sit-ins and prevention of departmental officials from visiting schools ... control personnel such as inspectors and subject advisors were barred from school grounds”. The situation in the township schools spiralled out of control as inspection system was perceived to constitute part of the apartheid state’s mechanisms (Class Act, 2007: 82). In areas such as Johannesburg, black educators refused “to allow principals, subject advisors and inspectors access to their classes for purposes of supervision” (Hartshorne, 1992: 321).

In an effort to resuscitate teacher appraisal, the National Department of Education in South Africa established and implemented Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) in 1998. It was from these DAS system that the more extensive IQMS emerged in 2003 (Class Act, 2007: 25). IQMS came into existence following an agreement between the national Department of Education and the teachers’ unions which was concluded in the ELRC and subsequently signed as ELRC Collective Agreement No. 8 of 2003. The ELRC is a “statutory body designed to provide bargaining and negotiation mechanisms on matters of education” (NEEDU, 2009: 9). Collective Agreement No. 8 of 2003 specifies that Whole School Evaluation (WSE), Developmental Appraisal System (DAS) and Performance Measurement (PM) run concurrently under the auspices of the IQMS programme (Baloyi, 2004: 181).

The purpose of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is “to identify the specific needs of educators, schools and district offices in terms of support and development; to provide support for continued growth for educators; to promote accountability; to monitor the overall effectiveness of an institution; and to evaluate the performance of educators” (DoE, 2005: 1). The IQMS comprises three programmes; namely, Developmental Appraisal Systems (DAS), Performance Measurement (PM) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE), and each programme has its own specific purpose.

The purpose of DAS is to appraise individual educators in a transparent manner with a view of determining areas of strength and weaknesses, and drawing up programmes for individual development (ELRC, 2003: 4). DAS serves the purpose of identifying both the strengths and areas of development for educators and drawing up a professional growth plan. Taylor, (2002: 3) noted that “[a]ppraisal schemes, such as DAS, have the potential to play an important role in identifying individual training and support needs”.

The purpose of PM is to evaluate individual teachers for salary progression and grade progression, and affirmation of appointments, rewards and incentives (ELRC, 2003: 4). The purpose of WSE is to evaluate the overall effectiveness of a school, school management, infrastructure of the school and learning resources as well as quality of teaching and learning (ELRC, 2003: 4). This study focuses on teacher evaluation (DAS and PM) and excludes school evaluation (WSE).

The implementation of IQMS was delayed until July 2004, as the Department of Education and the teacher unions were unable to come to an agreement on the manner in which these programmes should be implemented (Baloyi, 2004: 18; Weber, 2005: 67). Classroom inspection was the main area of conflict because teacher unions regarded it as a “mere replica of apartheid-era school and

classroom inspections that were divisive, demeaning and fault finding, rather than constructive or nurturing” (Baloyi, 2004: 181). On the other hand, the Education Department claimed that classroom inspection was aimed at teacher support and development. The first phase of IQMS was to run from 1 July 2004 to 31 July 2005, but the teacher unions indicated that the programme was “being implemented so late that it would be virtually impossible to complete a proper assessment by July 2005 deadline” (Boyle & Mkhize in *Sunday Times*, 2004: 4). The implementation of IQMS in several public schools from different provinces in South Africa commenced in January 2005.

### **1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT**

There is a contradiction between what is required by the legislation of school management and the IQMS policy. The Education Laws Amendment Act (2007: 12) states that it is incumbent on the principal of a school to manage all educators within the school and to implement all educational programmes and curriculum activities. The Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998 and ELRC Collective Agreement No. 1 of 2008 require both principals and deputy principals to guide and supervise the work and performance of staff. Principals and deputy principals are thus required to work with teachers in supervisory and support capacities, while, technically, the principal is responsible for implementation of all educational programmes. The IQMS documents (ELRC, 2002; DoE, 2003; DoE, 2005), task the DSG, the only structure in which principals and deputy principals do not hold membership, with support of post-level 1 educators. Thus, principals and deputy principals are potentially excluded from working directly with post level 1 educators.

Literature (Halverson, Kelley & Kimball, 2004; Cullen, 1997; Leithwood, Edge & Jantzi, 1999) reveals that principals and teachers experience challenges when implementing teacher appraisal systems in schools. These challenges includes *inter alia*: the perception that implementing teacher appraisal systems is time-

consuming, has excessive paperwork, present time management challenge and an additional workload for teachers and principals. The challenges experienced during the implementation of teacher appraisal systems in schools as documented in international studies prompted the researcher of this study to endeavour to gain insight into the perspective of the SMTs when they implement IQMS in South African schools.

#### **1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

This study extends the scope of existing studies by exploring implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System from a South African perspective. The findings of this study will assist the Department of Education to gain insight from the views and experience of the SMTs when implementing IQMS in schools. The study has the potential to provide feedback to the Department of Education on progress and challenges of implementing IQMS in schools. Study participants may benefit from reflecting on and critically analysing their roles in IQMS implementation. This study will increase the understanding of aspects on which educators need to be developed and support required during the implementation of IQMS in schools.

#### **1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

**Main question:**

How do School Management Teams (SMTs) view and experience implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)?

**Sub questions:**

- a) What are the views of SMT members on the IQMS?
- b) What are the experiences of SMT members when implementing IQMS in primary schools in Mpumalanga Province?

- c) Which role do SMTs play when implementing IQMS in primary schools in Mpumalanga Province?

## **1.6 DEMARCATION OF THE STUDY**

This study focused on three primary schools in Witbank 3 circuit in the Nkangala Region in the Mpumalanga Province. These three primary schools were chosen because of their different locations in order to explore the views and experience of the SMTs about the implementation of IQMS. The study was conducted in primary schools since a number of previous studies (Barnett, 2006; Monyatsi, Steyn & Kamper, 2006a; Ingvarson & Chadbourne, 1997; Fidler & Cooper, 1992; Barber, Evans & Johnson, 1995) have been conducted in secondary schools. A qualitative research approach was adopted and the data were gathered from interviews and documents retrieved in schools.

## **1.7 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The dimensions of the conceptual framework underpinning this study include evaluation, professional development, accountability and supervision of instruction. These concepts form part of school management as outlined in the Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998.

### **1.7.1 Evaluation**

Evaluation refers to “the process by which an organization periodically evaluates an employee’s behaviour and accomplishments” (Gryna, 2001: 231). Teacher evaluation is defined as a continuous and systematic process aimed at helping individual educators in professional development, career planning and in-service training in order to match the complementary needs of individual educators and



schools/institutions (Monyatsi et al, 2006a; Van Staden, 2000; Le Roux, 2002). These definitions reveal that teacher evaluation involves evaluators' judgements on performance of teachers during professional development and performance measurement. Teacher evaluation involves measuring job performance, identifying possible areas that need improvement, setting performance targets, deciding on ways to meet these targets and evaluating progress made in respect of meeting these targets. This explains the interrelatedness of these concepts: evaluation, professional development (formative evaluation) and performance measurement (summative evaluation) attainable by supervision of instruction.

Teacher evaluation comprises formative and summative evaluation. Scallan (2007: 6) highlights that formative evaluation serves both educational and developmental purpose; and summative evaluation is concerned about performance and competence. This means that formative evaluation identifies the strengths and areas of development in order to support and develop educators in schools. On the other hand, summative evaluation is concerned about evaluating performance of educators in terms of meeting or exceeding the performance standards after support and development has been provided during formative evaluation.

Teacher evaluation provides an opportunity for self-evaluation and peer evaluation. Millman and Darling-Hammond (1990: 219) states that "In these hybrid systems (evaluation systems that combine self-assessment and peer review) peers provide objective feedback to educators to assist them to focus on new behaviour they may have missed and to get them to focus on new behaviour they may wish to include." Self-evaluation during the implementation of IQMS takes place when an educator evaluates himself/herself against the performance standards applicable to him/her. The self-evaluated scores for educators are verified or disconfirmed by their DSGs. Millman and Darling-Hammond (1990: 218) noted that self-evaluation is a powerful mechanism for personal development because it brings about self-improvement of educators.

During the implementation of teacher appraisal systems, both external and internal evaluations are applied. External evaluation provides a mirror for the school and external evaluators have accumulated evaluative experiences from different schools that help with consistent evaluation of educators in schools (NEEDU, 2009: 32). The disadvantage of external evaluation is that external evaluators are rarely trusted; intimidate and stress teachers; and the possibility exists for some schools to be “named and shamed” (Coleman & Earley, 2005; Turner & Clift, 1988). On the other hand, internal evaluators, such as peers or head teachers, are good for team work, reflects on complex teaching and learning processes because of their understanding of the context of both the school and its learners (Umalusi, 2007: 5; NEEDU, 2009: 32). The disadvantage of internal evaluation is that good standards are not being upheld when teacher performance is assessed and internal evaluators may be too subjective in their judgement of teachers’ work. (Grubb, 2000; Umalusi, 2007).

NEEDU (2009: 46) recommended external evaluators to be “endowed with the authority to observe classrooms, evaluate teachers and principals, advise on support strategies, propose penalties to act on bad behaviour, and make judgments about schools”. SADTU perceive external evaluation as “an addition of another layer of bureaucracy for teachers and schools to cope with. Increased monitoring and inspections – if not linked to a positive programme of teacher development, will lead to further demoralization of the profession” (SADTU, 2009: 1). Jansen (2004: 16) supports both internal and external evaluation and suggests that “the government should focus firstly on internal peer-driven teacher development and then follow it up with external evaluation-driven accountability.”

### **1.7.2 Professional development**

Professional development is the first stage of teacher evaluation and is also referred to as formative evaluation. Bolam (1993) and Le Roux (2002: 112) define professional development as the systematic and ongoing efforts to enable employees to acquire new knowledge, skills and attitudes and to attain organisational objectives in a more effective and efficient way. Ling and McKenzie (2001: 91) define professional development as a means of empowering teachers by providing them with the ability to update and upgrade their knowledge and qualifications. These definitions reveal that professional development provides educators with an opportunity to acquire and update or upgrade knowledge, skills, attitudes and qualifications.

During professional development, targets are set, plans are devised to achieve these targets, and the type of support needed is identified. Both the strengths and areas of development for educators are identified to achieve their professional development. The areas for development inform the professional growth plan and support and mentoring required for developing educators. The IQMS Manuals (DoE, 2003; DoE, 2005) reveal that the process of evaluating educators involves self-evaluation; pre-appraisal meeting; classroom observation; post-appraisal meeting and completion of the PGP. The PGPs identify the performance targets to be met, areas for development and support required to develop each educator.

The Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998 states that all educators may be required to attend programmes for ongoing professional development up to a maximum of 80 hours per annum (EEA, 1998: 63). The ELRC Collective Agreement No. 1 of 2008, known as Occupational Specific Dispensation (OSD), requires principals and deputy principals to develop and empower themselves and other educators in the school (ELRC: 2008, 55).

### **1.7.3 Accountability**

Accountability is defined as “performing up to certain prescribed standards; fulfilling obligations, duties, expectations, and other charges” (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy & Doherty, 1994: 634). Kuye, Thornhill, Fourie, Brynard, Crous, Mafunisa, et al (2002: 121) define accountability as the responsibility for execution of activities and compliance with the set requirements, as well as for reporting on progress made. Singh (2004) and Jarvis (1990) define accountability in terms of being answerable for the way authority has been exercised and responsibilities discharged.

Accountability is about agreeing on goals or targets for individuals, teams, and organisations by using both monitoring and review processes to measure progress towards these targets and incentives for achieving predetermined performance targets (Coleman & Earley; 2005: 192). Geraldine (1997: 91) states that accountability serves the purpose of determining rewards and sanctions since it focus on collecting information on performance of teachers in order to determine pay levels, disciplinary warnings, dismissal, promotion and in-service needs. Accountability in the IQMS is achieved by evaluating the performance of educators against the performance standards applicable to their post levels; and scores are used to determine mastery of these performance standards (DoE, 2005: 15).

Educators qualify for financial rewards if they meet the minimum requirements of the performance standards. The rewards for IQMS include “salary progression, grade progression, and affirmation of appointments, and incentives” (ELRC, 2003: 4). Another feature of accountability is to impose sanctions. Educators failing to meet the minimum requirements of the performance standards do not get salary progression. In addition, section 39 of the Employment of Educators Act of 1998 states that poor performance constitutes misconduct and sanctions such as transfers, demotions or even dismissal (EEA, 1998: 15).

#### 1.7.4 Supervision of instruction

Supervision of instruction is an important tool for both formative and summative evaluation. Evaluators convey the instructions to educators so that they adhere and comply with the instructions during professional development and summative evaluation. Supervision of instruction is the process of engaging teachers in instructional dialogue in order to improve teaching and to enhance student achievement (Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern & Keeling, 2009: 27; Sullivan & Glanz, 2005: 27). Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (1998: 8) define supervision of instruction as “the assistance for improvement of instruction and educators throughout the school system from top to bottom of an organisational chart.”

Supervision of instruction follows a top-down management approach because school managers give the instructions to their subordinates (teachers). The top-down approach is not followed during the implementation of IQMS since senior school managers do not supervise instruction to a number of educators in schools. The DSGs observe the effectiveness of the instructions in the classroom context. There are contrasting views in literature on the effectiveness of supervision of instruction by the SMTs or DSGs. Halverson et al (2004) support the principals to supervise instruction for teachers by stating that the principals effect the instruction by supporting and encouraging staff during professional development process. Kleinhenz and Ingvarson (2004: 46) support peers to supervise instruction because the principals and deputy principals are “hierarchical(ly) distanced from the work of the teacher”. The researcher supports the SMTs to supervise instruction because of clear lines of accountability inherent in this type of supervision – the HODs account to the deputy principals and the deputy principals are held accountable by the principals.

### 1.7.5 Discussion

The concepts; evaluation, accountability, professional development and supervision of instruction are interdependent and complement each other during the implementation of teacher appraisal systems in schools. Educators are evaluated for the purpose of professional development (formative evaluation) and accountability (summative evaluation) attainable through supervision of instruction. These concepts are not new in education, but it is for the first time the HODs and post level 1 educators are entrusted with the responsibility to implement a policy without the effective involvement of the principals and deputy principals. This is a paradigm shift in teacher evaluation in South African schools since the DSGs are assigned with the role of evaluating educators; holding them accountable and supervising the instructions.

Literature reveals that the simultaneous implementation of professional development and accountability is the cause of an enduring dilemma for evaluators regarding their role during teacher evaluation in schools. Sullivan & Glanz (2005: 27); De Clercq (2008: 12) and NEEDU (2009: 27) report that evaluators are caught in the dilemma of evaluating and advising educators at the same time. This role confusion dilemma in the IQMS is exacerbated by the fact that the “SMTs and peer educators were not thoroughly prepared and trained to conduct evaluations and observations” (Kanyane, 2008: 108).

