

**The Implementation of the Integrated Quality  
Management System as an Instrument of Performance  
Management in Lebowakgomo Circuit, Limpopo  
Province**

**MPA**

**TJ Letsoalo**

**2009**

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED  
QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AS AN  
INSTRUMENT OF PERFORMANCE  
MANAGEMENT**

**IN LEBOWAKGOMO CIRCUIT, LIMPOPO  
PROVINCE**

**BY**

**LETSOALO TSHIONE JAN**

**RESEARCH DISSERTATION**

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

**MASTERS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**IN THE FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCE AND LAW**

**AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO**

**SUPERVISOR: Prof M.J. Mafunisa**

**2009**

## **DECLARATION**

**I declare that the mini-dissertation hereby submitted to the University of Limpopo, for the degree of Masters of Public Administration in the Faculty of Management Science and Law has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other university; that it is my work in design and in execution, and that all material contained herein has been duly acknowledged.**

**TJ Letsoalo**

**09 March 2009**

**Student Number: 8903103**

**DEDICATION**

This study is dedicated to my late wife, Matshogane Anna and my son, Thabiso, for their unconditional love and support throughout my studies. At the height of my studies, matters were worse in my family as my wife was terminally ill with cancer until she passed away on 19 February 2007. Despite her illness, my wife gave me her unstinting love and encouragement.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I wish to acknowledge:

1. God who gave me the courage, hope, endurance and strength to persevere in my studies.
2. Professor M.J. Mafunisa for his diligent and unbroken supervision throughout my studies, for the patient encouragement and valuable assistance he rendered. Indeed, his insightful guidance made it possible for me to complete my study with ease.
3. Limpopo Department of Education, my employer, who granted me permission to conduct my research.
4. Lebowakgomo circuit manager and the educators under his jurisdiction who were most cooperative during the data collection process.

## ABSTRACT

*The democratic political breakthrough of 1994 in South Africa intensified debate on the delivery of quality public education among the teaching fraternity. This culminated in the promulgation of education legislation such as the South African Schools Act of 1996, the Education Employment Act of 1998 and finally the Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, which contains a section on the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). This was an attempt by the Department of Education to enhance the development of educators. The main purpose of the IQMS is to determine educators' competence, to assess their strengths and areas in need of further development.*

*What triggered the research was the fact that the Department of Education and teachers' unions were always at loggerheads regarding the implementation of the IQMS. This made the researcher investigate the feasibility, successes and shortcomings of the implementation of the IQMS. The researcher used questionnaires, interviews and a document study for the collection of data.*

*The results indicated that the purpose, aim and objectives as enshrined in the Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003 had not been realised in the implementation of the IQMS within Lebowakgomo circuit in Limpopo Province. Instead of being developed, educators were left demoralised and confused. The IQMS had lost its meaning in the sense that the monetary aspects were over-emphasized at the expense of the development aspects. The professional development of educators was ignored by the Department of Education, as it did not make in-service training or departmental support in any form available. The departmental officials never visited schools to effect the whole school evaluation required by Collective Agreement Number 8. Thus, educators simply completed the IQMS forms without proper evaluation just for the sake of the 1% salary increase. Lack of support by the Department of Education had indeed put the implementation of the IQMS in a crisis.*

*Finally, recommendations were made. The key recommendation was the amendment of Collective Agreement No. 8 of 2003 so that the Development Support Groups are restructured. Furthermore, the review should take on board a reduction of the instruments that make up the IQMS. This is an attempt to streamline the IQMS and make it user-friendly.*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS****CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**

|                                     |    |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| <b>1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY</b>  | 10 |
| <b>1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT</b>        | 11 |
| <b>1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS</b>       | 13 |
| <b>1.4 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY</b> | 13 |
| <b>1.5 AIM OF THE STUDY</b>         | 14 |
| <b>1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY</b>  | 15 |
| <b>1.7 DEMARCATION OF THE STUDY</b> | 15 |
| <b>1.8 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS</b>   | 16 |
| <b>1.9 SEQUENCE OF CHAPTERS</b>     | 16 |

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>2.1 INTRODUCTION</b>   | 19 |
| <b>2.2 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PERSPECTIVE ON PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</b>                | 19 |
| <b>2.3 THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FOR EDUCATORS</b>         | 29 |
| <b>2.4 ACHIEVEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS THROUGH PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</b> | 32 |
| <b>2.5 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS</b>   | 33 |
| <b>2.5.1 Launching the process</b>  | 33 |
| <b>2.5.2 Coaching and mentoring</b>   | 35 |
| <b>2.5.3 Methods of performance evaluation</b>  | 36 |
| <b><u>2.5.3.1</u> Self-evaluation</b>   | 37 |
| <b><u>2.5.3.2</u> Development support group</b>                                       | 38 |
| <b><u>2.5.3.3</u> Observation of educator in practice</b>                             | 38 |
| <b><u>2.5.3.4</u> Personal growth plan (PGP)</b>                                      | 39 |
| <b><u>2.5.3.5</u> School improvement plan (SIP)</b>                                   | 39 |
| <b><u>2.5.3.6</u> Computerised performance appraisals</b>                             | 39 |
| <b>2.6 CONCLUSION</b>   | 40 |



### CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| <b>3.1 INTRODUCTION</b>               | 41 |
| <b>3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN</b>            | 41 |
| <b>3.3 AREA OF STUDY</b>              | 43 |
| <b>3.4 POPULATION</b>                 | 43 |
| <b>3.5 SAMPLING METHODS</b>           | 43 |
| <b>3.6 DATA COLLECTION METHODS</b>    | 43 |
| <b>3.7 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES</b> | 45 |
| <b>3.8 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS</b>   | 46 |
| <b>3.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS</b>     | 46 |
| <b>3.10 CONCLUSION</b>                | 46 |

### CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS (RESULTS)

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>4.1 INTRODUCTION</b>  | 48 |
| <b>4.2 AREAS OF CONCERN REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQMS</b> | 48 |
| <b>4.3 EDUCATOR TRAINING ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQMS</b>       | 50 |
| <b>4.4 THE SUPPORT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICIALS</b>      | 52 |
| <b>4.5 THE ROLE PLAYED BY THE DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT GROUPS (DSGs)</b>  | 53 |
| <b>4.6 DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONAL GROWTH PLANS (PGPs)</b>               | 54 |
| <b>4.7 DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS (SIPs)</b>            | 54 |
| <b>4.8 THE IMPACT OF THE IQMS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF EDUCATORS</b>    | 55 |
| <b>4.9 CONCLUSION</b>  | 59 |

**CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>5.1 INTRODUCTION</b>  | 61 |
| <b>5.2 AREAS OF CONCERN REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQMS</b> | 61 |
| <b>5.3 EDUCATOR TRAINING ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQMS</b>       | 63 |
| <b>5.4 SUPPORT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICIALS</b>          | 64 |
| <b>5.5 DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT GROUPS</b>                                | 65 |
| <b>5.6 PERSONAL GROWTH PLANS</b>                                     | 67 |
| <b>5.7 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS</b>                                  | 67 |
| <b>5.8 CONCLUSIONS</b>   | 68 |
| <b>5.9 RECOMMENDATIONS</b>   | 69 |
| <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>  | 72 |
| <b>ANNEXURE A</b>  | 77 |
| <b>ANNEXURE B</b>  | 83 |
| <b>ANNEXURE C</b>  | 86 |

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY**

In order to enhance the delivery process of quality education in South African Schools, the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) was introduced. The Integrated Quality Management System is informed by schedule 1 of the Employment of Educators Act No. 76 of 1998. In terms of Resolution 8 of 2003 an agreement was reached in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) to integrate programmes which comprise of the Developmental Appraisal System (DAS), the Performance Measurement System (PMS) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE). The Integrated Quality Management System sought to amalgamate the DAS, PMS and WSE.

The tenets of the IQMS are underpinned by the purpose of quality management systems which are to determine competence, assess strengths and areas for further development, ensure continued growth, promote accountability and monitor the overall effectiveness of an institution

<http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:TzHQJFrFUScJ:www.topkinisis.com/conferen>).

In order to achieve this purpose, educators have to be empowered to be in a position to execute their duties effectively and efficiently. This could be done through the implementation of the crucial aspects of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) such as the Development Support Groups, Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans. Putting these tenets of the IQMS into effect would ensure effective educator development. It was envisaged that the empowered educators would be in a position to deliver quality public education.

This research investigated the manner in which the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) was implemented at public schools in Limpopo Province with special

reference to Lebowakgomo circuit as a performance management system. The research finally established that the use of performance-related pay in the public sector, particularly in public schools as a means to motivate staff, usually resulted in corrupt tendencies such as favouritism, awarding high, undeserved scores, and fraud. The research further revealed that schools in Lebowakgomo Circuit failed to implement core components of the Integrated Quality Management System. Failure to put into effect significant aspects of the Integrated Quality Management System such as the Development Support Groups, Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans had indeed landed the whole implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System in an unmanageable crisis.

## **1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT**

One of the most challenging aspects of education management is the development and evaluation of educators for pay progression, i.e. the implementation of performance-related pay. Before the democratic dispensation in 1994, there was a system of inspection that was rejected by unions and educators as a form of witch-hunt. Teacher unions (the South African Democratic Teachers' Union in particular) demanded an evaluation system which was democratic, fair and transparent (Education Labour Relations Council, 1998). Negotiations ultimately resulted in the signing of Resolution No.8 of 2003, which contains a section on the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). This is an attempt to provide quality education to South African learners. There is a belief that the IQMS will improve educators' morale, dedication and diligence by providing them with pay progression and development.

The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is the new instrument to evaluate and measure the performance of educators. Its implementation started formally in 2004. In the past, there had been no formal instrument to appraise educators for development purposes and to evaluate them for salary progression. Lack of an instrument to evaluate educators might have contributed towards unsatisfactory results in learner achievement.

The question therefore arose as to how to support and cultivate effective teachers for all schools and all children

([www.pmg.org.za/docs/2006/060620iqms.htm](http://www.pmg.org.za/docs/2006/060620iqms.htm)).

The challenges and successes regarding implementation vary from province to province. Provinces such as Limpopo and Eastern Cape were seriously hampered on account of lack of capacity and the number of teachers that needed to be trained ([www.pmg.org.za/docs/2006/060620iqms.htm](http://www.pmg.org.za/docs/2006/060620iqms.htm)).

In a Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) weekly dated 07 October 2005, the president, Willie Madisha, states that they are witnessing a narrow vision of the provincial departments of education in relation to the implementation of the IQMS. According to Madisha, the IQMS was meant to drive the professional development of our educators, but this aspect is being ignored. Madisha further says that the South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU) made the argument a decade ago that there could be no meaningful assessment of educators without a corresponding programme for their development

(<http://www.cosatu.org.za/news/weekly/20051007.htm>).

In 2005, SADTU declared a dispute regarding the poor implementation of the IQMS by the Department of Education. The dispute, which dated back to 2005, went to arbitration during April 2006. The problem arose out of the failure of the provincial departments to implement the IQMS, and renegeing on agreements regarding salary progression. There was an uneven implementation of the IQMS across provinces. By then only five out of nine provinces had paid teachers their pay progression, but not necessarily to all categories of teachers

([http://www.sadtu.org.za/index.php?option=com\\_content&id=186&Itemid...](http://www.sadtu.org.za/index.php?option=com_content&id=186&Itemid...)).

All these issues aroused the researcher's interest regarding the feasibility of the IQMS, its successes and shortcomings.

The research problem was thus centred on determining the feasibility, successes and shortcomings of the implementation of the IQMS as an instrument of performance management for educators, i.e., whether the IQMS was managed in such a way that educators were motivated and empowered in respect of the acquisition of skills, knowledge and competence. What triggered this problem was the current tension between the Minister of Education, Ms Naledi Pandor, and teachers' unions about the implementation of the IQMS. At the heart of the fall-out between the unions and the Department of Education (DOE) was the 1% salary increment, which teachers should have received after they had been appraised. The Department of Education (DOE) refused to effect the increase because provinces such as Limpopo and Eastern Cape had failed to carry out the evaluation obligation. The unions argued that failure by the DOE to assess teachers could not be used as an excuse to deny teachers their salary increase (Mohlala, 2006:1). The president of the National Professional Teachers' Organization of South Africa (NAPTOSA), Dave Balt, states that there is little evidence that provincial departments have been able to provide the kind of training required in terms of the IQMS ([www.mg.co.za/articlePage.aspx?articleid=281661&area=/the teacher/teacher...](http://www.mg.co.za/articlePage.aspx?articleid=281661&area=/the%20teacher/teacher...)). The Secretary-General of the South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU), Thulas Nxesi, further highlighted the problem when he called for a review of the IQMS to see whether it needed to be streamlined, delinked from pay progression and what problems there were with implementation (Mohlala, 2006:2). Accordingly, this problem statement guided and directed both the planning of the research and the research itself (Brynard & Hanekom, 1997:15).

### **1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The following were the research questions for this study:

- Are educators empowered, motivated and trained for the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)?

- Does the Development Appraisal (DA) help educators to determine their areas of strength and weakness?
- Does the Whole School Evaluation lead to the overall effectiveness and efficiency of a school and educators?