The supporters of separating accountability and professional development argue that the consequence of simultaneous implementation of these concepts is negligence of the latter. Both international and South African studies reveal that professional development of educators is neglected when formative and summative evaluation are applied together (De Clercq, 2008; Gryna, 2001; Class Act, 2007)..De Clercq (2008: 12) states that “combining appraisal for development and performance management with a common appraisal instrument also sends ambivalent messages to school staff who can be tempted to use the

instrument for the sole purpose of securing rewards”. A similar argument is advanced by NEEDU (2007: 15) that some teachers are tempted to comply with the sole desire of satisfying the rewards system attached to performance appraisal component. Class Act (2007: 5) further warns that “the danger is that the theory of professional development may be subsumed into the practice of accountability”. Class Act (2007: 44) further indicates that the “department runs the risk of DAS disappearing altogether and the remaining IQMS system being viewed as a punitive inspection process, albeit internally administered”.

The proponents of integrating professional development and accountability argue that it is almost impossible, and perhaps unadvisable, to separate these two concepts because they act in a complementary and reciprocal fashion (Stronge, 2006: 107). Gordon (2006: 268) argues that it is essential that professional development and accountability should be combined for the purpose of unity and for coherence necessary for an effective evaluation system. Stronge (2006: 107) maintains that “formative and summative evaluations cannot be seen as two discrete categories. Ongoing assessments provide basis for summative evaluation, and summative evaluation can inform the types of assistance and professional learning opportunities needed to assist with formative development”.

The researcher supports the integration of professional development and accountability in one instrument, but suggests that internal evaluators should be responsible for professional development of educators while external evaluators take charge of summative evaluation. This will ensure that professional development of educators is not neglected and internal evaluators serve the role of preparing educators for summative evaluation. It is possible to achieve authentic evaluation from external evaluation.

## **1.8      *STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH***

### **CHAPTER 1**

Chapter 1 serves as the orientation of the study. It sets the background and provides the context of this study. It includes the conceptual framework underpinning this study and outlines the research problem and the purpose of the study.

### **CHAPTER 2**

Chapter 2 discusses the literature review about the implementation of teacher appraisal systems from the international and South African studies.

### **CHAPTER 3**

Chapter 3 discusses the research design, methodology, data collection, analysis and presentation of data.

### **CHAPTER 4**

Chapter 4 presents and discusses the data obtained from the interviews and documents retrieved from schools.

### **CHAPTER 5**

The final chapter deals with the findings from data analysis and provides conclusions and recommendations as well as aspects for further research.



## **1.9 SUMMARY**

This first chapter sets the background for the study and its significance. The problem statement was formulated from the experience of the participants in literature when implementing teacher appraisal systems in schools. The conceptual framework underpinning this study was discussed in detail.

The next chapter presents a review of existing literature on teacher appraisal systems from the international and South African perspective focusing on the roles, views and experiences of school managers when implementing teacher appraisal systems in schools.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter contains a review of the existing literature on teacher appraisal systems drawn from international and national sources. The literature reviewed includes books, journals, dissertations and theses, research reports and official documents, as well as print media and conference papers. The literature studied covered themes such as the purpose of teacher evaluation; role of school management when evaluating teachers; implementation of teacher appraisal systems from international and South African perspectives; influence of politics, human capacity and school context; evaluating performance of teachers; training of evaluators; and integration of teacher evaluation systems into management programmes of schools.

#### **2.2 PURPOSE OF TEACHER APPRAISAL**

Teacher appraisal systems throughout the world focus on accountability and development as the purpose of evaluation (Coleman & Earley, 2005: 192). Cardno (1999: 93) asserts that “appraisal has multiple purposes related to accountability and improvement requiring activity that is both evaluative and developmental”. Akpotu and Oghubvu (2004: 45) argued that the purpose of educator appraisal is to ensure control, accountability, quality, professional development, and effective teaching and learning. The concepts, “value for money”, “quality assurance”, “accountability” and “levering up standards” are associated with public management and the purpose of teacher appraisal (Coleman & Earley, 2005: 187).

According to Barnett (2006: 2), the purpose of teacher appraisal is to provide an opportunity for educators to receive feedback and to be recognised for their skills, as well as to assess areas for additional professional growth. Studies (Bartlett, 2000; Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004; Poster & Poster, 1993) conducted in the United States of America, England and Australia reported that the purpose of educator appraisal includes defining skills which teachers should demonstrate in classrooms; developing abilities of both teachers and evaluators alike and to enable them to recognise their skills; use of teacher appraisal system to evaluate performance of teachers; and using the system as a mechanism to upgrade or to improve skills.

Weisberg et al (2009: 10) contend that teacher appraisal systems serve both theoretical and practical purposes. In theory, an evaluation system should identify and measure the strengths and weaknesses of teachers accurately and consistently. Teachers receive feedback in order to improve their teaching practice and schools receive feedback in order to determine how best to allocate resources and to provide support. During the implementation of IQMS, theoretical evaluation is achieved by identifying the strengths and areas of development for educators so that Professional Growth Plans (PGPs) for educators are developed. However, Weisberg et al (2009: 10) argue that, in practice, teacher evaluation systems devalue the instructional effectiveness by generating the performance information that reflects virtually no variation among teachers in any way. This implies that teacher evaluation systems do not differentiate between performing and underperforming teachers; instead, they create an impression that teachers' performance is the same.

### **2.3 IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEMS IN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT**

This review includes the implementation of teacher appraisal systems in countries such as the United Kingdom (UK), New Zealand, Hong Kong, Australia and the United States of America (USA).

#### **United Kingdom**

According to the School Teacher Appraisal Regulation 4 (Welsh Statutory Instrument, 2002: 4) “[i]t is the duty of the governing body and the head teacher of a school to exercise their functions under these regulations with a view of securing that performance of school teachers and head teachers in discharging their duties at the school is regularly appraised in accordance with these regulations”. Regulation 21 of School Teacher Appraisal (Welsh Statutory Instrument, 2002: 9) further states that “the head teacher must appoint an appraiser for every school teacher at the school.”

These regulations reveal that the school principal, sometimes with the assistance of a governing body, appoint evaluators for teachers in schools. Each teacher is evaluated by one evaluator, the principal or an appointed appraiser. The United Kingdom implements internal evaluation, although researchers such as Winter (2000a) are calling for the introduction of external evaluation because external evaluators will be able to observe a number of complete lessons, which is impossible for senior staff to achieve in schools.

#### **New Zealand**

In New Zealand, the school principals are primary evaluators for all teachers in schools. A case study conducted in 54 schools in New Zealand (80% primary and 20% secondary) revealed that “[i]n most cases staff appraisal is performed

by the principal but it may also include elements of peer and self-appraisal” (Cardno, 1999: 88). This implies that evaluation of teachers in New Zealand makes provision for self-evaluation and peer evaluation. The principals are responsible for evaluating teachers in New Zealand schools and they also form part of peer evaluation.

Piggott-Irvine (1996) explores the role of the principals when teacher appraisal is implemented in New Zealand schools. His findings reveal that apart from the role of evaluating teachers, the principals are responsible for monitoring performance of teachers, conduct formal interviews with teachers and provide appraisal training for teachers. This means that the principals are responsible for professional development of teachers in schools.

## **United States**

In the United States, a number of districts have developed their evaluation systems based on the teaching standards. For example, in the Western United States “principals are primary evaluators of teacher performance, but assistant principals also conduct evaluations at large elementary, middle, and high schools” (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009: 41). The study by Kimball and Milanowski supports the notion that teacher evaluation in one particular US region is the responsibility of the principals and assistant principals in large schools. This means that only the senior managers of schools are responsible for evaluating teachers in Western US schools.

The principals from the US schools expressed the view that they experienced some challenges when implementing the teacher appraisal system in their schools. They mentioned that the implementation of the teacher appraisal system presents time management challenge; involves increased number of meetings and a greater volume of paperwork (Halverson et al. 2004: 11). They also reported that the ratings of the principals vary considerably on accuracy and the

manner they provide the growth-directed feedback (Kimball and Milanowski, (2009: 34). The principals recommended education districts or external evaluators (master evaluators) to evaluate teachers in the Western US schools in order to minimise teacher evaluation challenges.

### **Hong Kong**

Hong Kong implements both internal and external evaluation. The school managers are responsible for internal evaluation and the Advisory Inspectorate Division of Education Department provides external evaluation (Mo, 1998: 20). Evaluators in Hong Kong are central to the success of the appraisal system and evaluators must be “credible, respected and skilful individuals in line management in order to eliminate any fear of the potential misuse of the appraisal data” (Mo, 1998: 24). This suggests that evaluators should possess these qualities in order to be entrusted with the responsibility to evaluate teachers in Hong Kong schools.

### **Australia**

Australia introduced three teacher appraisal systems in the 2000s, namely; the Experienced Teacher with Responsibility (ETWR), the Western Australian Level 3 Classroom Teacher Position (L3), and the National Statement from Teaching Profession on Teaching Standards, Quality and Professionalism. The ETWR was discontinued because the principals were “responsible for all procedures and for making summative judgment on which applicants’ success depended” (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004: 38).

The ETWR was replaced by the L3, an external evaluation system conducted by external assessors. The external assessors were selected by the Education Department on the grounds of a demonstrated expertise (educators who had satisfied the requirements for the L3 and trained as peer assessors). The L3 was

discontinued because it was implemented in the Western part of Australia and it was replaced by the National Statement.

The National Statement is a nationally coordinated teacher evaluation system implemented by external experts in order to recognise teachers who demonstrate advanced standards of practice, and it urge teachers “to be ‘pro-active’ in advancing their professional standards ‘agenda’ in Australia” (Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004: 46). It is the responsibility of the teachers to invite the external experts to evaluate their performance when they are ready to be evaluated. Teachers are awarded certificates as recognition for mastering their performance standards on completion of external evaluation.

#### **2.4 IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHER APPRAISAL WITHIN A SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT**

The South African studies conducted so far have focused on the implementation of Developmental Appraisal Systems (Mokoena, 2005; Mthethwa, 2001; Lekome, 2007; Somo, 2007). To date, no South African study has focussed on the roles of teams responsible for evaluating educators in schools. A study by Kanyane (2008) focused on the attitudes of teachers towards implementing IQMS in schools. The participants expressed the opinion that IQMS is an “effective process that could improve and maintain high standards of teaching, resulting in improvement and development of learning in the classrooms” (Kanyane, 2008: 106). Somo (2007) investigated the perceptions, experiences and expectations of educators on professional development and found that “most educators reported that there are no meetings or programmes of School Development Teams in their schools and schools do not have any formal school-based continuous professional development programmes” (Somo, 2007: 92).

Other South African studies (Blaauw, 2000; Mudau, 2000) reported that the success of teacher appraisal system depends on the ability of the school

principal to lead the advocacy campaign and to train educators on the appraisal system. This means that the principals play an important role for effective implementation of a teacher appraisal system in schools. The National Department of Education has, so far, commissioned Class Act (2007) and National Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU, 2009) to conduct the implementation review of the IQMS. These reviews have identified a number of challenges experienced by educators when implementing IQMS. These challenges include, *inter alia*, conflicting roles of the School Management Teams (SMTs) and School Development Teams (SDTs), lack of human capacity to implement IQMS, subjective ratings, and lack of training of individuals and structures responsible for implementing IQMS (Class Act, 2007; NEEDU, 2009).

## **2.5 INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL FACTORS, HUMAN CAPACITY AND THE SCHOOL CONTEXT**

Teacher appraisal should be seen in a political, social and school context. *Politics* influence the implementation of teacher appraisal systems in schools; for instance, the inspection system was used in South Africa to evaluate teachers in schools during the apartheid era. The inspection system was subjective and judgemental and inspectors adopted an autocratic style of supervising the performance of educators (Class Act, 2007: 82). The policies were reviewed when the democratic government took over in 1994 in order to support values and principles of democracy. The IQMS was born out of this policy review and has the potential to develop and support educators.

Educators and teacher unions support the implementation of IQMS in schools. The South African Democratic Teachers Union (SADTU) contributed to the collapse of the inspection system in the early 1990s in South African schools. However SADTU argue that they have never been opposed to evaluation of educators; instead, they wanted a developmental process that is able to identify and address teachers' weaknesses through training and mentorship (SADTU,



2008: 1). The IQMS serve the purpose of identifying the specific needs of educators for support and development; provision of support for continued growth; and evaluating the performance of educators (DoE, 2005: 1). SADTU supports IQMS by stating that “SADTU is a signatory to the IQMS which subjects teachers to regular evaluation. We are prepared to be monitored and evaluated ....” (SADTU, 2008:1).

The *human capacity* influences the implementation of teacher appraisal systems in schools. The human capacity in the context of this study refers to the skills and knowledge of individuals and teams responsible for evaluating educators. It is important that evaluators should understand the process of evaluation, the evaluation criteria and the rating tool. Class Act (2007: 69) reveals that educators in South African schools “lack the capacity to understand the purpose of IQMS; the IQMS instrument; and the implementation of IQMS”. The Development Support Groups (DSGs) were not trained to evaluate educators during the implementation of IQMS in schools. The participants in the studies by Barnes (2003) and Gallie (2007) complained that the Department of Education did not grant them access to effective development, support and training necessary to evaluate themselves.

The *school context (culture)* is another factor which influences the implementation of teacher appraisals in schools. Anderson (1993: 16) asserts that the culture of the organisation such as mutual trust and openness determines the perceptions of educators and successful implementation of a teacher appraisal system. On the other hand, Duke (1995: 80) states that the implementation of a teacher appraisal system depends on bureaucratic and hierarchical cultural setting of the school. The DSGs structures are neither bureaucratic nor hierarchical because peers evaluate peers. Gallie (2007: 71) contends that different schools need different kinds of support with different solutions unique to their particular context and challenges. This implies that a one-size-fits-all approach is not suitable for all schools from different contexts

when teacher evaluation systems are implemented. In addition, Halverson et al. (2004: 39) found that implementing teacher evaluation varies considerably from school to school, and it is shaped by ways the principals understand their leadership roles, knowledge and skills, as well as factors such as teacher morale and prevailing challenges confronting schools. This suggests that effective implementation of a teacher appraisal system is determined by the role, knowledge and skills of the principal.

## **2.6 TRAINING OF EVALUATORS FOR IMPLEMENTING TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEMS**

Training of evaluators lays a foundation for successful implementation of teacher appraisal systems. Weisberg et al (2009: 28) assert that,

for a performance evaluation system to fairly and accurately reflect variations in teacher effectiveness, evaluators (principals, assistant principals, peers or third parties) must be well trained in setting rigorous but achievable performance standards, objectively measuring teacher performance against those standards, providing constructive and actionable feedback to teachers and designing and providing the differentiated support teachers need to meet or exceed the standards.

Literature reveals that evaluator training is a prerequisite for successful implementation of teacher appraisals in schools. Researchers (Bretz, Milkovich & Read, 1992; Hedge & Kavanagh, 1998; Woehr & Huffcutt, 1994) found that evaluator training has a positive effect on accuracy of the ratings and classroom observations. Wragg, Wikeley, Wragg and Hayne (1996: 125) assert that it is essential that evaluators should have a good level of knowledge and understanding of evaluation context. According to Glickman et al (1998: 8), evaluators should apply relevant knowledge and exhibit interpersonal skills and technical skills when evaluating performance of teachers. NEEDU (2009: 27)

recommend quality evaluators with a high level of professionalism and autonomy (from the provincial education departments and schools) to conduct evaluation of educators.