#### **1.4 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY**

This research was significant in the sense that it described the importance and effectiveness of the IQMS in evaluating the performance of educators. It further exposed areas of weakness in implementing the IQMS. It ultimately recommended possible ways of improving the performance of educators in line with the IQMS. The recommendations, if considered by the Department of Education, could go a long way towards helping to streamline the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. The research recommendations addressed the shortcomings and strengths in respect of the implementation of the IQMS for the improvement of educators' performance. Hence, the research report might serve as a guide for the effective and efficient implementation of the IQMS.

The research shed light on whether educators understood performance standards and assessment criteria. It further established whether development programmes such as the Personnel Growth Plan and School Improvement Plans were implemented fairly for salary progression, grade progression, affirmation of appointments and rewards and incentives. All these indicated whether Development Support Groups (DSGs) were competent enough to provide the required support and mentoring. It was further clearly indicated whether educators accepted the IQMS as a vital instrument to measure their performance.

Moreover, the research helped to determine whether the Department of Education gave educators enough support in respect of the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. Furthermore, the research assisted with checking whether the Department of Education ever sent departmental officials to monitor the implementation

of Whole School Evaluation. Lack of support on the part of the Department of Education officials had a detrimental effect on the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System.

The research further shed light on the feasibility of applying performance-related pay in the public sector, with special reference to the school situation. It demonstrated the challenges pertaining to the resultant corrupt tendencies that usually go hand in hand with performance-related pay. The report recommended ways in which to deal with these corrupt practices. The research was indeed significant in the sense that it exposed that where money is involved, other crucial areas such as developmental aspects are usually neglected, while much focus is placed on the acquisition of money.

### **1.5 AIM OF THE STUDY**

The aim of the study was to establish whether performance management through the IQMS could assist educators to improve their skills and competence so that they would be able to deliver quality public education. The effectiveness of the IQMS in improving the performance of educators was evaluated and described. This aim guided the whole study to the effect that it was ultimately evaluated whether this aim was realised or not.

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- to check whether educators were able to evaluate themselves and identify their strengths and weaknesses;
- to establish whether educators were able to draw up their own Personal Growth Plan (PGP);
- to determine whether such Personal Growth Plans were used effectively for the compilation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP);
- to establish whether the development programmes derived from the SIP were



implemented effectively and efficiently;

- to check whether educators were given support and opportunities for development to assure continued growth.

## **1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

The shortcoming of the study was that some Lebowakgomo principals were reluctant to reveal the problems they experienced with regard to the implementation of the IQMS. This was because it affected the areas of performance in which they were workshopped for implementation. Some principals and educators painted a picture of everything going smoothly while hiding critical weaknesses. In addition, some educators at certain schools did not take the Integrated Quality Management System seriously, so that asking them questions pertaining to the IQMS became a boring exercise. That was why some educators simply responded that the IQMS was just a futile and useless exercise. For this reason, they did not go into it any deeper to give relevant information.

## **1.7 DEMARCATION OF THE STUDY**

The study was limited to Lebowakgomo Circuit which is located in Limpopo Department of Education. Lebowakgomo circuit is situated at Lebowakgomo township which is 52 km south-east of Polokwane. Polokwane is the capital city of Limpopo Province. Limpopo province is the 7<sup>th</sup> province and is found in the northern part of South Africa near the Limpopo River, after which the province is named. Only schools within Lebowakgomo Circuit were sampled.

## **1.8 DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS**

The following concepts are defined to establish a common ground for the discussion of the Integrated Quality Management System:

- 1.8.1 The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) is a combination of Development Appraisal (DA), Performance Measurement (PM) and Whole School Evaluation (WSE) (Education Labour Relations Council, 1998:2).
- 1.8.2 Performance management is a method that managers use in government to assess progress towards achievement of predetermined, results-oriented goals (Starling, 2002:396). According to Spangenberg (1994:14), performance management is thus a set of techniques used by a manager to plan, direct and improve the performance of subordinates in line with achieving the overall objectives of the organization. Performance management comprises the management of all performance-related activities within the organization, of which performance appraisal is only one of those activities (Fisher, Miller, Katz & Thatcher, 2003:74).

## **1.9 SEQUENCE OF CHAPTERS**

Chapter one deals with the introduction of the study. A background to the study was given. The background related how the Integrated Quality Management System originated. The tenets of the Integrated Quality Management System were clarified. The problem statement was also unpacked in chapter one. The problem of evaluating educators' performance before the democratic dispensation in 1994 until the introduction of the Integrated Quality Management System in 2004 was highlighted. The tensions between the Department of Education and the teachers' unions were exposed. Three critical research questions for the study were asked in chapter one. These questions remained the points of reference throughout the study. Motivation for the study, its aim, limitation and demarcation of the study were also extensively elaborated upon in chapter one.

An extensive literature review is done in chapter two. Reviewing the accumulated knowledge about the question was actually the first step in the research process. Neuman (2006:110) argues that it is best to find out what is already known about the question before trying to answer it. In trying to find out what was already known, the public administration perspective on performance management was the first issue to be unpacked. This was done by defining public administration in relation to performance management. Thereafter, the historical development of performance management for educators in South Africa was unfolded. This covered the history of performance management for educators during the apartheid government until the new democratic dispensation. The discussion of literature was concluded with the elaboration of the aspects of performance management as outlined in Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003

Chapter three deals with research methodology. The research design chosen was explained first. The qualitative research design was used. This approach aims at understanding social life and the meaning that people attach to everyday life. This meant that the educators' accounts of their understanding, experience and perceptions regarding the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) were considered and evaluated. The values and beliefs they attached to the IQMS were taken into account. The area of study, population and sampling methods were also reflected upon. The data collection methods that were used included interviews, questionnaires and document study.

Chapter four deals with a detailed analysis of the collected data. Educators' concerns regarding the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System were highlighted. Another critical area that was analysed was the issue concerning educator training on the implementation of the IQMS. It was further checked whether the departmental officials gave educators enough support. Finally, the manner in which aspects of the Integrated Quality Management System such as the Development Support groups, Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans were put into effect was extensively analysed.

Chapter five contains the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Findings were based on similar issues analysed in chapter four. These issues ranged from the concerns expressed by educators, educator training, departmental support and the basic elements of the Integrated Quality Management System mentioned in chapter four. Conclusions and recommendations emanating from the findings were then made. This brought the research report to its closure.

## **1.10 CONCLUSION**

It has become evident that it is imperative for Integrated Quality Management System to be implemented in order to empower educators to be in a position to execute their duties effectively and efficiently. It has emerged that this could be done through the implementation of significant aspects of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) such as the Development Support Groups, Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans. If schools could be empowered to put these tenets of the IQMS into effect, the effective educator development would unfold with ease. The empowered educators would be in a position to deliver quality public education.

The research has also unpacked how to deal with the resultant corrupt tendencies that usually occur during the implementation of performance management system at public institutions. The challenges of implementing performance related pay in the public sector were also highlighted. It has further emerged that instead of putting much emphasis on educator development, great focus was placed on the acquisition of one percent salary increment during the implementation of IQMS. Furthermore, it has become incumbent upon the Department of Education to put aside more funds and sufficient time for educator training. Finally, recommendations given at the end of this report could, if considered by the Department of Education, assist in streamlining the implementation of the IQMS and making it more user-friendly.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

It was imperative to discuss the theoretical framework within which the research was located. This was done by attempting to explain what public administration is and also by describing what aspects of public administration were looked at in the research. The crucial concepts of efficiency, effectiveness and economy were analysed and their impact on the performance of employees was also looked at. The inherent difficulties of measuring and reporting on efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness were unpacked. Furthermore, the use of standards to motivate personnel to perform better was discussed. Another crucial aspect was to analyse the positions of different authors on the difficulties of measuring performance in the public sector as compared to the private sector.

Moreover, the historical development of performance management in the education sector unfolded. What happened during the apartheid government in respect of performance management for educators up to the democratic dispensation was discussed in detail. Finally, aspects of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) were discussed, thus giving direction as to what was actually to be researched. The literature review ultimately served as a basis for further research. The issues alluded to above were discussed as follows:

#### **2.2 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PERSPECTIVE ON PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT**

Rosenbloom (1989:4) says public administration is the action part of government, the means by which the purposes and goals of government are realized. According to Rosenbloom (1989:3-4), public administration involves the formulation and implementation of public policies intended to provide services. Hanekom and Thornhill (1983:125) say that the immediate object to be achieved through public administration is the most efficient utilization of resources at the disposal of officials and employees. Apart

from maintaining peace and order, the ultimate aim of the state is to promote the general welfare of the community. Nigro and Nigro (1984:3-11) say that public administration is a government instrument for dealing with general societal problems. It covers all three branches, *viz.* legislative, executive and judicial branches and their interrelatedness.

Cloete (1977:58) states that the administrative process consists of policy-making, organizing, financing, the provision and utilization of personnel, the determination of work procedures and the exercise of control, *i.e.* checking and rendering account. Hanekom and Thornhill (1986:18) indicate that these administrative functions are interdependent. They cannot be divorced from each other. For instance, organizing cannot take place independently of policy making or financing, because implicit in policy-making are organizing and financing. Coetzee (1988:12) highlights the mutual interdependence of the administrative functions by indicating that to determine a policy it is necessary to have a fixed procedure, and to review a procedure it is necessary to have a clear policy to work on. These functions are performed in government institutions and are aimed at goal realization.

The focus of the research paper was on personnel utilization which falls within human resource management. Cloete (1977:129) says personnel utilization embraces training on the job, the allocation of specific functions, supervision, and the evaluation of personnel for the purposes of training and promotion, the counselling of personnel members to solve personal problems or to encourage them to develop themselves, the creation of an esprit de corps and the elimination of friction between employees or groups. Thus, the Integrated Quality Management System focuses on the evaluation of personnel for the purpose of training, pay progression and grade progression. This is a way of trying to realize Cloete's (1977:152) assertion that training is a means to utilize personnel optimally. Training opportunities need to correspond with the actual individual needs of the personnel. According to Cloete (1977:160), training is of paramount importance for the proper utilization of personnel.

A fundamental requirement of personnel administration is that every worker should be utilized to his/her full capacity. To meet this requirement, evaluation of the performance

of the individual must be undertaken continuously. In the case of the IQMS, evaluation of educators' performance takes place throughout the year. Performance evaluation, also known as merit rating, must contribute to the maintenance and even improvement of the effectiveness of the workforce. It must provide for the fair treatment of workers by keeping their remuneration and promotion in line with their performance. If workers are treated fairly their morale will remain high. The aim should always be to obtain a method by means of which the merit of workers can be determined and reported on (Cloete, 1997:134).

Minnaar and Bekker (2005:128) indicate that performance management is based on the theory of management by objective, a management process originating from the strategic management process. Performance management is predominantly used to implement the strategies identified during the strategic planning process. According to Minnaar and Bekker (2005:129), performance management may be regarded as a natural extension of the strategic management process and cannot be separated from it.

Cloete (1998:242) argues that continuous evaluation or appraisal of the conduct and effectiveness of personnel is essential. Each central personnel institution usually institutes a system of evaluation that must be applied by all institutions within its area of jurisdiction. In practice, the various supervisors apply the evaluation system. They have to record their findings in writing and submit their reports on their respective subordinates in the first instance to their own supervisors and finally to the top official of the executive institution or even to the central personnel institution. According to Cloete (1998:242), evaluation of public officials is done for the purpose of special or routine salary adjustments, promotion, reassignment, training and dismissal. This is the case with the Integrated Quality Management System in terms of which educators are evaluated mainly for salary progression and professional development.

On the other hand, Minnaar and Bekker (2005:127) allude to the fact that the concepts of efficiency, effectiveness and economy lie at the heart of organizational performance in the government sector. Combined in an integrated perspective, they deliver value for money. Economy refers to the resources required to render services and execute the

mandate of the organization. In order to achieve economy, these resources must be obtained and utilized as inexpensively as possible, with the precondition that they comply with acceptable quantity and quality benchmarks. Efficiency refers to the relationship between the cost and the expedience of transforming input into output. The cost and quality of the management process is a major consideration in this regard. Effectiveness relates to goal achievement, that is, whether the goals and objectives have been achieved within the limitation of allocated resources; and if so, how much value has been created in the process. Hence, the concepts of economy, efficiency and effectiveness are directly related to a cost/benefit assessment. It would be seen whether the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System would indeed take these concepts into account.

Pauw, Woods, Van der Linde, Fourie and Visser (2002:139) argue that given the inherent difficulties in measuring and reporting on efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness, strong political support is needed to support the implementation of performance measurement and management. For instance, accounting officers have to enter into performance agreements with ministers. Accounting officers and other public servants should have clearly defined responsibilities for resources committed and outputs produced. Accounting officers have to be empowered to determine and obtain resources required to deliver on agreed outputs. There must also be incentives to ensure improved efficiency and effectiveness and there must also be sound risk management. Regarding the IQMS, it should still be checked whether educators are given professional and political support from bureaucrats and the Member of the Executive Council (MEC).