A study by Kimball and Milanowski (2009: 41) revealed that all evaluators in schools districts in the Western US had been trained on basic aspects of teacher evaluation systems including the understanding of the performance standards; interpreting different rubric levels and procedures to be followed. Weisberg et al (2009: 22) found that evaluation training in schools districts in the Western US was a one-time endeavour offered when an administrator is new in his/her position or when the district implements a revised teacher evaluation system.

Class Act (2007: 54) reveals that the advocacy training provided by the Department of Education to a number of educators per school was too inadequate to be termed “training.” Advocacy training refers to the attainment of “large-scale buy-in to the process and [it] answer the questions what and why” (ELRC, 2003: 6). Subsequent to advocacy training, a follow up training should take place before the system is implemented in schools (Class Act, 2007: 53). This means that advocacy training precedes the actual training of evaluators in order to enable them to implement the teacher appraisal system effectively. The IQMS Report (2007/2008) reported that the advocacy training was insufficient to equip educators with the knowledge and skills necessary to train the rest of staff members in their schools. Class Act (2007: 53) contends that “[t]he most effective training happens during the implementation process so that participants become aware of the implementation challenges and training is provided to help them deal with those challenges”.

A study by Lekome (2007: 182) reported that “neither the in-service training at the school level nor the Area Project Office level was done” during the implementation of Developmental Appraisal Systems. Class Act (2008: 79) notes that evaluators need “effective training on the issue of conformity of approach

(reliability) in order to standardise the implementation and the use of the IQMS.” This implies that evaluators should have knowledge to evaluate the performance of educators in order to provide accurate ratings. However, NEEDU (2009: 32) reveal that “most teachers and appraisers do not know how to conduct an effective analysis on teacher performance and prioritise their developmental needs and have not been given sustained high quality training and opportunities to meet these expectations.”

SADTU blames the Department of Education for failing to train educators on the implementation of IQMS in schools. They argue that “[w]hilst the union secured buy-in from the majority of their members; many of the provincial departments of education were unable to deliver in terms of training and implementation of the new IQMS” (SADTU, 2009: 2). Monyatsi et al (2006b: 435) argue that the effectiveness of appraisal practice is undermined (sometimes seriously) by lack of understanding and inappropriate preparation and training. Anderson (1993: 141) contends that “teachers would be disappointed by the system which merely identifies problems but does not correct weaknesses, which promises but does not supply training, or has insufficient resources to monitor and encourage teachers”.

## **2.7 EVALUATING PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS**

Literature reveals that schools find themselves in a vicious cycle when evaluating performance of teachers. Weisberg et al (2009: 23) argued that “evaluators generally do not accurately evaluate poor performance leading to an expectation of high performance ratings and evaluators face resistance when they issue negative ratings. The result is a dysfunctional school community where it is impossible to openly identify and address areas of development for teachers.” It is through accurate ratings that areas of development are identified and ultimately, educators are assisted to achieve their professional growth. NEEDU (2009: 45) argues that “school improvement planning depends on accurate

assessment of strengths and areas for improvement, and requires training, practice and support or mentoring.” Kimball and Milanowski (2009: 39) assert that, in a context where there are different levels of performance, evaluators rate a moderate level of performance higher if other performers in the group are poor performers or lower if others in the group are good performers. As a result, the ratings are inflated for schools with greater concentrations of lower performing teachers.

Literature reveals that motivation, skills, time and resources influence decisions of evaluators when evaluating the performance of educators in schools. Evaluator motivation affects the degree of lenient ratings of evaluators if their goal is to maintain good relationships with employees (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009: 38). Mero, Guidice and Brownlee (2007: 225) contended that accountability lead to accurate or lenient ratings, depending on factors such as audience characteristics and the form of evaluation in place. This implies that an accurate rating is achieved if there are proper accountability structures, and lenient ratings prevail when there are no clear lines of accountability.

Kimball and Milanowski (2009: 63) assert that the principals are lenient when evaluating teachers in schools because of high expectations from teachers that they will achieve outstanding ratings despite their poor performance. Weisberg (2009: 22) reported that there is a strong and illogical expectation among teachers that they will receive outstanding ratings and “even teachers who are just beginning their careers believe they deserve the highest performance ratings and are dissatisfied if they are rated good, not great”. In this context “teachers perceive low or negative ratings not in terms of what they communicate about performance but as a personally-directed insult or attack” (Weisberg et al, 2009: 23).

Several South African studies reported that the DSGs are subjective when evaluating the performance of educators in the IQMS. Kanyane (2008: 51)

reported that the entire process of rating educators is compromised by linking rewards with the performance of educators and causes subjective rating since no one wishes to forfeit the benefits attached with good performance. NEEDU (2009: 59) found that “the scoring process remains a very difficult one because of high amount of subjectivity in the implementation of scores”. The scores are inflated to avoid low ratings which could jeopardise the chances of a salary increase. The *Sunday Times* newspaper reported that “Teachers inflate colleague’s ratings to ensure pay increases” (Govender, 2006: 6). Bisschoff and Mathye (2009: 401) supported that teachers cheated on the ratings and threatened their DSGs because they all wanted to receive money associated with good performance. In a similar context, Kanyane (2008: 88) reported that teachers lose sight of the objectives of evaluation process because everybody wants salary progression. NEEDU (2009: 26) reported that teachers manipulated the evaluation process in order to qualify for pay progression during implementation of the IQMS in schools.

*Evaluator skill* influences the ratings of evaluators in schools. Kimball and Milanowski (2009: 38) argue that “the more skilled the evaluator, the more likely that he will give ratings that accurately reflects how the teacher actually performs on the dimensions defined by the evaluation system.” Ribas (2005: 18) contends that “effective evaluators must know educational standards and processes and should be able to analyse teacher’s ability, talk effectively with teachers about implementation, and write clearly and concisely about them”. It is also essential that, in addition to classroom observations, evaluators should use variety of data sources in order to make accurate assessments. This implies that professional development of educators is achieved if there is effective evaluation. Class Act (2007: 61) revealed that Development Support Groups lack skills to evaluate the performance of educators and are unable to determine the correct order of ratings due to lack of training. This finding is supported by Halverson et al. (2004: 36) that evaluators do not provide valuable feedback and “negative feedback is difficult to convey and often avoided for fear of depressing employee motivation.”

Literature reveals that evaluators do not provide consistent ratings and lack the understanding of the rating descriptors. Class Act (2007: 72) reveals that lack of consistent ratings is informed by the vast differing interpretations and descriptions of the ratings. Halverson et al. (2004: 17) argued that there is no clear relationship between the scores and the written narratives since evaluators are unable to justify the ratings and there is little or no discussion of the rationale behind low scores appearing in the narrative. Class Act (2007: 72) emphasised that “If evaluators do not have a clear understanding of the rating descriptors, they cannot assign the most appropriate rating.” However, Class Act (2007: 75) found that the ratings are accepted at face value without being moderated internally or externally. To date, there are no guidelines or procedures for collecting a portfolio of evidence for moderating the scores in the IQMS (Class Act, 2007: 50).

*Time and resources* is a challenge when teacher appraisal systems are implemented in schools. The participants and respondents from different studies (Amsterdam et al., 2005; Coleman & Earley, 2005; Halverson et al., 2004; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009; Bisschoff & Mathye, 2009) reveal that the amount of paperwork and time required for evaluating educators are factors affecting the implementation of teacher appraisal systems in schools. In their principal evaluation study, Amsterdam et al. (2005: 239) found that the respondents were concerned about time requirements and potential subjectivity of the evaluation process as well as the amount of paperwork required. Coleman and Earley (2005: 193) mentioned that a considerable time and more paperwork is required when a performance appraisal is implemented. Similarly, Kimball and Milanowski (2009: 48) reported that the participants in their study experience evaluation of teachers as complex and time consuming. Bisschoff and Mathye (2009: 401) asserted that the IQMS process “leads to a paper-driven system that does not appear practical for schools with few resources, considering that all this leads to a 1% progression in the salary of the successful candidates”. In the same

context, Halverson et al (2004: 34) reported that “it was apparent that the evaluation system is extremely time-consuming, absorbing as much as 25% of the principal’s time”.

## **2.8 INTEGRATION OF TEACHER APPRAISAL SYSTEMS**

Few studies have been conducted on the integration of teacher appraisal systems into the management programmes of schools. A study by Bartlett (2000) revealed that the appraisal system was not integrated into the programmes of schools in England. West-Burnham (1993: 7) argues:

If appraisal is to be successful it must be firmly integrated into the management structures and processes of the school. If it is not, then, at worst, it will become a marginal bureaucratic routine – at best mutual therapy. Integration into the management structure of the school ensures that appraisal is kept in perspective.

Ker (1999: 5) recommends that “[a]ppraisal processes need to be built into day-to-day teaching activities; and the ritual of the appraisal event needs to be removed”. Ker further argued that “it is essential that the appraisal should be conceptualised as a professional activity embedded in the daily activities of teachers than to reduce it to the status of an event (Ker, 1999: 8). In South Africa, principals and SDTs are responsible for integrating IQMS into the school management programmes (DoE, 2005: 50). The SMTs are required to coordinate the plan for managing IQMS when it is integrated into the school programme (ELRC, 2002: 2).



## **2.9 CONCLUSION**

This chapter contains a review of literature on teacher appraisal systems in schools. Teacher appraisal systems all over the world serve the purpose of professional development and performance measurement (accountability). Different countries implement either internal or external evaluation. Countries such as South Africa, the UK, US and New Zealand implement internal evaluation.

Factors such as politics, human capacity and school culture influence the implementation of a teacher appraisal system. Literature reveals that evaluators need to undergo extensive training before a new teacher appraisal system is implemented in schools. Evaluators are faced with a dilemma to evaluate and develop educators simultaneously. Literature reveals that evaluators conduct subjective evaluation and inflate the scores because of the pressure from teachers who expect to achieve outstanding ratings. NEEDU (2009) and Jansen (2004) recommend the implementation of both internal and external evaluation as a solution to subjective evaluation. The next chapter focus on research design and methodology employed in this study.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter describes the research design and methodology employed in this study. It describes the data gathering techniques and data analysis procedures. Validity, reliability and ethical considerations are discussed in this chapter.

#### **3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN**

According to Wiersma (1995), the purpose of a research design is to provide the most valid and accurate answers possible to the research questions. This study employed a case study to gather data on the views and experiences of the SMTs when implementing IQMS in schools. The term “case study” pertains to “a limited number of units of analysis (often only one) such as an individual, a group or an institution, are studied intensively” (Welman & Kruger, 2000: 190). A multiple case design was employed in this study.

In a case study, the “meaning is socially constructed by individuals in interaction with their world” (Merriam, 1998: 3). The participants of this study expressed their views on how they perceive the implementation of IQMS in their schools. Case studies strive to portray “what it is like to be in a particular situation, to catch the close up reality and thick description of participants’ lived experiences of thoughts about and feelings for a situation (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007: 254). The researcher conducted the interviews with the participants in their own

schools and they had the opportunity to share their views and experiences of implementing IQMS in their schools.

According to Yin (2003: 13), a case study relies on multiple sources of evidence, and enables the researcher to gather data from various key stakeholders. The data in this study were obtained from the interviews held with the principals, deputy principals and head of departments (HODs). The data were also retrieved from the IQMS documents in schools. Cohen et al (2007: 261) reveal that a case study also provides an opportunity to check the data collected through triangulation. Triangulation in this study was achieved through the use of interviews, documents analysis and member checks.

### **3.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study adopted a qualitative research approach. Strauss and Corbin (1990: 524) highlight that, because of its interpretive character, a qualitative research methodology allows the discovery of meaning for the research events. The principals, deputy principals and HODs of the selected schools gave meaning of the implementation of IQMS in schools. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1994: 379), a qualitative research provides the researcher with the opportunity to obtain a more complete picture of what is happening in a particular situation. The researcher obtained information from the participants on the implementation of IQMS in schools.

According to Scheurich (1997: 61), a qualitative approach endeavours to ascertain what is in a particular individual's mind in order to access the perspectives of the participants. The researcher accessed the perspectives of the participants and was able to form a holistic understanding from the views expressed and experiences of the implementation of IQMS in their respective schools described by the participants.

### **3.4 DATA COLLECTION**

Data collection refers to the sample used to collect data in a study. The participants of this study were sampled from various schools and they differ in race, age, gender, and management experience.

#### **3.4.1 Sampling**

*Purposive sampling* was used to select the participants and sites in order to learn about and to understand the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2002: 204). The schools in this study were selected by *maximal variation sampling*. Maximal variation sampling refers to a purposeful sampling strategy which enables the researcher to sample cases or individuals that differ in particular characteristic or trait (Creswell, 2002: 204). The three primary schools were selected because they differ in terms of their locations (urban, semi-urban and township schools). The purpose of selecting these schools was to gain an in-depth understanding of the implementation of IQMS in primary schools from different institutions. This is in accordance with the spirit of qualitative research and its quest for explanations which encompass complexity, subtlety and even contradictions (Denscombe, 2003: 168).

#### **3.4.2 Profile of the participants**

The research participants of this study were the principals, deputy principals, and HODs. These SMT members were selected because of their overlapping role in all the structures implementing IQMS in schools, namely the SMT, School Development Team (SDT) and Development Support Group (DSG). The SMTs' participation in the SDTs and DSGs provides them with first hand information and experience of implementing IQMS in schools. This study benefited from the

involvement of the SMTs with the SDTs and DSGs since they were able to express the views of these structures as well.

The nine SMT members sampled in this study included six Africans and three whites. Four participants were males and five females. The table below indicates the experience of the principals in managing schools ranges between 21 and 34 years. The deputy principals have between 2 and 11 years of experience. The two HODs from the semi-urban and township schools are less experienced members of the SMTs except the HOD from the urban school who have 18 years experience.

The table below presents a description of each participant according to the population group, gender, number of years experience in position, and type of school in which they are employed.



<b>PARTICIPANT</b>	<b>POPULATION GROUP</b>	<b>GENDER</b>	<b>EXPERIENCE IN POSITION</b>	<b>SCHOOL TYPE</b>
<b>Principal A</b>	White	Male	21 years	Urban
<b>Principal B</b>	African	Female	30 years	Township
<b>Principal C</b>	African	Male	34 years	Semi-urban (Mine)
<b>Deputy A</b>	White	Female	2 years	Urban
<b>Deputy B</b>	African	Female	6 years	Township
<b>Deputy C</b>	African	Male	11 years	Semi-urban (Mine)
<b>HOD A</b>	White	Male	18 years	Urban
<b>HOD B</b>	African	Female	5 years	Township
<b>HOD C</b>	African	Female	1 year	Semi-urban (Mine)

### **3.5 DATA GATHERING TECHNIQUES**

The data in this study was collected by *interview* and *document retrieval* from the selected schools.