Van der Waldt and Du Toit (2005:203) state that with regard to government institutions, standards should be expressed quantifiably in terms of productivity, effectiveness and cost-effectiveness wherever practical. Standards can be used to motivate personnel to perform better or can serve as a norm for measuring actual performance. Personnel affected by the standards must accept them and consider them to be achievable. This means that the objectives should be acceptable to those who are expected to produce the results and those who expect the results. Furthermore, measures should coincide logically with the institution's objectives and focus on critical points to contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the institution. The actual performance must then be



compared with standards and any deviation be calculated to determine whether the process is under control. For example, income statements in the form of management reports usually include columns for budgeted results, actual results and deviations. After the examination of these results, corrective actions have to be taken to rectify any deviation from the original plan. Corrective action can also mean an alteration of the plan, although this is only done if the original plan or standards were clearly incorrect. Van der Waldt and Du Toit (2005:204) finally conclude that those being evaluated should receive regular feedback on the results of their efforts, among other things, to enable them to determine their progress. Income statements, absentee reports and production reports, inter alia, can be used to determine progress. What went wrong may be rectified.

Starling (2002:396) states that performance measurement is a method that managers use in government to assess progress towards the achievement of predetermined, results-oriented goals. Performance measures should be related directly to the organization's mission and used to determine areas where improvement can be made. Performance measures are used to measure productivity and success in meeting customers' needs. It goes without saying that 'what gets measured gets managed'. Thus measuring educators' performance would put the Department of Education in a position to manage educators effectively.

Minnaar and Bekker (2005:125) argue that performance must be measured in terms of the benefits produced for the clients. In order to achieve this, goals and objectives must be SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound). This creates a situation where the assessor knows exactly what the organization intends to achieve, how much, of what quality and by when. Satisfactory performance implies this; poor performance implies negative deviation. This kind of management has to be carried out at every stage and phase of the strategic management process, linking strategies to key performance indicators. Hence, goals and objectives must be linked to outcomes, which then become the key performance indicators of what the organization wishes to achieve. Outcomes are indicators of the measures of value created in, or added to the management environment. In the public sector context indicators of positive outcomes are often linked

directly to government policy, because these policies are also the key determinants of the mandate of the specific organization.

Activities are linked to outputs, and relate to physical products of the actual tasks or activities performed to add value, that is, to achieve goals and objectives. These outputs represent the key performance indicators for action plans. Thus, organizations are engaged in ongoing activities to realise predetermined goals and objectives. Achieving the results represents a measure of the value that has been created or added through the process. The ultimate test of performance would be whether the benefits gained from the investment outweigh the cost of that investment (Minnaar & Bekker, 2005:125). This is just an indication of the link and interrelationship between performance management and strategic management. In the case of the Integrated Quality Management System, the performance of educators is supposed to be evaluated in such a way that the policies of the Department of Education and of schools are ultimately realised. Such policies enshrine the goals and objectives to be achieved, hence a step towards realising the strategic plans of schools.

Hughes (2003:151) argues that the absence of performance management can also lead to other personnel problems. For instance, a clique of like-minded managers may develop and hire or promote those of their own kind. These may be, for example, all males from a particular religious or social sect. This means that the absence of performance management may spark discrimination. Hughes (2003:151-152) further argues that a system of promotion by seniority is an acknowledgement either that performance cannot be measured or that everyone has equal performance in administrative tasks. The public workforce using the practice of seniority would hardly be a model of efficiency. The results would be that the personnel system has failed to attract the right people to government service or promote the most able. It will be similarly difficult to provide an appropriate reward structure or to remove people who are not performing. In terms of the Integrated Quality Management System, those educators who perform well are given one percent salary progression in a year.

Performance management is instrumental ensuring that good performers are identified and it helps to remove those who are not performing. Both performance appraisal and performance pay are an attempt to introduce the incentives common in the private sector into the public sector, in order to provide some tangible reward to the able. This will improve quality (Hughes, 2003:153). The Integrated Quality Management System is mainly developmental in nature. It is not intended to remove those whose performance is below par, but aims at developing them. Holmes and Shand (1995:563) state that performance management is a worthwhile exercise as it can provide improved information relevant to decision-making. It can usefully inform the budget process. It can also provide useful accountability information for public debate. It can thus contribute to greater transparency in government, a major factor in improving performance. Thus, the IQMS can help determine the budget for the training of educators in order to improve their performance.

According to Armstrong and Murlis (1988:157), performance management is about getting better results through people. It consists of a range of activities, the primary aim of which is to help managers to get improved performance from their staff, who will be rewarded accordingly. It is concerned with the development of potential so that people are capable of taking on greater responsibilities and thus of earning even higher rewards.

Cheminais, Bayat, Van der Waldt and Fox (1998:162) state that performance management is a shared process between managers, individuals, and the teams that they manage. Performance management is based on the agreement of objectives, knowledge, skill, and competence requirement and work and development plans. It involves the joint and continuing review of performance against these objectives, requirements and plans, and the implementation of improvement and further development plans. For instance, with the IQMS, educators have to develop their Personal Growth Plans, which would be used to develop the School Improvement Plans (SIP). The SIP must contain the development plans for the whole school.

According to Armstrong and Murlis (1988:157), performance management is a lever for achieving cultural and behavioural change and a means of empowering people by giving

them more control over their work and their performance development. It provides the basis for performance-related pay. It thus lays the basis for incentives such as recognition, status and opportunities for advancement. Cheminai *et al.* (1998: 163) argue that the increased use of performance-related pay in the public sector is essentially aimed at motivating staff by rewarding performance in the hope that they will be able to deal with the recruitment and retention problems experienced due to competition for staff from the private sector. With the IQMS, much emphasis is placed on improving the performance of educators and giving them one percent salary progression.

Armstrong (1994:28) states that performance management can provide the following potential benefits to the public sector:

- greater clarity of role and objectives;
- encouragement and support to perform well;
- provision of guidance and help in developing abilities and potential;
- an objective and fair basis for assessing performance;
- the opportunity to be involved in the process with advanced information; and
- time for preparation.

These benefits assist in the process of motivating public employees towards the improvement of service delivery, ultimately contributing towards the promotion of the general welfare. All these potential benefits are in line with Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, which contains a section on the IQMS. However, it will still be seen whether these benefits will be realised during the IQMS implementation.

Hughes (2003:157-159) further acknowledges that there are difficulties in measuring performance in the public sector when compared to the private sector. Firstly, individual public servants may see the use of indicators of appraisal as a threat, but it can be an opportunity of pointing to good practices and good performance, both of which may be rewarded. Secondly, there is little point in setting clear objectives, or funding programmes accordingly, unless there is some means by which progress towards

objectives is monitored. Another problem has been the idea of providing incentives by means of extra pay. Hughes (2003:161) states that even if performance pay is a good idea in the abstract, it has been hard to implement in a fair and reasonable way. It could be used to reward the favourites and may cause resentment in those who consider themselves worthy of extra reward but do not get anything. Finally, the problem of unfairness is still a critical issue in performance management in respect of the public sector.

Pauw *et al.* (2002:141), in comparing performance management in the private sector and the public sector, state that in the private sector money is the end or aim as well as the means. Money is thus an input and an output of the business process. Companies put money into business in order to make money out of business, while using money to run business. Money provides both the norm and the standard for performance measurement. The norm is the aspect or thing that people take into account when measuring success. The standard is the amount that is expected. In terms of the Integrated Quality Management System, performance standard and criteria are used to measure educators' performance. In government institutions, money is generally the means rather than the end. For instance, the legislature puts money into a public service institution not to receive money back, but to achieve other ends, i.e. service delivery. For instance, the Integrated Quality Management System would mainly serve to deliver quality public education. These are things that must be measured in non-monetary terms. Government departments are not in the business of making money.

Pauw *et al.* (2002:142) highlight that in order to measure performance, performance indicators must be established. Performance indicators consist of something measured, i.e. quantity and quality. For instance, the Department of Transport can measure the number of kilometres of roads graded and the quality of the roads. The Department of Home Affairs may measure the number of passports issued and in terms of quality, the Department may calculate the number of passports with serious mistakes.

Hughes (2003:161-163) has cited other problems in the implementation of performance measurement in the public sector. Firstly, it is difficult to design adequate measurements

of performance. There are also problems in implementing the designed performance measurement instruments. A pattern seems to occur in which performance measurement instruments are initially both opposed and poorly conceived. It is again difficult to design a system that provides reliable comparisons and is accepted by those involved. In many parts of the public service, it is difficult to compare the performance of individual people in a fair and comprehensive way. The morale problem also has a negative impact on performance management. Demoralized workers are obviously less effective. Some public servants are less enthusiastic about the new development regarding performance management. Some might feel comfortable with the old administration. The new system may be more rewarding for those who are capable but less comfortable for those who enjoy the easy way. Some public servants also profess to be concerned about the disruption that changes inevitably bring. Hence, improving overall performance requires attention being paid to the problem of morale. It will be seen whether the IQMS was able to address the problem of morale and the negative attitude of educators towards change.

According to Van der Waldt and Du Toit (2005:204), it is useful to know beyond all doubt when an institution is succeeding. Managers have to determine predictors of results. Early warning signs are needed to determine which events signify improvements or a worsening situation. Early warning signs may include the following:

- Input measurements: for example material, human resources and time required for service. Changes in economic conditions can indicate a future change in the demand for services.
- Results of early steps: evaluate the project to date. This may indicate possible trends in the future.
- Change in assumed conditions: changing conditions can cause a deviation from the expected results. All changes should force management to re-

evaluate methods and objectives.

Hence, performance management helps public servants to determine whether results have been achieved. Hughes (2003:161) asserts that it is very difficult for public managers to achieve results if they are to follow the same detailed procedures as in the bureaucratic model. The freedom of management to act needs to be meaningful, but no one can escape verification after the fact that results have been achieved.

Emphasis should not only be on indicators of overall progress towards objectives or the achievement of financial targets, but also on indicators of customer or client satisfaction or the speed and level of service delivery. Indicators should aim at measuring effectiveness and quality (Flynn, 1997:170-85). All these will help to determine whether the IQMS can help to deliver quality public education.

### **2.3 THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FOR EDUCATORS**

The breakdown of the inspectorate and subject advisory services in the majority of schools in South Africa caused the Department and the unions to think about new ways of managing the performance of educators. Between 1985 and 1990 it became almost impossible for school inspectors and subject advisors to go into schools. The inspectors were driven out because they adopted a judgmental approach. They came to schools with the assumption that educators' performance needed to be judged.

In terms of the judgmental approach, there was a general tendency to find fault, to be negative in reports that were written and not to acknowledge the positive things that educators did. Also of significance in the judgmental approach was the tendency not to involve the person being judged. This rested on the belief that people left to themselves were not likely to give a critical assessment of their own performance. They tended to point only to the positive and not to the negative aspects of their performance. Teachers saw this judgmental approach as equivalent to 'policing educators' performance'. A summative form of evaluation tends to use the judgmental approach. The summative form of evaluation looks at what educators do to achieve what is required of them. In this

way, educators are inspected and their performance tends to be quantitatively evaluated by focusing on aspects of teaching and learning that can be counted (South African Democratic Teachers' Union, 1999: 11).

Within the organized teaching profession, the need was felt to develop an appraisal instrument that would be acceptable to all stakeholders and would enhance the development of competency of educators and the quality of public education in South Africa. Through negotiation, research and piloting of various proposals in which teacher unions participated, a document which represented the good faith which existed between the various stakeholders, and embraced the democratization that is prevalent in education in South Africa today, was finalized (South African Democratic Teachers' Union, 1999:7).

Once the pilots were concluded, further discussions and negotiations around the new appraisal system took place in the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) in which teachers' unions, provincial departments and the National Department of Education were involved. On 28 July 1998, a final agreement was reached within the ELRC on the implementation of the new developmental appraisal system. This agreement is reflected in Resolution Number 4 of 1998. The Development Appraisal System was introduced during the tenure of Sibusiso Bengu as the first Minister of Education in the democratic South Africa (Mohlala, 2006:2). It was agreed that the instrument to be implemented had to be developmental in nature and would be conducted at all levels of personnel within education, in and outside of schools, excluding education therapists and psychologists. It adopted a developmental approach in that the appraisal system, aimed essentially at acknowledging the positive aspects of educators' performance. It rests on the belief that nobody is just full of faults. Assessment of educators' performance therefore also needs to note the good things that educators do. Hence, the developmental approach uses the formative form of evaluation that is qualitatively framed and emphasises the process rather than the product.

The appraisal of educators within the developmental approach seeks to build on the strengths that educators have. It also provides ways in which negative aspects may be



responded to in a developmental way on the basis of the strengths that exist. The person being appraised is part of the appraisal process and thus contributes to decisions about his/her performance and ways in which it may be improved. Instead of blaming the educator in a faultfinding way, the developmental approach tries to find ways in which such negative aspects may be responded to within developmental programmes that will enable the educator to improve his/her performance (SADTU, 1999:11-12). Schultz and Schultz (1994, in Fisher, Miller, Katz & Thatcher, 2003:73) say that the frequent appraisal of employee performance is vital, not only for the continued growth of the organization, but also for the employees' own development.