#### **3.5.1 Interviews**

Marshall and Rossman (1999: 109) define an interview as “a conversation with a purpose; it is a useful way of getting large amounts of data quickly”. The researcher chose interviews as a data collection strategy for this study because an interview “enables participants to discuss their interpretations of the world they live in and to express how they regard situations from their own point of view” (Cohen et al, 2002: 267). The interviews held with the participants provided the researcher with an understanding of how the SMTs view and experience implementation of the IQMS in schools. Rubin and Rubin (1995) note that, through qualitative interviews, the researcher finds out what other people feel and think about their worlds, and the interviewer is able to understand their experiences and reconstruct events and problems in which he/she has not participated. The researcher was able to understand how the SMTs experience implementation of the IQMS in schools.

The researcher chose the semi-structured interviews to collect data from the participants in this study. The interviews were chosen because they provide the researcher with the opportunity to ask questions and record answers from one participant at a time (Creswell, 2002: 215). The interviews allow the interviewer to decide on follow-up questions from the responses of the participants. The researcher decides on the order and wording of questions although they are prepared beforehand. All the participants were asked same questions (see appendices F, G and H). The questions probed on the views and experiences of the SMTs when implementing IQMS in schools.

The appointments were arranged with the participants and all preparations were made prior to the actual meetings. The permission to use the venues in schools was requested in advance from the principals. The participants agreed to participate in the study and they signed the consent forms. The participants indicated their preference for the interviews to be held in the principals' offices since they felt that these offices have fewer distractions than the other offices in their schools. Each interview was scheduled for 30 minutes with each participant: the HOD, deputy principal, and principal in each school. Not all the interviews lasted the proposed time as some of the participants deemed it necessary to talk more on some of the issues than initially expected. The principals were the first to be interviewed, followed by the deputy principals and the HODs. The participants had arranged for the interviews to be conducted in that order in all the schools. An audiotape was used to record the interviews for the purpose of accurate transcription of the verbal interaction.

### **3.5.2 Documents Retrieval**

*Documents* are public and private records that qualitative researchers obtain from the sites or participants in a study. These records may include newspapers, minutes, personal journals, and letters (Creswell, 2002: 219). The documents perused in this study were the IQMS year programmes, shared SMT and SDT minutes, School Improvement Plans (SIPs), and summaries of summative scores. The purpose of perusing these documents was to ascertain the roles and responsibilities of the SMTs when implementing IQMS in schools.

## **3.6 DATA ANALYSIS**

According to Vithal and Jansen (2001: 27), the aim of data analysis is to make sense of the accumulated data. Data analysis involves the reduction and interpretation of data (Cohen & Manion, 1995: 116). Qualitative data analysis is



primarily an inductive process of organising data into categories and identifying patterns (relationships) between categories. According to White (2003: 115), qualitative data analysis refers to a systematic process of selecting, categorising, comparing, synthesising and interpreting in order to provide explanations for a single phenomenon of interest. This means that qualitative data analysis is about making sense of data from the perspective of the participants taking into consideration the situation, patterns, themes, categories and regularities (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007: 461).

The *interview data* from the audio recordings were transcribed into text and analysed by the *constant comparison* method. The constant comparison method allows comparison of newly acquired data with the existing categories and theories that have been developed in order to achieve a perfect fit between these categories and data (Cohen et al, 2007: 473). The interview data were coded by grouping the responses of the participants into similar ideas, concepts or themes that had been predetermined. The data were regrouped into categories that allowed for comparisons between what different people had said, themes that emerged and the way the concepts had been understood (Rubin & Rubin, 1995: 228). The advantage of this method is that it automatically groups data and enables themes, patterns and similarities to be detected at a glance (Cohen et al, 2007: 467).

The documents were analysed by the *content analysis method*. The term 'content analysis' is defined as the process of summarising and reporting written data – the main contents of data and their messages (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007: 475). Krippendorp (2004: 18) define content analysis as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts to the contexts of their use.” The researcher read the contents of the IQMS year plans, minutes of the SMT and SDT, School Improvement Plans, and summaries of summative scores. The purpose of perusing these documents was to draw

inferences on the role of the SMTs during the implementation of IQMS in schools.

### **3.7 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY**

According to Cohen et al (2007: 133), reliability is a necessary but insufficient, condition for validity in research, although reliability is a necessary precondition of validity. Validity, on the other hand, may be a sufficient, but not necessary a condition for reliability.

#### **3.7.1 Validity**

Validity is an important standard by which quality of research is judged and a requirement for both quantitative and qualitative/naturalistic research (Cohen et al, 2007: 133). Validity refers to the extent to which empirical measurement adequately reflects real meaning of concepts under consideration (Babbie, 2001: 143). Bless and Higson-Smith (1995: 82) stress the same point that validity involves obtaining results that accurately reflect concepts being measured. Winter (2000b) states that, in terms of qualitative data, the issue of validity may be addressed through honesty, depth, richness and scope of data achieved, the participants approached, the extent of triangulation and objectivity of the researcher. There are two types of validity, namely, internal and external validity. Both internal and external validity are quantitative terms referred to as credibility and transferability respectively in a qualitative research (Schwandt, 2001: 279). Both credibility and transferability are discussed in detail for the purpose of validity and reliability of this study.

## Credibility

Credibility refers to “demonstration that it is possible to sustain by data an explanation of a particular event, issue or set of data which a piece of research provides” (Schwandt, 2001: 279). The data are credible if it is trustworthy and the results can be verified. Member checking is used to verify data accounts. Member checking refers to “a process where the researcher asks one or more participants in the study to check the accuracy of the account” (Creswell, 2002: 252). The transcripts of the interviews were taken back to the participants to comment and determine the accuracy of the transcripts. The participants added credibility to this study by reacting to the data and the final report.

*Triangulation* was used in this study taking into account that it “is a powerful way of demonstrating concurrent validity, particularly in qualitative research” (Campbell & Fiske, 1959 cited in Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007: 141). Cohen et al. (2007) describes different types of triangulation. The type of triangulation applicable to this study is methodological triangulation, defined as “the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behaviour” (Cohen et al, 2007: 141). In this study, triangulation was achieved by conducting interviews and analysing school records.

This study employed the investigator triangulation, “the use of more than one participant in a research setting in order to increase validity and reliability of data” (Cohen et al, 2007: 143). Three SMT members from different post levels per school were interviewed to ensure that the data collected from the interviews were valid and reliable.

## **Transferability**

Transferability refers to the degree to which results may be generalised to a wider populations, cases or situations (Cohen et al, 2002: 109). Schofield (1990: 209) suggests that in qualitative research, it is important to provide clear, detailed and in-depth descriptions so that readers are able to decide on the extent to which findings from one piece of research are generalisable to another situation. Lincoln and Guba (1985: 316) argue that it is not the task of the researcher to provide an index of transferability but they suggest rather that researchers should provide sufficiently rich data for readers and users of the research to determine whether the study is transferable. The researcher in this study provided sufficient data on the views of the participants when implementing IQMS in their schools. It is upon the readers to determine whether the findings of this study are transferable to other cases.

### **3.7.2 Reliability**

According to Fink and Kosecoff (1998:33), reliability means assessing whether a particular technique applied repeatedly to the same object will yield the same results each time. Schwandt (2001: 279) states that dependability and confirmability are qualitative terms similar to quantitative terms; reliability and objectivity respectively.

#### **Dependability**

The objective of dependability is to ensure that the same study conducted all over again will arrive at the same findings and conclusions. The '*external audit*' was employed in order to achieve dependability of this study. The external audit refers to "the auditor outside the study to review different aspects of the research" (Creswell, 2002: 253). The researcher provided the auditor with the

interview transcripts, interview questions guide, lists of interviewees, and notes from documents used by the researcher when analysing the data. The external auditor acknowledged that the findings of the researcher are supported by data after going through the documents provided by the researcher.

### **Confirmability**

Confirmability is a qualitatively-oriented criterion which indicates that the qualitative research findings are the product of focus of the inquiry, not the researcher's biases (Babbie, Mouton & Prozesky, 2001: 278). The researcher guards against his bias in this study which may have been influenced by his position as the principal of a school. He reported on the views expressed by the participants in this study, not his views.

The researcher was also aware that the contexts, race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, status, social class and age function as potent sources of bias (Lee, 1993; Scheurich, 1995). To avoid bias in this study, the researcher engaged the qualitative analyst to review the interview transcripts and critique the researcher's interpretations whether it is supported by data. The researcher ascertained that the views expressed in this study are the views of the participants and are supported by data. The researcher shared the themes from the study and the final report with the participants in order to check the accuracy of representation of data.

### **3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The following ethics were considered for this study: The ethical clearance certificate (Appendix A) for conducting this study was obtained from the University of Pretoria. The permission (Appendix B) to conduct this study was requested and the Head of Mpumalanga Department of Education granted the

researcher a permission to conduct the study in schools (Appendix C). A letter of request to conduct the study was sent to both the circuit manager of Witbank 3 circuit and principals of the participating schools (Appendix D and E respectively). The participants gave their consent (Appendix E) to participate in the study.

The researcher considered voluntary participation; informed consent; confidentiality and anonymity of the participants before conducting this study.

### **3.8.1 Voluntary participation**

Trochim (2001: 24) reveal that the principle of voluntary participation requires individuals not to be forced to participate in the research. The participants participated voluntarily in this study without pressure or manipulation. They agreed to participate after the researcher explained to them the purpose of this study.

### **3.8.2 Informed consent**

Informed consent entails informing the research participants about the overall purpose of investigation and main features of the research design as well as any possible risks or benefits that participation in the research study may involve (Kvale, 1996: 112). Farnham and Pilmott (1995: 47) define informed consent as the “knowing consent of individuals to participate as an exercise of choice, free from any element of fraud, deceit or similar unfair inducement or manipulation.” Trochim (2001: 24) state that informed consent means that the research participants are fully informed about the procedures and risks involved in the research while it is essential that they give their consent to participate.

The researcher held a meeting with the participants in each school to explain the nature of the study. The participants were informed that the purpose of the study

was to explore their views and experiences about the implementation of IQMS in schools. They were assured that the information required will be used only for the purpose of this study. The participants were also informed that they are free to withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice. All the participants have shown interest and willingness to participate in the study and signed the consent forms (Appendix E).

### **3.8.3 Confidentiality and anonymity**

Trochim (2001: 24) states that confidentiality and anonymity are two standards that help to protect privacy of the research participants. According to Kvale (1996: 114), “confidentiality in research implies that private data identifying participants will not be reported”. The data collected from the participants was saved in a password-protected file and stored on the personal computers of both the researcher and the supervisor. The participants in the study were assured of their anonymity and confidentiality of their responses during the initial meeting and subsequent research activities. The names of the participants and schools were not mentioned in the study. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2000:139) “all personal data captured during the research ought to be secured and made public only behind a shield of anonymity.”

### **3.9 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The study was conducted in the primary schools in the Nkangala Region in the Mpumalanga Province. Only three schools were sampled and nine participants took part in the study. This study focused on the views and experiences of the SMTs and did not involve the views of other stakeholders such as post level 1 educators, external IQMS coordinators and circuit managers. The study focused on primary schools and did not involve secondary schools.

### **3.10 CONCLUSION**

This chapter discussed the methodology which informed the collection of data from the participants in sampled schools. The research design; data collection methods and data analysis were discussed in detail. The researcher considered ethics, validity and reliability in this study. Chapter four focuses on data analysis.



## CHAPTER 4

### DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the findings on how School Management Teams (SMTs) view and experience implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in Mpumalanga primary schools. The interviews were transcribed and data were coded, analysed and interpreted. The participants in this study were members of the SMTs from the three primary schools. SMTs comprise head of departments (HODs), deputy principals and principals. The IQMS year plans, minutes of the SMTs and School Development Teams (SDTs); School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and summaries of summative scores were perused and analysed.

#### 4.2 DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis involves the process of making sense of data (Merriam, 1998: 178). For *analysis of the interview data*, the verbal interviews were transcribed into text. The newly acquired data were compared with the existing categories from the literature. The interview data were coded by grouping the responses of the participants into similar ideas, concepts or themes that had been uncovered. The *document analysis* involved perusing the IQMS documents in schools to ascertain the roles and responsibilities of the SMTs when implementing IQMS in schools.

#### **4.2.1 INTERVIEW ANALYSIS**

The results of the study are presented in *themes* emerging from the responses of the participants from the interview questions compared with predetermined themes from the literature review. The following themes emerged from this study: *roles of the SMTs during the implementation of IQMS; views of the SMTs on the implementation of IQMS; evaluating the performance of educators; support and mentoring (professional development); accountability in respect of the IQMS; training of evaluators; and challenges experienced by the SMTs with the implementation of IQMS.*

##### **4.2.1.1 Roles of the SMTs during the implementation of IQMS**

Participants described their roles when implementing IQMS in schools as participation at individual level with little or without effective involvement of the other members of the SMTs, SDTs and DSGs. The major roles of the SMTs are principal supervision of the implementation of IQMS in schools; coordination of IQMS by the deputy principals and evaluation of educators by HODs.

The principals and deputy principals have no effective role on evaluation of educators in the implementation of IQMS since the HODs and peer educators evaluate educators in schools. This implies that IQMS is a programme which is implemented in schools without the effective involvement of senior managers. This is contrary to the conditions of employment of principals and deputy principals. The Education Laws Amendment Act (2007) and Employment of Educators Act (1998) states that principals and deputy principals are required to guide and supervise the work and performance of staff.

Apart from supervising the implementation of IQMS in schools, the principals reported that they were responsible for conducting the advocacy workshop for staff members to introduce IQMS in their schools. The other role of the principals is to moderate scores for educators. The IQMS policy (DoE, 2005: 2) supports

that principals should ensure that educators are fairly evaluated during the implementation of IQMS in schools. The principals are responsible for submitting the scores for educators to the provincial department of education for salary progression. They are also responsible for submitting the School Improvement Plans. The roles of the principals in this study are consistent with the IQMS Manual (DoE, 2005: 2) that principals have “the overall responsibility to ensure that IQMS is implemented uniformly and effectively at the school”.

The unexpected finding was that all the principals in this study do not form part of the SDTs in schools although the IQMS policy (ELRC, 2003: 12) stipulates that the principal should be a member of the SDT. The non-participation of the principals in the SDTs results in the role of coordinating IQMS to be shifted to deputy principals. The principals and deputy principals were of the opinion that their exclusion from the DSGs of educators compromises the quality of evaluating educators during the implementation of IQMS in schools. Only the principal from the township school was of the opinion that it would be burdensome for the principals to evaluate all educators in schools and supported the idea of the DSGs to evaluate educators in schools.

The urban and township school deputy principals and HOD from the semi-urban school reported that they coordinate IQMS in their schools. They mentioned that their coordination role involves formation of the DSGs; drafting evaluation time tables for the DSGs; developing the SIPs; keeping the IQMS records and files for educators; and managing the implementation of both baseline and summative evaluation in schools. The IQMS policy (ELRC, 2003: 5) stipulates that it is the role of the SDTs to coordinate IQMS in schools. However, the deputy principals in this study reveal that they coordinate their tasks with minimal involvement of the other SDT members.