It was further agreed that the appraisal would be tied to the nature of job descriptions of the specific level of post to which a person is attached (Education Labour Relations Council, 1998:24). In terms of the Education Labour Relations Council (ELRC) Resolution Number 4, the new appraisal system was supposed to be implemented in 1999 and be reviewed in April 2000. However, the Department of Education did not implement ELRC Resolution Number 4 containing the new appraisal system until the introduction of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) in 2003 in terms of Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003 (ELRC, 2003:3). The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) also contains the Whole School Evaluation instrument introduced by the second Minister of Education in the democratic South Africa, Kader Asmal (Mohlala, 2006:2). The implementation of the IQMS formally started in 2004.

In terms of the IQMS all teachers have to be evaluated on a yearly basis with those deemed to have performed satisfactorily receiving an additional one percent pay increase on top of the increases agreed to in normal bargaining processes. In 2006 the South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU) said that labour had declared a dispute over the one percent pay increase the Department of Education (DOE) had refused to pay to all teachers. SADTU's chief negotiator, Fikile Hugo, argued that because the DOE had not implemented the system properly in 2005, all teachers should automatically qualify for pay progression. The president of the National Professional Teachers' Organization of South Africa (NAPTOSA), Dave Balt, supported Hugo that because the DOE had not

properly assessed and evaluated teachers, all teachers should automatically receive an additional one percent which was in terms of ELRC Resolution 8 containing the IQMS

([www.fin24.co.za/articles/business/display\\_article.aspx?Nav=ns&1v12=buss&Ar...](http://www.fin24.co.za/articles/business/display_article.aspx?Nav=ns&1v12=buss&Ar...)).

The Deputy Director-General of the Department of Education, Firoz Patel, stated that the arbitration system had to determine whose fault it was that the evaluation of teachers had not been completed on time, but the Department of Education (DOE) still disputed that all teachers should be paid an additional one percent, even those whose performance was below par (Kgosana, 2006:1). All these arguments indicate the tensions prevalent between the DOE and the teachers' unions on the implementation of the IQMS. The issue in question here is the effective implementation of the IQMS for efficient performance of educators. The deputy president of SADTU, Thobile Ntola, stated at the World Teachers' Day on 5 October 2006 that the success of the IQMS was threatened by the lack of support and commitment by the provincial departments of education. He further stated that the implementation of the IQMS appeared to be in crisis. Ntola called on the DOE to dedicate resources and support to the implementation of the IQMS

([www.sadtu.org.za/idex.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=284&Itemid...](http://www.sadtu.org.za/idex.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=284&Itemid...)).

In her address at the SADTU conference on Friday 1 September 2006, the Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, acknowledged that the IQMS contained too many tools that did not work together in a coordinated manner. 'They have the propensity to confuse the system rather than to enhance the quality of teaching', the minister stated ([www.sadtu.org.za/idex.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=290&Itemid...](http://www.sadtu.org.za/idex.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=290&Itemid...)). This is a clear indication that the implementation of the IQMS is in crisis. The then president of the Democratic Alliance (DA), Tony Leon, stated that Minister Pandor had had running battles with teachers' unions, SADTU in particular, over the implementation of the IQMS. Although the minister had previously expressed the hope that successful implementation of the IQMS would help to identify specific needs of educators, schools and district offices for support and development, the minister appeared to be lacking

capacity to ensure efficient implementation of the IQMS ([www.iol.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_South+Africa&set\\_id=1&click\\_id=&art\\_id...](http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?from=rss_South+Africa&set_id=1&click_id=&art_id...)).

## **2.4 ACHIEVEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS THROUGH PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT**

Few employees enjoy being tested or evaluated, few welcome criticism, and most react with hostility to the idea of performance appraisal. The total management of employee performance, when handled properly, should thus be a welcome alternative to merely measuring an employee's actions. When performance management systems are tied into the objectives of the organization, the resulting performance is likely to meet organizational needs. They also present a more holistic view of performance. Development of performance management should be a joint effort between line and human resource management (Nel, Gerber, Van Dyk, Haasbroek, Schultz, Sono & Werner, 2001:516).

Nowadays unions are involved in the development of performance management systems, particularly in the South African context. For instance, the IQMS is a joint venture between the unions and the employer, *viz.* the Department of Education. Lundy and Cowling (1996:306) say that subordinates should play an active role in the management of their performance as a whole. In the case of the IQMS, an educator must first evaluate him/herself before identifying a development support group consisting of a peer and an education specialist. A peer and education specialist will evaluate him/her according to prescribed performance standards and assessment criteria (ELRC, 2003: 22).

There are generally three major purposes of performance management. It is a process for strategy implementation; it is a vehicle for culture change; and it provides input to other human resources systems, such as development and remuneration. For these purposes to be realized a vision of objectives should be communicated to all employees and departmental and individual performance should be set within wider objectives. A formal

review of progress towards targets should be conducted and the whole process should be evaluated to improve effectiveness (Nel *et al.*, 2001:516-517).

Performance management is a set of techniques used by a manager to plan, direct and improve the performance of subordinates in line with achieving the overall objectives of the organization. Typical performance management systems consist of four stages: performance planning (setting goals in terms of the business plan and developing action plans); managing performance through activities such as coaching and providing assistance; reviewing performance formally and informally; and rewarding performance (Spangenberg, 1994:14). Hence, the Integrated Quality Management System is designed in a similar way as alluded to by Spangenberg.

## **2.5 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS**

The aspects of performance management process are identified and discussed in the paragraphs below.

### **2.5.1 Launching the process**

Advocacy must address issues relating to the purpose of the three programmes, the objectives and outcomes of Development Appraisal, Performance Measurement, and Whole School Evaluation. The focus should be on quality education for all, transformation and the advantages for educators, schools and the system as a whole. Advocacy should also address the relationship between the three programmes and how they should inform and strengthen one another in an integrated system (ELRC, 2003:20). Training should focus on self-evaluation, planning for the whole year and the roles and responsibilities of the structures that will be involved in planning, coordinating, monitoring, reporting and keeping the appropriate records (ELRC, 2003:20).

Crossly and Taylor (1995:11) state that managers should encourage their subordinates to become 'knowledge workers'. Knowledge workers are those who can use their hands and minds to organize and deal with information technology. They possess the skills to analyse and problem-solve complex issues and tasks, and they are far more independent

than the employees of the past. Managers must determine how much value will be added to the organization if the goals are achieved. Value can be financial, developmental, competitive, or knowledge. Thus, in implementing the IQMS, educators can add value in the form of knowledge, skills, abilities, competencies, and innovation. They will finally be able to deliver quality public education.

Nel *et al.* (2001:519) state that the first stage of performance management involves the following steps:

- Managers and subordinates meet to discuss how the organization's strategic

goals must be adopted and adapted by the department and individuals. At school level, the principal, the School Management Team (SMT) and educators have to discuss how to achieve the goal of realizing quality education for all. The principal and the SMT will then establish the Staff Development Team (SDT). This could include the principal, senior management and educators. The SDT is responsible for liaising with educators and the district office to coordinate the provision of developmental programmes (ELRC, 2003: 20-21).