The HODs in this study perceived evaluating the performance of post-level 1 educators as their main role when implementing IQMS in schools. They

described the role of evaluating post level 1 educators as burdensome because they participate in several DSGs and evaluate many educators. The HODs' concern is valid if one considers that the principals and deputy principals evaluate between one and three SMT members in this study. The HODs also reported that they guide and develop educators in their schools which are consistent with the role of mentoring and supporting educators by the DSGs stated in the IQMS policy (DoE, 2003: 5).

The SMTs and SDTs do not work together when implementing IQMS in schools. The principal from the township school mentioned that there is lack of partnership of these structures when they implement IQMS. She stated that:

*To be honest, I don't recall a joint meeting of the SMT and SDT taking place in our school. We never had such meetings in our school since the inception of IQMS.*

This suggests that the SMTs and SDTs do not hold shared meetings to discuss the implementation of IQMS in schools. This is contrary to the IQMS policy (DoE, 2005: 3) which states that both the SMTs and SDTs should work together and mutually support each other on all matters relating to IQMS. The principal from the semi-urban school was of the opinion that it is his role to help educators to be sufficiently open to reveal their shortcomings. He mentioned that,

*You know the first thing that I must do as a principal is to motivate educators to accept this animal known as the IQMS. Motivate them to be honest enough about their shortcomings.*

The view expressed by this principal was consistent with the IQMS policy (DoE, 2005: 2) recommendation that principals should organise workshops to clarify areas of concern for educators.

#### 4.2.1.2 Views of the SMTs on the implementation of IQMS

Participants viewed IQMS as a teacher appraisal system with the potential to support and develop educators provided evaluators are honest and self-critical with the ratings. The positive views expressed by the SMT members on the IQMS support the views expressed by the participants in the study by Kanyane (2008: 106) that IQMS is an effective process that could improve and maintain high standards of teaching.

All the participants experience the implementation of IQMS as an event in schools serving the purpose of baseline and summative evaluation. However, baseline evaluation cannot be regarded as teacher evaluation *per se* since educators are not evaluated; instead, the summative scores from the previous year are recorded into the new Pay Progression to Educators (PPE) forms. The actual evaluation of educators in schools takes place during summative evaluation. They mentioned that educators are evaluated when the scores are required by the provincial department for salary progression. This suggests that the once-off evaluation of educators does not provide an opportunity for continuous support and development of educators. Ker (1999: 8) argued that appraisal should be conceptualised as an activity embedded in daily activities of teachers; instead of reducing it to the status of an event.

The principals and deputy principals argued that educators do not reveal areas where they have to improve. Indicating that they need to improve in certain areas means low scores and they may run the risk of not qualifying for a salary progression. Weisberg et al (2009: 23) argued that where it is impossible to openly identify and address areas of development for teachers, the result is a dysfunctional school community. It becomes a challenge to support and develop educators in schools if their areas of development are not clearly delineated.

Seven out of nine participants expressed the view that the DSGs do not conduct authentic evaluation. They argued that the DSGs do not measure the

performance of educators according to set criteria but with the aim to help the evaluatee qualify for salary progression. The participants therefore argued that inflated ratings on the summative evaluation means no need for professional development. The result is lost professional development opportunities for educators whose ratings were inflated.

Participants expressed the view that linking salary progression with summative evaluation is the cause of neglecting professional development in schools. The principal from the urban school mentioned that:

*There are uncertainties about IQMS being used for payment increases than for improvement of educators and these cause uncertainties and negativism from the teachers.*

This view is supported by Bisschoff & Mathye (2009); Kanyane (2008); Govender (2006) and NEEDU (2009) that educators lose sight of the objective of the evaluation process and manipulate the system in order to qualify for pay progression when incentives are linked to teachers' performance.

The deputy principal from the township school revealed that IQMS is a separate programme in schools implemented by the SDTs and DSGs. She argued that:

*The problem is that it [IQMS] seems as if it's another department that needs to be run by other people.*

This suggests that the SMTs are not effectively involved in the implementation of IQMS since the SDTs and DSGs are responsible for implementing IQMS and evaluating educators in schools. It emerged from this study that the SMTs and SDTs do not implement IQMS together and it is not integrated into the programmes of schools. West-Burnham (1993) and Ker (1999) support

integration of a teacher appraisal system in the programmes of schools to keep the appraisal in perspective.

The deputy principals from the semi-urban school reported that there is no time to implement IQMS in schools. She mentions that:

*There is no time to do IQMS separately, unless it is streamlined as part of the curriculum.*

The literature (Wragg et al, 1996; Barnett, 2006; Fiddler & Cooper, 1992; Kleinhenz & Ingvarson, 2004; Mthethwa, 2001; Monyatsi et al, 2006a) supports that there is no time to implement teacher appraisal systems in schools. Schools develop their strategic plans in order to manage the activities for the year and such activities are integrated in the programmes of schools for prioritisation and effective implementation. Teacher appraisal system is the only activity which is not integrated in the programmes of schools; hence it is not accorded top priority during its implementation.

#### **4.2.1.3 Evaluating the performance of educators**

All the SMT members are responsible for evaluating educators in schools. The selection of the DSGs on the basis of immediate senior and peer educator criterion excludes the principals and deputy principals from evaluating educators in schools. The principals who participated in this study evaluate one deputy principal; the deputy principals evaluate between two and three HODs; and the HODs evaluate between seven and nine post level 1 educators.

One of the roles of the principals during evaluation of educators is to moderate the ratings of the DSGs. The principals in this study did not perceive moderation of scores to be serving both upgrading and downgrading of the scores for educators; instead, they focus on reduction of the scores. Both the principals

from the urban and semi-urban schools mentioned that they reduce the scores for educators when they suspect that the scores were inflated. The principals mentioned that reducing the scores for educators affects collegiality in schools because educators perceive it as a means to deny them an opportunity of a salary increase. This finding reinforces a study by Weisberg et al (2009) that teachers perceive low or negative ratings as a personally-directed insult or attack.

The principal from the urban school mentioned that,

*Everybody wants to get full marks even if they don't deserve them. This is evident with the extramural activities. There are educators who are always involved in sports with children and there are those who don't participate at all, but they give themselves full marks on extramural activities. What do you call that? When I reduce their scores they become angry with me, but I do it in order to ensure fairness.*

Both the principals and deputy principals expressed the view that many educators do not assist with extra-curricular activities such as sports, but they give themselves outstanding ratings in performance standard seven (extra mural activities). This suggests that educators are dishonest with self-evaluation. The principals and deputy principals expressed the view that the DSGs promote dishonest ratings since they do not reduce the inflated scores of educators. The principal from the township school mentioned that she does not moderate the scores for educators because she does not want to “interfere with the ratings of the DSGs.” Her reluctance to moderate the scores is consistent with the findings of Class Act (2007: 27) that the scores are accepted at face value without internal or external moderation.

The two principals claimed that they reduce the scores if they suspect that the DSGs were lenient when evaluating educators. However, the deputy principals



and HODs argued that reducing the scores for educators is not justifiable. The principals reduce the scores on the assumption that they know educators deserving high and low ratings in their schools. This is contrary to the findings of the DSGs measured on the day of evaluation.

Seven out of nine participants expressed the view that evaluation of educators for the purpose of IQMS does not help to develop educators in schools. This view is clearly expressed by the principal from the urban school who questioned the role of the IQMS in schools. He asked,

*What is the role of IQMS in our schools because it does not bring any improvement in teaching and learning, instead it creates an impression that the performance of teachers is good, yet the opposite is true? Teachers are not developed or trained and they do not learn anything from IQMS since it was introduced in our schools. As principals we are denied access of getting first hand information when educators are evaluated in our schools since we do not form part of their DSGs. Why do we have IQMS in our schools?*

All the participants expressed the view that after five years of implementing IQMS in schools, they do not see the importance of IQMS in their schools. They perceive the implementation of IQMS as a routine to help educators to qualify for salary progression. They expressed the view that the implementation of IQMS does not serve the purpose of developing educators and improving schools. This view supports Anderson (1993: 141) that teachers would be disappointed with the appraisal system which does not correct weaknesses and does not supply training or has insufficient resources to monitor and encourage teachers.

Participants expressed the view that the implementation of IQMS in schools does not provide educators with an opportunity for support and mentoring. They argued that evaluation of educators once per year cannot be termed 'quality

teaching’; instead it promotes ‘window dressing’. They mentioned that educators, including underperforming educators prepare themselves thoroughly on the day of evaluation and rise to the expectation of the day to impress their DSGs. The principals and deputy principals expressed the view that the scores assigned by the DSGs during evaluation of educators does not correlate with the daily teaching practice of educators in schools. According to them many educators do not deserve the ratings they get in the IQMS.

The principals and deputy principals were of the opinion that the criteria for selecting the DSGs in schools contributes to subjective ratings. They mentioned that teachers select their friends in the DSGs to help each other to secure salary progression. They argued that educators do not select educators who are capable of assisting them with their professional development. The principal from the urban school argued that:

*They choose their “friends” and they take the HOD, the one that they are involved with as friends or the weaker one. Then, when they sit down, they see to it that they get good marks ...*

This view is supported by the deputy principal from the urban school that:

*Surely, if you want to develop yourself you are going to choose somebody who can really help you. You won’t choose your friends, your friend as a peer, your friend as your senior, and then you are going to look after one another to get good marks.*

All the principals and deputy principals were of the opinion that the selection of the DSGs should be the responsibility of the SMTs. They argued that it is impossible for educators to select evaluators with a potential to critically evaluate and expose their poor performance and who are capable of assigning low ratings without safeguarding the interest of a salary increase.

All the principals and deputy principals in this study mentioned that evaluatees and their DSGs inflate the scores during summative evaluation. The deputy principal from the semi-urban school mentioned that

*You [an educator] need this score for remuneration that goes with it, everybody wants money, and everybody wants that 1%. So, nobody is going to go down and say I got to under-score myself purposely, but they will over-score themselves purposely.*

All the principals, deputy principals and the HOD from the township school reported that inflation of the scores begins with self-evaluation and serve as a benchmark for the DSGs about the scores the evaluatee aspires to achieve in every performance standard. They mentioned that the DSGs endorse the ratings of educators for pay progression and sustenance of collegiality. Studies conducted on the IQMS affirmed that teachers cheated and threatened the DSGs to inflate the ratings in order to ensure pay increases (Govender, 2006; Bisschoff & Mathye, 2009; Kanyane, 2008). The principals, deputy principals and the HOD from the township school perceive the DSGs to be serving the sole role of helping educators to qualify for pay progression.

The two HODs from the urban and semi-urban schools differed with the rest of the participants on the issue of inflation of the scores. They contended that the DSGs do not inflate scores because the scores for educators are informed by their mastery of the performance standards. However, the principals and deputy principals insisted that the DSGs inflate the scores for salary progression. They argued that if the DSGs were providing fair ratings, they would have managed to identify underperforming educators in schools.

The HOD from the township school who supported the principals and deputy principals that evaluatees and the DSGs inflate the scores described the criteria

for selecting the DSGs as a mechanism to prevent the principals and deputy principals from evaluating post level 1 educators in schools. She argued that excluding the principals and deputy principals from evaluating educators in schools compromises credibility and quality of the IQMS. She mentioned that the principals and deputy principals have a reputation of being strict, honest and firm when implementing the policies of the Department of Education. She further recommended the introduction of external evaluation as a solution to minimise subjective ratings in schools by mentioning that:

*The scores will only be deserved if IQMS is properly implemented and monitored by outsiders.*

The deputy principal from the semi-urban school supported the view that the DSGs are inconsistent with the ratings; some are lenient and few are strict. She suggested that schools should use one common DSG to evaluate all educators. She further suggested that external evaluators should evaluate all educators in schools in order to achieve objective ratings. All the participants in this study supported external evaluation since external evaluators have a potential to provide honest and credible ratings because they are unfamiliar with evaluatees and do not have the pressure to maintain collegiality in schools. NEEDU (2009: 27) recommends the appointment of independent quality evaluators/appraisers with a high level of professionalism and autonomy to strengthen internal evaluation of educators in schools.

#### **4.2.1.4 Training of evaluators**

The principals were the only participants in this study who attended the advocacy training conducted by the Mpumalanga Department of Education. The principals mentioned that they were trained together with two post level 1 educators from their schools. The advocacy training took two days for approximately three hours per day. The purpose of these advocacy training was to introduce IQMS as a

new teacher appraisal system in South African schools. The principals mentioned that they did not gain adequate information necessary to implement IQMS in schools from the advocacy training due to limited time that was allocated for the workshop; hence, the principal from the urban school described it as a “marathon workshop.” The IQMS Training Manual (DoE, 2003) was used as a guide to train the delegates and they were required to conduct similar workshops to the rest of staff members in their schools. The SDTs and DSGs have been established in all schools studied and Professional Growth Plans (PGPs) and School Development Plans (SIPs) have been developed.

The deputy principals and heads of department expressed the view that they should have been part of the advocacy training in order to acquire first hand information about implementing IQMS. They argued that they would have gathered sufficient information to guide, support and develop educators in schools. They complained that they do not offer any effective assistance with the implementation of IQMS in schools due to lack of knowledge that training would have provided. It emerged from literature that evaluator training provides evaluators with knowledge and skills to conduct effective evaluation in schools (Amsterdam et al, 2005; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009; Sullivan & Glanz, 2005; Weisberg et al, 2009; Wragg et al, 1996: 125).

All the participants reported that the SDTs and DSGs were not trained to implement IQMS in schools. The HODs as the DSG members with the biggest responsibility in terms of teacher appraisal did not form part of the delegation which attended the advocacy training. To date, the DSGs have not been trained on evaluation of educators and implementation of professional development in schools. Literature (Weisberg et al, 2009; Bretz, Milkovich & Read, 1992; Hedge & Kavanagh, 1998; Woehr & Huffcutt, 1994; Wragg, Wikeley, Wragg & Hayne, 1996; Glickman et al, 1998; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009:) reveals that evaluator training is essential to provide information on measuring teacher performance against the performance standards; to provide constructive feedback to teachers;

to provide support for teachers in order to meet or exceed the performance standards; to provide accurate ratings; and also to interpret the different rubric levels and procedures to be followed.

All the participants were of the opinion that the Department of Education should provide further training to guide and develop the SMT members and educators in schools on the implementation of IQMS. It should be noted that the National Department of Education has since August 2008 appointed external IQMS moderators to provide training, guidance, support and development of educators in schools. The participants in this study were not aware of this initiative since their interviews were held in September 2008.

#### **4.2.1.5 Support and mentoring (professional development)**

All the participants in this study experience professional development of educators as a challenge in their schools. They struggled to describe how the implementation of IQMS helps to support and develop educators in their schools. Literature (Bolam, 1993; Le Roux, 2002; Ling & McKenzie, 2001) reveals that the objective of professional development is to empower educators with knowledge and skills for continued growth. The participants in this study affirmed that implementing IQMS does not help educators to acquire knowledge and skills.

The principal from the urban school mentioned that they identify an SMT member who understands the performance standards to develop other educators in the school. However, the principal's response was not supported by the other SMT members in the school. The principal from the semi-urban school reported that the DSGs support educators during the implementation of IQMS in schools, but could not explain the kind of support provided by the DSGs to educators. The principal from the township school mentioned that educators do not have skills to develop each other which makes it impossible to support and mentor educators in schools. She posed the following question:

*Mentoring? How can you mentor a person when you also need to be mentored?*

All the deputy principals struggled to describe the implementation of professional development for educators in their schools. The deputy principal from the urban school mentioned that a week per term is allocated for supporting educators, but could not describe how educators are supported during that particular week. The deputy principal from the semi-urban school mentioned that SMT members give support to educators, but was unable explain the kind of support offered, and so were the other SMT participants in the same school. The township school deputy principal supported her principal by mentioning that educators lack knowledge and skills to develop each other. A similar finding was reported by Class Act (2008) and NEEDU (2009) that educators are not supported and developed during the implementation of IQMS in schools. The HODs mentioned that they support post level 1 educators by developing the work schedules and lesson plans together, the assessment activities and curriculum management strategies. The HODs are obviously focusing on 'curriculum development'; instead of providing a holistic professional development of educators according to the performance standards.

The conclusion drawn from the views and experiences of the participants in this study is that educators do not get support and mentoring during the implementation of IQMS in schools. All the participants could not explain how the implementation of IQMS helps to develop educators in schools. There were no mentors and mentoring programmes found in all schools to assist with professional development of educators. All the participants expressed the view that they should have been trained to conduct professional development of educators in their schools.

#### **4.2.1.6 Accountability in respect of the IQMS**

All the participants expressed the view that nobody is held accountable for implementing IQMS in schools. They mentioned that the structures and individuals are not held accountable for implementing IQMS. The principals mentioned that they are not held accountable for implementing IQMS since they do not participate in the SDTs and do not form part of the DSGs for teachers. However, they mentioned that they are held accountable for policy implementation in schools. The principal from the urban school stated that:

*I am an accounting officer; I am responsible for every policy in the school*

The principal from the urban school stated that he takes full accountability for evaluating educators in his school although he does not participate in the DSGs for educators. He mentioned that he discusses the criteria for evaluating educators with the HODs before they evaluate teachers in order to have the same understanding and interpretation of the performance standards. This principal claims to hold the HODs accountable; instead of the DSGs, However, a contradiction emerged when the HODs from the same school mentioned that they are not held accountable for the ratings they assign to teachers either as individuals or members of the DSGs.

The principal from the semi-urban school expressed his dissatisfaction about exclusion of principals from evaluating educators in schools. He was of the opinion that principals should form part of every educator's DSG in order to monitor the rating process unfolds than to moderate scores – the end product of the evaluation process. He felt it was inappropriate for the principals to be excluded from evaluation of educators in schools and suggested that the DSGs should account for the ratings they assign to educators. He was of the opinion that the principals are deprived an opportunity of acquiring first hand information on the performance of educators in their schools. This view is consistent with the assertions of both Singh (2004) and Jarvis (1990) that accountability means to be



answerable for the way authority has been exercised and responsibilities discharged.

The principal from the semi-urban school complained that,

*I am actually sitting outside all the DSGs; they go and evaluate the educator and decide on the scores and, thereafter, bring it to me. I just see the scores with no evidence whatsoever, then how do I moderate the scores?*

The principal from the township school was the only senior manager who supported the DSGs to evaluate educators in schools. She argued that the principals do not have time to evaluate all educators in schools and mentioned that post level 1 educators are not under their jurisdiction. She was of the opinion that the HODs should be held accountable for the ratings of post level 1 educators as their immediate seniors in schools. The view of insufficient time for principals to evaluate all educators in schools is consistent with Halverson et al (2004: 34) that teacher evaluation system is extremely time-consuming and absorbs 25% of the principal's time.

The deputy principals mentioned that that they had never been called upon to account as individuals or members of the SMTs, SDTs or DSGs by principals and officials from the Department of Education since they started coordinating IQMS in schools. They were of the opinion that the Department of Education will hold them accountable if IQMS is not implemented in their schools. The HODs supported the views expressed by principals and deputy principals that nobody is held accountable for implementing IQMS in schools. They mentioned that they have never been questioned on the ratings they assign to individual teachers during the implementation of IQMS in schools.

The views expressed by the participants in this study on the accountability role of all the stakeholders involved during the implementation of IQMS in schools reveal that to date, individuals and structures are not held accountable for implementing IQMS in schools. This provides a potential opportunity for educators and the DSGs to inflate the ratings since nobody holds them accountable for the ratings they assign to educators. Mero, Guidice and Brownlee (2007) reported that evaluators provide accurate ratings when they are aware that they will be held accountable for the ratings they assign to teachers.

#### **4.2.1.7 Challenges experienced by the SMTs during implementation of the IQMS**

Participants reported a considerable number of challenges they experience when implementing IQMS in schools. The principal from the urban school mentioned that the Mpumalanga Department of Education do not support schools on their Schools Improvement Plans (SIPs). He mentioned that they do not receive feedback from the provincial department of education on their SIPs they submit every year. This suggests that schools develop the SIPs for the purpose of complying with requirements rather than for the purpose of developing educators and improving their schools. Weisberg et al (2009: 19) reported a similar concern that the Department of Education districts do not provide meaningful feedback to schools.

All members of the SMT from the township schools mentioned that the implementation of IQMS in their school demand more paperwork for the copies required to evaluate educators. They mentioned that they do not evaluate all educators on time due to a large number of educators to be evaluated in their school. Studies (Coleman & Earley, 2005; Bisschoff & Mathye, 2009) support that teacher appraisal systems leads to a paper-driven system that is not practical for schools with few resources.

The deputy principal from the semi-urban school was concerned about disruption of teaching and learning during evaluation of educators in schools. She mentioned that two classes are left unattended to when three educators evaluate each other. This suggests that the SDTs do not have an effective plan to implement IQMS without disrupting teaching and learning in schools. The HODs and the principal from the semi-urban school mentioned that some educators still perceive IQMS as judgemental; fault-finding and additional work to their overloaded scope of work.

#### **4.2.2 DOCUMENT ANALYSIS**

The following documents were retrieved from the schools to determine the roles and responsibilities of the SMTs when implementing IQMS in schools.

##### **4.2.2.1 IQMS Schools' Year Plans**

The purpose of perusing the IQMS school year plans was to ascertain the roles of the SMTs during the implementation of IQMS in schools. This study reveals that the SMTs have no role in developing the IQMS year plans since schools use the IQMS suggested management plan from the Mpumalanga Department of Education (MDE) to manage the implementation of IQMS. The MDE IQMS Management Plan states that IQMS should be integrated in the programmes of schools during the month of February. None of the schools in the study have integrated the MDE IQMS plan into their programmes. In addition, the MDE IQMS year plan state that the period from April to October is scheduled for mentoring and developing educators in schools. This study reveals that schools do not have a plan to develop and support educators during this period.

##### **4.2.2.2 Minutes of the SMTs and SDTs**

The purpose of perusing minutes of the SMTs and SDTs was to establish the roles and responsibilities of these structures when implementing IQMS in schools. There were no records of meetings for the SDTs found in all schools.

Somo (2007) reported a similar finding that the SDTs do not hold meetings and do not have the programmes to implement IQMS in schools. However, the IQMS coordinators in schools (deputy principals from the urban and township schools and the HOD from the semi-urban school) affirmed that they hold the SDT meetings for preparing the timetables for classroom observation of the DSGs and to develop the SIPs, but such meetings are not documented.

There were no records of shared meetings between the SMTs and SDTs in all schools. This supports the views expressed earlier on by the principal from the township school that the SMTs and SDTs do not hold joint meetings to discuss IQMS matters in schools. This may be an indication that the SMTs and SDTs do not work together and do not support each other when implementing IQMS in schools.

#### **4.2.2.3 Professional Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans**

The Professional Growth Plans (PGPs) for educators and School Improvement Plans (SIPs) were found in all schools studied. There were few areas of development identified by educators in their PGPs. The PGPs reveal that educators get high scores in their performance standards but still indicate a need for development in the same overrated performance standards. This suggests that educators disregard their developmental needs in preference of securing a high score for salary progression. This therefore creates an impression that professional development of educators is not necessary because all educators achieve outstanding results.

All the schools had their School Improvement Plans developed and have delineated delegated duties of the SMTs, SDTs, DSGs and the Department of Education. The SIPs are submitted to the provincial department of education every year. It emerged from this study that schools do not get feedback from the provincial department of education on their SIPs. As a result both the PGPs and

SIPs do not serve the purpose of developing educators and improving schools because there is no feedback and follow ups on these developmental plans.

#### **4.2.2.4 Summary of summative scores**

The reason for perusing the summaries of summative scores was to establish educators that were affected by reduction of their scores. The summaries of summative scores comprise the scores for all educators in a school. The summary of scores for each participating school revealed that all educators qualify for salary progression despite reduction of their scores. This means that the scores for educators were not reduced to the extent that they did not qualify for salary progression. This suggests that evaluation of educators through the IQMS does not differentiate between performing and underperforming educators.

### **4.3 DISCUSSION**

All the participants in this study expressed the view that IQMS is a teacher appraisal system with a potential to develop educators in schools provided both evaluators and evaluatees are honest with the evaluation process and are able to identify their areas of development without the influence of the financial reward. However the experience of the principals and deputy principals with the implementation of IQMS in schools reveals that educators are dishonest with self-evaluation, they inflate their scores and do not identify areas where they need development. The DSGs do not conduct authentic evaluation since they conduct subjective evaluation and inflate the scores in order to help educators to qualify for salary progression and to maintain collegiality in schools.

Participants described their roles as participation at individual level with little or without effective involvement of the other members of the SMTs, SDTs and DSGs. The individual roles of the SMTs sustain the implementation of IQMS in schools. The principals supervise the implementation of IQMS, the deputy

principals coordinate IQMS; and the HODs evaluate educators. The experience of the participants further reveal that they (SMTs) do not do not work with the SDTs and DSGs and do not support each other during the implementation of IQMS in schools.

Participants expressed the view that the implementation of IQMS does not benefit educators in schools since educators are not supported, mentored and developed due to lack of mentors and mentoring programmes. As a result, both the PGP and SIP do not serve the purpose of developing and improving schools.

#### **4.4 SUMMARY**

This chapter dealt with data analysis. The interviews were analysed and major themes were analysed and compared with predetermined themes. The documents including minutes of the SMTs and SDTs, year plans for the IQMS, School Improvement Plans; and summary of summative scores were perused, analysed and the findings were reported. Chapter five focus on conclusions and recommendations based on the findings of the study.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

This chapter provides an overview of the study with reference to the literature review, research questions and the findings. The purpose of conducting the study was to explore the views and experiences of the School Management Teams (SMTs) when Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is implemented in schools. The conclusions, recommendations and topics for further research are discussed in this chapter.

#### **5.2 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The purpose of this section is to highlight the main findings of this study reported in chapter 4, and presented according to the three research questions underpinning this study as follows:

##### **Research question 1**

##### **What are the views of the SMT members on the IQMS?**

Participants expressed the view that very little training was provided by the provincial department of education for effective implementation of IQMS in schools. All the participants raised a concern about the advocacy training conducted to the principals and some post level 1 educators that it was inadequate to be termed 'training'. They were of the view that the Department of Education should have trained the SMT members in schools in order to guide, support and develop educators during the implementation of IQMS in their schools.

The SMT members raised a concern that the national department of education did not conduct evaluator training to the DSGs; the structure entrusted with the responsibility to evaluate educators in schools. The lack of training of the DSGs is contrary to literature (Weisberg et al, 2009; Bretz, Milkovich & Read, 1992; Hedge & Kavanagh, 1998; Woehr & Huffcutt, 1994) which states that evaluator training is a prerequisite and lays a foundation for successful implementation of a teacher appraisal system. South Africa made a mistake by implementing IQMS without training the DSGs on how to conduct effective team evaluation especially post level 1 educators who do not have the experience of evaluating teachers.

All the participants expressed the view that IQMS is an ineffective teacher evaluation system because it does not help educators to address their specific needs; nor provide support and continued growth for educators; and does not promote accountability as envisaged in the IQMS Manual (DoE, 2005: 1). The finding of this study reveals that the DSGs do not conduct authentic evaluation when measuring the performance of educators due to lack of skills and knowledge; hence their evaluation is characterised by subjective evaluation and inflation of scores.

Participants expressed the view that IQMS promotes 'window dressing' because all educators, including underperforming educators provide outstanding performance since they are prepared on the day of evaluation which is the opposite of their everyday teaching practice in schools. This suggests that the implementation of IQMS in schools does not help to differentiate between performing and underperforming teachers. This supports the study by Weisberg et al (2009) that teacher evaluation systems reflect virtually no variation among teachers.



## **Recommendations:**

Based on these findings, it is recommended that the Department of Education should train both the SMTs and SDTs in order to achieve effective and efficient implementation of the IQMS in schools. The training of these structures should include *inter alia*: delineation of the roles and responsibilities of the SMTs and SDTs; management of professional development of educators in schools; effective rating and justification of the scores for educators; accountability in terms of the IQMS; identification of mentors and mentoring programmes in schools; and linking in-service training programmes with the IQMS.

A separate training of the DSGs is required since authentic evaluation cannot be achieved if evaluators lack knowledge and skills to evaluate and develop educators in schools. The training of evaluators is imperative and supported by literature (Weisberg et al, 2009; Bretz, Milkovich & Read, 1992; Hedge & Kavanagh, 1998; Woehr & Huffcutt, 1994; Wragg, Wikeley, Wragg & Hayne, 1996; Glickman et al, 1998; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009:) that it provides evaluators with knowledge and skills to evaluate teachers in schools.

The training of the DSGs should focus on issues such as how to evaluate the performance of educators against the performance standards; interpretation of the rating instrument and the rating scale for common understanding and meaning of the rating levels; provision of support and mentoring for educators during the implementation of IQMS in schools. It is recommended that the DSGs should provide ongoing support and guidance in order to achieve professional development of educators. Evaluation of educators should be conducted at least once per quarter for continuous evaluation and ongoing professional development. The ratings of the DSGs should be moderated by the principals in conjunction with the DSGs in order to ensure validity and reliability of the scores.

## **Research question 2**

### **What are the experiences of the SMT members when implementing IQMS in primary schools in Mpumalanga Province?**

The experience of the participants reveals that IQMS is an event which is implemented when the scores are required by the provincial department for baseline evaluation and summative evaluation. Baseline evaluation is the transfer of the summative scores for educators from the previous year into the new Pay Progression to Educators (PPE) forms. Educators are not evaluated during baseline evaluation; they are evaluated once per annum for summative evaluation. The participants were unable to link baseline evaluation with professional development of educators. The experience of the participants in this study reveals that evaluation of educators once per year is insufficient to provide educators with the necessary support and development required throughout the year in schools. Ker (1999: 8) argued that appraisal should be conceptualised as an activity embedded in daily activities of teachers; instead of reducing it to the status of an event.

The experience of all the participants in this study reveals that professional development of educators is not understood; hence, it is not taking place in schools. All the participants had no idea of how professional development of educators is accomplished, implemented and monitored in their schools. There were no mentors and mentoring programmes to develop educators in all the schools. This supports literature (De Clercq, 2008; Gryna, 2001; Class Act, 2007) that professional development of educators is neglected when formative and summative evaluations are applied simultaneously. This study found that the areas of development for educators are not clearly delineated in their Professional Growth Plans. Both the PGP and SIP do not serve the purpose of developing educators and improving schools. This finding supports a study by

Weisberg et al (2009) that where it is impossible to openly identify and address areas of development for teachers, the result is a dysfunctional school community.

The participants experience subjective rating as a major challenge during the implementation of IQMS in schools. There is a misconception among educators that IQMS serve the purpose of a financial reward. This promotes subjective rating since no educator wants to forfeit the benefit of a salary progression. This finding supports literature (Govender, 2006; Bisschoff & Mathye, 2009; Kanyane, 2008) that teachers cheated and threatened the DSGs to inflate the ratings in order to ensure pay increases. The participants experienced the criterion for selecting the DSGs in schools as another contributing factor to subjective ratings. They argued that educators do not select the DSG members with a potential to critique and expose their poor performance. As a result, an opportunity for developing educators is lost because the DSGs do not evaluate for the purpose of identifying the areas of development; instead, they focus on helping educators to get at least the minimum score so that they do not miss an opportunity of a salary progression.

The participants experience non-accountability of evaluators and evaluatees during the implementation of IQMS in schools. The DSGs do not hold teachers accountable for self-evaluation and the DSGs are not held accountable by the SMTs or SDTs for the ratings they assign to teachers. This provides a potential opportunity for the DSGs to inflate the ratings since nobody is holding them accountable. Mero, Guidice and Brownlee (2007) reported that evaluators provide accurate ratings when they are aware that they will be held accountable for the ratings they assign to teachers. The Department of Education does not hold the principals or SMTs accountable for teacher evaluation in schools. This suggests that IQMS is a loose system which does not seek quality assurance.

The experience of the participants reveals that after five years of implementing IQMS in schools, educators do not link the importance of IQMS into their daily teaching activities, yet professional development is supposed to be their way of life. To date, there is no significant contribution that could be attributed to the implementation of IQMS in schools such as improving teaching and learning and developing educators.

### **Recommendations:**

In view of the experience of the participants when implementing IQMS in schools, it is recommended that the Department of Education should seek innovative ways of monitoring quality assurance through the process control systems in order to overcome the problem of subjective ratings. The circuit managers should hold the principals accountable for evaluation results of the DSGs. It is the responsibility of the principals to verify the scores from the DSGs. The IQMS policy (DoE, 2003) states that principals are required to moderate evaluation results of IQMS in order to ascertain fair and consistent ratings. The DSGs will provide accurate and reliable ratings if they know that they will be required to justify their ratings.

Educators should be subjected to both internal and external evaluation. The DSGs should focus on professional development of educators. They should provide ongoing support and mentoring to educators by training and developing them in accordance with the performance standards. External evaluators should be responsible for summative evaluation for all educators in a school in order to achieve the most accurate ratings. External evaluators have a potential to evaluate objectively because they are unfamiliar with educators in schools and do not experience the pressure to maintain collegiality.

Each school needs to state its goal and success indicators for developing educators in the School Improvement Plan. The principals and deputy principals

should monitor the PGPs for educators to ascertain that educators are supported during formative evaluation. The circuit managers or external IQMS coordinators should monitor the School Improvement Plans in order to ensure that schools get the necessary support for their improvement.

### **Research question 3**

#### **Which role do SMTs play when implementing IQMS in primary schools in Mpumalanga Province?**

This study found that the principals and deputy principals have no role during evaluation of educators in schools; instead the HODs and peer educators are responsible for evaluating educators. The principals and deputy principals do not evaluate post level 1 educators because they are not their immediate seniors. This implies that IQMS is a programme which is implemented in schools without the effective involvement of senior managers. This is contrary to the conditions of employment of the principals and deputy principals. The Education Laws Amendment Act (2007) and Employment of Educators Act (1998) states that principals and deputy principals are required to guide and supervise the work and performance of staff. The lack of involvement of the principals and deputy principals in teacher evaluation in schools contradicts with literature. Studies conducted in UK (Welsh Statutory Instrument, 2002), New Zealand (Cardno, 1999) and the Western United States (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009) reveals that principals are primary evaluators for all teachers in schools.

All the SMT members in this study described their roles as participation at individual level with little or without effective involvement of the other members of the SMTs, SDTs and DSGs. The principals supervise the implementation of IQMS, the deputy principals coordinate IQMS; and the HODs evaluate educators. The HODs evaluate educators without involving the principals and deputy principals. The deputy principals do not involve principals when they coordinate

IQMS; design schedules for classroom visits of the DSGs and when they evaluate the HODs. The principals do not involve the other structures, the SMTs, SDTs or the DSGs when moderating the scores for educators.

There was no evidence of a collaborative role of the structures responsible for implementing IQMS in schools despite the overlapping role of the SMT members to the SDTs and DSGs. The SMTs and SDTs do not plan, coordinate and support each other when implementing IQMS as stated in the IQMS Manual (DoE, 2005: 3). The SMTs do not have meetings with the SDTs or the DSGs to discuss matters pertaining to the implementation of IQMS in schools. This suggests that the more structures are entrusted with the responsibility of implementing IQMS in schools, the lesser their accountability role.

### **Recommendations:**

The apparent contradiction of the IQMS policy and legislation should be reviewed and addressed in the bargaining chamber of the Education Labour Relations Council. The principals and deputy principals should lead, control and monitor the implementation of IQMS without limitations in schools. The criteria for selecting the DSGs for educators should be reviewed so that the SMT members should share the responsibility of evaluating educators in schools. The HODs as subject specialists should evaluate teaching and learning (performance standard 1), curriculum management (performance standard 2), lesson plans and observation (performance standard 3), and assessments of learners (performance standard 4). This suggests that the HODs should be responsible for evaluating educators on performance standards 1 to 4 because it is their role in terms of their job description in the Employment of Educators Act (1998) to manage the implementation of curriculum in their various departments in schools.

The principals and deputy principals should evaluate performance standards 5 to 7 because these performance standards require leadership and management

skills. Professional development of educators is the most important aspect of the IQMS and is specifically addressed in performance standard 5 of the IQMS rating instrument. The principals and deputy principals should provide an opportunity for educators to achieve professional growth by consistently monitoring their Professional Growth Plans. They should also be responsible for evaluating human relations of educators (performance standard 6) because it is their role to foster and promote good working relationship among educators in schools. The allocation of duties for educators in schools including extra-curricular and co-curricular participation (performance standard 7) is one of the roles and responsibilities of the principals and deputy principals. There is no logical explanation for allocating the duties without supervising their execution.

The Department of Education should equip the SMTs with the skills for human resource development, quality assurance and project management in order to add value and quality during the implementation of IQMS and other programmes in schools. The training of the SMT members will provide them with leadership and managerial skills to manage schools effectively and efficiently.

### **5.3      *LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY***

This study focused on three primary schools in the Mpumalanga Province in the Nkangala Region in Witbank 3 circuit. This is obviously a limited target population of the SMTs which may not represent all schools in the circuit, the province or the country. This makes it difficult to generalise the findings beyond the three schools in which the study was conducted. It is left to the reader to decide how relevant the findings of this study are to their particular setting.

#### **5.4 CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY**

This study provides a synopsis of the views and experiences of the SMTs when IQMS is implemented in schools. The study has the potential to make a significant contribution to all stakeholders in the Department of Education responsible for teacher development and quality assurance. The findings based on the research questions highlight important aspects to be considered by the SMTs, educators and the Department of Education when implementing IQMS in schools.

#### **5.5 ASPECTS OF FUTURE RESEARCH**

The following aspects of this study merit further investigation. In view of the limited scope of this study, it is recommended that a more in-depth study should be conducted to provide more insights into the topic. There is a need for investigation of this phenomenon through the use of a representative sample comprising of both primary and secondary schools. Thus, all types of schools such as urban, semi-urban, rural and township schools should be included in the sample.

This study explored only the perspective of the SMTs regarding implementation of the IQMS; the views and experiences of post level 1 educators were omitted. It is therefore recommended that future studies explore the views of post level 1 educators on the implementation of IQMS in schools.

The participants expressed the view that the DSGs do not conduct authentic evaluation when evaluating educators in schools. A study to focus on the experience of the DSGs when evaluating educators is necessary considering that it is the first time the DSGs are entrusted with the responsibility to evaluate educators in schools and were not trained to evaluate educators.



A major finding of this study is that the performance of educators as measured by the IQMS is outstanding. Therefore, a study to examine a correlation of the performance of educators in the IQMS with the learners' results is necessary to determine whether IQMS is improving quality of teaching and learning as envisaged in the Employment of Educators Act 76 of 1998.

## **5.6 CONCLUDING REMARKS**

The purpose of this study was to explore how the SMTs view and experience the implementation of IQMS in primary schools in the Mpumalanga Province. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of this study could serve as a point of departure in addressing the problems experienced during the implementation of IQMS in schools.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Amsterdam, C.E., Johnson, R.L., Monrad, D.M., & Tonnsen S.L. (2005). A collaborative approach to the development and validation of a principal evaluation system: A case study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 17(3).
- Akpotu, N.E. & Oghubvu, E.P. (2004). Performance appraisal of Nigerian secondary teachers: The students' perspectives. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 32(3).
- Anderson, G.C. (1993). *Managing performance appraisal systems: Human resource management in action*. USA: Blackwell.
- Babbie, E., Mouton, J. & Prozesky, B. (2001). *The practice of social research*. (South African edition). Southern Africa: Oxford.
- Baloyi, C.R. (2004). *The role of the state in the establishment of a culture of learning and teaching in South Africa (1910–2004)*. Pretoria. University of South Africa.
- Barber, M., Evans, A. & Johnson, M. (1995). *An evaluation of the National Scheme of School Teacher Appraisal*. London: Department for Education.
- Barnes, A. (2003). Policy at the chalk face: A case study of the implementation of the DAS in a primary school. Unpublished minor MPhil dissertation. Cape Town. University of Cape Town.
- Barnett, J. (2006). Research in Ontario secondary schools. Toronto, ON: Ministry of Education, Ontario.  
<http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/fieldcentres/TVC/RossReports/vol11no2.htm>.  
Accessed on 29 January 2007.
- Bartlett, S. (2000). The development of teacher appraisal: A recent history. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 48: 24–37.
- Blaauw, L.E. (2000). *Principals' perceptions of staff appraisal in schools*. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Bisschoff, T. & Mathye, A. (2009). The advocacy of an appraisal system for teachers: A case study. *South African Journal of Education*, 29: 393–404.
- Bless, C. & Higson-Smith, C. (1995). *Fundamentals of social research methods*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cape Town: Juta.

- Bolam R. (1993). Recent developments and emerging issues, in *The continuing professional development of teachers*. London: General Teaching Council for England and Wales.
- Boyle, B. & Mkhize, T. (2004). Teachers to be appraised. *Sunday Times* 5 August: 4.
- Bretz, R.D., Milkovich, G.T. & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: Concerns, directions, and implications. *Journal of Management*, 18(2): 321 – 352.
- Cardno, C. (1999). Appraisal policy and implementation issues for New Zealand schools. *The International Journal of Education Management*, 13(2): 87–97.
- Chisholm, L. (1999). The democratization of schools and the politics of teachers' work in South Africa. *Compare*, 29(2): 111–126.
- Class Act Educational Services. (2007). *IQMS Implementation review: A DoE commissioned report*. Pretoria: National Department of Education.
- Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1995). *Research Methods in Education*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York. Routledge Falmer.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2002). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Coleman, M. & Earley P. (2005). *Leadership and management in education: Cultures, change and context*. United States: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating qualitative and quantitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Cullen, K. (1997). Head teacher appraisal: A view from the inside. *Research Papers in Education*, 12(2): 177–204.
- De Clercq, F. (2008). Teacher quality, appraisal and development: The flaws in the IQMS. *Perspectives in Education*, 26(1): 7–18.
- Denscombe, M. (2003). *The good research guide*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. California: Sage.
- Department of Education (DoE). (2003). Training manual. *Integrated Quality Management Systems*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Department of Education (DoE). Educator's Manual. (2005). *Integrated Quality Management Systems*. Mpumalanga Department of Education: Government Printers.
- Department of Education (DoE). (2008). *IQMS Annual Report 2007/2008*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Duke, D.L. (1995). *From Accountability to Professional Development*. Albany: New York Press.
- Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). (2002). *Evaluation procedures, processes and performance standards for institution based educators. Collective Agreement no. 9 of 2002*. Pretoria, Centurion: ELRC.
- Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). (2003). *Integrated quality management systems. Collective Agreement No. 8 of 2003*. Centurion: ELRC.
- Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). (2003). *Evaluation procedures, processes and performance standards for institution based educators.. Collective Agreement No. 1 of 2003*. Centurion: ELRC.
- Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC). (2008). *Annexure A: Occupation Specific Dispensation (OSD) Collective Agreement No. 1 of 2008*. Centurion: ELRC.
- Farnham, P. & Pilmlott, J. (1995). *Understanding industrial relations*. New York: Cassell.
- Fidler, B. & Cooper, R. (1992). *Staff appraisal and staff management in schools and colleges*. London: Longman.
- Fink, A. & Kosecoff, J. (1998). *How to conduct surveys: A step by step guide*. California, Sage.
- Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. (1994). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Boston, Mass: McGraw Hill.
- Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. (2006) *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Gallie, M. (2007). The implementation of the developmental appraisal in a low functioning South African school. Unpublished doctoral thesis (PhD), Pretoria: Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria.
- Geraldine, H. (1997). The industrial relations of appraisal: The case of teachers. *The European Journal of Analysis, Policy and Practice*, 28(3): 206–220. UK: Blackwell.
- Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P. & Ross-Gordon J.M. (1998). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. USA: Viacom.
- Gordon, S.P. (2006). Teacher evaluation and professional development, in Stronge, J.H. *Evaluating teaching* (second edition). California: Corwin Press, p 268–286.
- Govender, P. (2006). Teachers inflate colleagues' ratings to ensure pay increases. *Sunday Times*, 2 April: 6.
- Government Gazette*. (2007). Education Laws Amendment Act, 2007 Volume 510 No. 30637. Cape Town. South Africa.
- Government Gazette*. (2009). National Evaluation and Development Unit (NEEDU) Volume 526 No. 32133. Pretoria. South Africa.
- Grubb, N.W. (2000). Opening classrooms and improving teaching lessons from school inspections in England. *Teachers College Board*, 102(4): 696–723.
- Gryna, F.M. (2001). *Quality planning and analysis*. McGraw-Hill, Bradley University.
- Halverson, R., Kelley, C. & Kimball, S. (2004). Implementing teacher evaluation systems: How principals make sense of complex artifacts to shape local instructional practice. *Educational Administration, Policy and Reform: Research and Measurement Research and Theory in Educational Administration*, Vol. 3.
- Hartshorne, K. (1992). *Crisis and challenge: Black education 1910–1990*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Hedge, J.W. & Kavanagh, M.J. (1998). Improving the accuracy of performance evaluations: Comparison of three methods of performance appraiser training. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(1): 68–73.
- Heese, C. & Badenhorst, D. (eds). (1992). *South Africa – The education equation: Problems, perceptions and prospects*: Pretoria: Van Schaik.

- Jansen, J. (2004). *Autonomy and accountability in the regulation of the teaching profession: A South African case study*. University of Pretoria. Pretoria.
- Jarvis, P. (1990). *An international dictionary of adult and continuing education*. London: Routledge.
- Kanyane, C.M.B. (2008). The politics of resistance in the implementation of integrated quality management system. Unpublished Master's dissertation. Pretoria. University of Pretoria.
- Ker, P. (1999). *Appraisal and teacher development: It ain't broke – it just won't work*. HERDSA Annual International Conference. Melbourne, 12–15.
- Kimball, S.M. & Milanowski, A. (2009). Examining teacher evaluation validity and leadership decision making within a standards-based evaluation system. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(1): 34–70.
- Kleinhenz, E. & Ingvarson, L. (2004). Teacher accountability in Australia: Current policies and practices and their relation to the improvement of teaching and learning. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(1).
- Krippendorp, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuye, J.O., Thornhill, C., Fourie, D., Brynard, P.A., Crous, M., Mafunisa, M.J., Roux, N.L., VanDijk, H.G. & Van Rooyen, E.J. (2002). *Critical perspectives on public administration: issues for consideration*. Sandown: Heinemann.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. London: Sage.
- Lee, R.M. (1993). *Doing research on sensitive topics*. London: Sage.
- Leithwood, K., Edge, K. & Jantzi, D. (1999). *Educational accountability: The state of the art*. Gutersloh: Bertelsmann Foundation.
- Lekome, B.P. (2007). Professional development of primary school educators through the development appraisal system. Unpublished master's dissertation. Pretoria. University of Pretoria.
- Le Roux, A.S. (2002). *Human resource management in education: Theory and practice*. Glenstantia.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Ling, L.M. & McKenzie, N. (2001). The professional development of teachers in Australia. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 24: 87–99.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. New Delhi: Sage.
- Mero, N.P., Guidice, R.M. & Brownlee A.L. (2007). Accountability in a performance appraisal context: The effect of audience and form of accounting on rater response and behaviour, *Journal of Management*, 33(2): 223–252. Sage Publishers.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Millman, J. & Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). *Teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. California. Corwin Press.
- Mo, K.W. (1998). School climate and the effectiveness of teacher appraisal in Hong Kong self-managing schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. April 13–17. San Diego, California.
- Mokoena, M.A.M. (2005). The effects of developmental appraisal policy on teacher learning. Unpublished doctoral thesis (PhD). Pretoria. University of Pretoria.
- Monyatsi, P., Steyn, T. & Kamper, G. (2006a). Teacher appraisal in Botswana secondary schools: A critical analysis. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(2).
- Monyatsi, P., Steyn, T. & Kamper, G., (2006b). Teacher perceptions of the effectiveness teacher appraisal in Botswana. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(3): 427–441.
- Mthethwa, J.M. (2001). The management of educator appraisal in South African schools within the changing environment. Unpublished masters' thesis. Pretoria. University of Stellenbosch.
- Mudau, H.B. (2000). *Teacher appraisal in the Northern Province: A management perspective*. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Piggott-Irvine, E. (1996). Appraisal: what is really happening in New Zealand schools. Paper presented at the New Zealand Educational Administration Society Conference, Christchurch, January.



- Poster, C. & Poster, D. (1993). *Teacher appraisal: Training and implementation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Republic of South Africa (RSA). (1998). *Employment of Educators Act (EEA), Act 76 of 1998*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Republic of South Africa (RSA). (1996). *South African Schools Act, Act 84 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Ribas, W.B. (2005). *Teacher evaluation that works!!* Westwood: Ribas.
- Rogers, G. & Badham, C. (1994). *'Evaluation in the management cycle'*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. London: Sage.
- SADTU. (2008). *Response to Jack Bloom's article in the Citizen*. [www.sadtu.org.za/node/181](http://www.sadtu.org.za/node/181). Accessed 01 March 2010.
- SADTU. (2009). *SADTU Response to the NEEDU Report: Top heavy on evaluation, light on development*. Media Release. 18 May 2009. [www.sadtu.org.za/node/181](http://www.sadtu.org.za/node/181). Accessed on 01 March 2010.
- Scallan, S. (2007). *Educational appraisal appraised: literature review*. UK. Health Care Education Department.
- Scheurich, J.J. (1995). A postmodernist critique of research interviewing. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8(3): 239–52.
- Scheurich, J.J. (1997). *Research method in the postmodern*. Washington DC: Falmer Press.
- Schofield, J.W. (1990). Generalisability in qualitative research. In E. Eisner and A. Peshkin (eds) *Qualitative Inquiry in Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, 201 – 232.
- Schwandt, T.A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. UK: Sage.
- Schlenker, B.R., Britt, T.W., Pennington, J., Murphy, R. & Doherty, K. (1994). The triangle model of responsibility. *Psychological Review*, 101: 632–652.
- Singh, D.R. (2004). *Encyclopedia dictionary of education, vol. 2*. Delhi: Commonwealth Publishers.



- Somo, M.P. (2007). The perceptions, experiences and expectations of educators about their own professional development in schools. Unpublished masters' thesis. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stronge, J.H. (2006). *Evaluating teaching*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. California: Corwin Press.
- Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (2005). *Supervision that improves teaching*. California: Corwin Press.
- Taylor, N. (2002). *Accountability and support: improving public schooling in South Africa*. National Consultation on School Development Department of Education, Jet Education Services.
- Trochim, W.M.K. (2001). *Research methods knowledge base*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Atomic Dog.
- Turner, G. & Clift, P. (1988). *Studies in teacher appraisal*. Great Britain: Redwood Burn.
- Umalusi and Centre for Education Policy Development series. (2007). *Do we need an Inspectorate?* <http://www.umalusi.org.za/ur/publications/20080916>. Accessed 03 March 2009.
- Van Staden, E.J.C. (2000). *Human resource management 1*. 2nd edition. Pretoria. SACTE.
- Vithal, R. & Jansen, J. (2001). *Designing your first research proposal: A manual for researchers in education and the social sciences*. Durban. Juta.
- Weber, E. (2005). New controls and accountability for South African teachers and schools: The Integrated Quality Management System. *Perspectives in Education*, 23(2): 63–72.
- Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J. & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness*. USA. Linotype.
- Welman, J.C. & Kruger, S.J. (2000). *Research methodology for the business and administrative sciences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Welsh Statutory Instrument (2002) No. 1394 (w.137). *The School Teacher Appraisal (Wales) Regulations. 2002*. Education, Wales.

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/legislation/wales/wsi2002/20021394e.htm>.  
Accessed 29 May 2008.

- West-Burnham J. (1993). *Appraisal training resource manual*. Essex: Longman.
- White, C.J. (2003). *Research: An introduction for educators*. Pretoria.
- Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research methods in education: An introduction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Winter, B. (2000). Teachers' appraisal doubts. *BBC News Online: Education*.bbc.co.uk/1/low/education/6358. Accessed 05 June 2008.
- Winter, G. (2000). A comparative discussion of the notion of "validity" in qualitative and quantitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 4(3–4), March. [www.nova.edu/ssw/QR/QR4 - 3 /winter.html](http://www.nova.edu/ssw/QR/QR4 - 3 /winter.html). Accessed on 27 September 2009.
- Woehr, D.J. & Huffcutt, A.I. (1994). Rater training for performance appraisal: A quantitative review. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 67: 189–205.
- Wragg, E.C., Wikeley, F.J., Wragg, C.M. & Hayne, G.S. (1996). *Teacher appraisal observed*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Yin R.K. (2003). *Applications of case study research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

## **APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX A ETHICAL CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE**

## APPENDIX B

### APPLICATION LETTER TO THE MPUMALANGA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



Enquiries: SG. Nkambule P.O. Box 6312  
013 6844073 Tasbetpark  
0826877829 1040  
20 January 2008

**TO: HEAD OF DEPARTMENT  
MPUMALANGA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

I, Mr SG. Nkambule, a Masters student (26497086) at the University of Pretoria hereby request to conduct research in Witbank 3 circuit schools.

I am conducting a research on the topic:

#### **How School Management Teams View and Experience Implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System**

The purpose of this research is to explore how the SMTs view and experience implementation of the IQMS in primary schools in the Mpumalanga Province. Interviews of approximately 30 minutes with each participant (principal, deputy principal, and head of department) will be scheduled. Documents such as the IQMS year plans, joint SMT/SDT minutes, Professional Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans, and summary of summative scores will be perused.

Confidentiality and anonymity of the participants will be considered and the schools' names in the study will not be disclosed. The information required from the participants and schools is to help the researcher in this study.

For more information, do not hesitate to contact my supervisor, Dr. Christina Amsterdam Department of Education Management and Policy Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria. Tel: 012 420 5513, Fax: 012 420 3581, Email address: christina.amsterdam@up.ac.za

Yours truly,

---

SG Nkambule (Mr)



# APPENDIX C PERMISSION LETTER FROM MPUMALANGA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## MPUMALANGA PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT

Building 5  
Government Boulevard  
Riverside Park  
NELSPRUIT  
1200  
Republic of South Africa



Private Bag X11341  
NELSPRUIT  
1200  
South Africa  
Tel. No.: (013) 766 5462  
Fax No.: (013) 766 5577

### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION *OFFICE OF THE HOD*

*Litiko letemfundo    Umnyango weFundo    Departement van Onderwys    Umnyango wezemfundo*

### INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

**TO :** MR JJ MABENA  
DIRECTOR: NKANGALA REGION

**FROM :** MR MR TYWAKADI  
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

**DATE :** 22 AUGUST 2008

**SUBJECT :** REQUEST TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

I refer to the attached.

- Permission is hereby granted for MR SG Nkambule to conduct research in Witbank 3 schools.
- Your office is requested to give him the necessary support for him to conduct the research.

Thank you,

  
MR MR TYWAKADI  
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

  
DATE

*All hands on deck: pioneering quality education and training for all*



## APPENDIX D

### APPLICATION LETTER TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN SCHOOLS



Enquiries: SG Nkambule  
0826877829

P.O. Box 6312  
Tasbetpark  
1040  
12 September 2009

Dear Principal

#### REQUEST TO CONDUCT A RESEARCH IN YOUR SCHOOL

I hereby request to conduct a research in your school on the topic:

#### **How School Management Teams View and Experience Implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System**

The purpose of the research is to explore how the SMTs view and experience implementation of the IQMS in primary schools. I request to conduct interviews with the principal, a deputy principal, and one head of department. I will also like to peruse the following documents: the IQMS year plan, joint SMT/SDT minutes, Professional Growth Plans and a School Improvement Plan, and summary of summative scores.

The participants are assured of their anonymity and the name of the school will not be mentioned in the study. A permission to conduct this study in your school has been granted by the Head of Department in the Mpumalanga Department of Education. A copy of the permission is attached for your reference.

Thanking you in advance.

---

S.G. Nkambule

## APPENDIX E LETTER OF CONSENT



Enquiries: SG Nkambule  
0826877829  
017 6830223

P.O. Box 6312  
Tasbetpark  
1040  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

TO: The Principal/ Deputy Principal/ HOD

### **RE: REQUEST FOR YOUR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCH PROJECT**

You are invited to participate in a research aimed at collecting information about views and experiences of the SMTs during implementation of IQMS in schools.

Your participation in this research project is purely on a voluntary basis. You will not be subjected to any risk or harm of any kind. You are not going to be required to respond to acts of deception or betrayal in the research process or its published outcomes. Your name and your school name will remain anonymous and will not be mentioned in research report. All the information to be gathered in this research will assist the researcher in this study. You will be free to withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice.

Title of research project: How School Management Teams View and Experience Implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System.

Purpose of the research: The purpose of this study is to explore views and experiences of School Management Teams (SMTs) during implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in primary schools in the Mpumalanga Province.

What is expected of you as a participant in the study? You are required to participate in an interview of approximately 30 minutes to be recorded in a tape recorder for accurate inscription of verbal interaction. Schools are requested to provide the researcher with documents such as the IQMS year plan, joint SMT/SDT minutes, Professional Growth Plans and a School Improvement Plan, and summary of summative scores.

Benefits: The SMT will benefit by critically evaluating their role during implementation of IQMS in schools. Participation in this study will increase the knowledge base of the participants in terms of IQMS.

## CONSENT FORM

I, Mr/Dr./Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ hereby voluntarily agree to participate in the research on “How School Management Teams View and Experience Implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System.”

I have read and fully understand the content of this consent letter and I hereby give my consent to participate in this study.

Name of Participant:.....

Signature of Participant:.....Date:.....

**Nkambule SG MEd (Leadership) student no: 26497086**  
**Contact no: 0826877829 or 0176830223**

**Supervisor: Dr C Amsterdam**  
**Contact no: 0124205513**



## APPENDIX F INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PRINCIPALS



1. How long have you been teaching and how long have you been a Principal?
2. What is your view (perception) of IQMS as a teacher appraisal system recently introduced in schools?
3. What are your roles and responsibilities during implementation of IQMS in the school?
4. How are you held accountable for implementing IQMS both as an individual and as a member of the SMTs/DSGs or SDTs?
5. How is IQMS integrated into the school programme in your school?
6. Do you think educators deserve the ratings they get in IQMS?
7. Would you regard IQMS as an effective teacher evaluation in schools?
8. How is the process of supporting and mentoring educators managed in your school?
9. What are the challenges of implementing IQMS in your school?

## APPENDIX G

### INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR DEPUTY PRINCIPALS



1. How long have you been a deputy principal?
2. What is your view (perception) of IQMS as a teacher appraisal system recently introduced in schools?
3. What are your roles and responsibilities during implementation of IQMS in the school?
4. How are you held accountable for implementing IQMS both as an individual and as a member of the SMTs/DSGs or SDTs?
5. How is IQMS integrated into the school programme in your school?
6. Do you think educators deserve the ratings they get in IQMS?
7. Would you regard IQMS as an effective teacher evaluation in schools?
8. How is the process of supporting and mentoring educators managed in your school?
9. What are the challenges of implementing IQMS in your school?

## APPENDIX H INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD OF DEPARTMENTS (HODs)



1. How long have you been an HOD?
2. What is your view (perception) of IQMS as a teacher appraisal system recently introduced in schools?
3. What are your roles and responsibilities during implementation of IQMS in the school?
4. How are you held accountable for implementing IQMS both as an individual and as a member of the SMTs/DSGs or SDTs?
5. How is IQMS integrated into the school programme in your school?
6. Do you think educators deserve the ratings they get in IQMS?
7. Would you regard IQMS as an effective teacher evaluation in schools?
8. How is the process of supporting and mentoring educators managed in your school?
9. What are the challenges of implementing IQMS in your school?