- Managers and subordinates jointly decide on the action plan to achieve the individual's goals. In respect of the IQMS, planning by the SDT must incorporate all the processes and will have to be designed to take the school's year plan into account.
- Managers and subordinates agree on specific times for formal checks to be done on the progress towards the goals. By the end of February, educators in a school could be provided with a timetable indicating when they can expect to be evaluated.
- Managers and subordinates agree on the type of value that will be added if goals are achieved. With regard to the IQMS, they also have to understand the performance standards and criteria against which they will be evaluated.

The outcome of the above four steps must be incorporated into a written document which will be signed by both the manager and subordinates. In terms of the IQMS, this document is called the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIP encompasses all educators' development programmes with specific timeframes. It then becomes a contract that encourages the participation of both parties. Both parties have to evaluate the progress made towards the achievement of benefits (Nel *et al.*, 2001:519).

### **2.5.2 Coaching and mentoring**

Katz (1995:38) argues that interim progress reviews and coaching meetings are key elements in monitoring an employee's performance. The manager and Development Support Group (DSG) members use coaching skills to help employees to improve, offer advice on changing behaviours and approaches and encourage progress towards achieving goals and adding value. Performance problems must be noticed and analysed at an early stage. Nel *et al.* (2001:520) state that the manager must explore the causes of the performance problem. Many factors are beyond the worker's control. The DSG therefore has to take contextual factors such as the support of the Department into account.

After determining the causes of the problems, the next step is to take control of the problems. Factors that affect performance positively should be encouraged, and constraining factors should be eliminated or reduced (Nel *et al.*, 2001:520). The manager, educators and their DSGs should develop an action plan. At school level, this action plan is known as the School Improvement Plan (SIP), which is arrived at after considering the completed evaluation instrument and each educator's Personal Growth Plan. This SIP contains the developmental needs which will help the school to determine the type of training required (ELRC, 2003:24).

### **2.5.3 Methods of performance evaluation**

The success of performance evaluation depends on the persons who carry out the evaluation and the methods or techniques chosen to measure performance (Nel *et al.*, 2001:522).

Bittel and Newstrom (1990:194) mention factors that should be considered when appraising an employee. These can vary from plan to plan. The appraiser should answer the following questions about the employee's performance:

- What has the individual done since the previous appraisal? How well has it been done? How much better could it be?
- In what ways have strengths and weaknesses in the individual's job approach affected this performance? Can these factors be improved?
- What is the individual's potential? How well could the employee do if really given a chance?

The appraiser should also distinguish between objective factors and subjective factors. Objective factors focus on hard facts and measurable results such quantity, quality and attendance. Subjective factors tend to represent opinions, such as those about attitude, personality, and adaptability.

Bittel and Newstrom (1990:195) further state that appraisers should make sure that their ratings are consistent from employee to employee. An employee's rating is never measured against another's. Performance is always compared with the stated responsibilities and standards established for a particular job. A good performance rating is based on facts.

The appraisers should also take into account the halo effect and ensure that it is avoided. This is because people have a tendency to allow one favourable or unfavourable incident or trait to influence their judgement of an individual's performance. Examples of the halo effect are 'recency' in terms of which the appraiser remembers what happened the previous week or the previous month, overemphasis according to which too much weight is placed on one outstanding good or poor performance, unforgiveness in terms of which the appraiser does not allow an employee's improved performance to outshine a poor performance in the past, prejudice according to which an individual's contrary personality is allowed to overshadow his or her good work, favouritism in terms of which

one is influenced by a person's likableness, despite a poor performance, indiscriminateness according to which an appraiser is too critical or too generous; no one obtains a good rating or everyone does; and stereotyping in which an appraiser bases judgment on preconceived notions about such things as race, sex, colour, religion, age, or national origin (Bittel & Newstrom, 1990:196). One of the best ways to minimize the halo effect is to rate all employees on a single factor before proceeding to ratings for the next factor. This helps to avoid generalisation.

Bittel and Newstrom (1990:200-201) further advise that a performance rating or appraisal interview should be done privately, or in the appraiser's office or in a private room. The appraiser need not be within the earshot of other employees. The appraiser should give the employee every chance to explain obstacles standing in the way of their success. Confidence in an appraiser as a supervisor and in the performance system is important. The supervisor should not show anger, regardless of what kind of remarks the employee makes, always avoid comparison between employees and treat each rating as confidential. The methods and people responsible for evaluation will now be discussed.

#### *2.5.3.1 Self-evaluation*

Each educator should evaluate him/herself using the same instrument that will be used for both Developmental Appraisal (DA) and Performance Measurement (PM). In this way educators will familiarise themselves with the Performance Standards, the criteria (what they are expected to do) as well as the performance levels (how well they are expected to perform) in order to meet the minimum requirements for pay progression. This self-evaluation forms part of both Development Appraisal and Performance Measurements (PM).

When evaluating him/herself the educator has to reflect critically on his/her own performance and set his/her own targets and timeframes for improvement. The educator takes control of his/her improvement and is able to identify priorities and monitor his/her own progress. Self-evaluation becomes an ongoing process (ELRC, 2003:21-22).



Cascio (1995:291) says self-evaluation will improve the ratee's motivation and reduce defensiveness during the evaluation interview. Reid *et al.* (2004:166) state that it is normally good practice to give advance notice of an appraisal interview, and then ask the appraisee to write a report on his/her own performance, and use this to start off the discussion.

### **2.5.3.2 Development Support Group (DSG)**

After having completed a first self-evaluation and having reflected on strengths and areas in need of development, each educator needs to identify his/her own support group within the school. This must include the educator's immediate senior, i.e. Education Specialist/Head of Department or Subject Head and a peer selected by the educator. Both selected immediate senior and peer should have learning area or subject experience and expertise so that they can provide guidance and support. Each educator will have a different DSG constituted by both the immediate senior and peer. Educators' different DSGs will be factored into the broad planning of the School Development Team (SDT) to ensure a reasonable spread and pace of work for evaluators (ELRC, 2003:22).

### **2.5.3.3 Observation of educator in practice**

After identifying the personal DSG, the educator needs to be evaluated, to determine a 'baseline' evaluation with which subsequent evaluation can be compared in order to determine progress. By this time, the educator will have determined strengths and areas in need of development during self-evaluation. Discussion of the strengths and weaknesses will precede the observation of the educator in practice. To confirm the educator's perceptions of the strengths and areas of need, the DSG has to observe the educator in practice. The subsequent discussion between the educator and the DSG must enable the educator to develop a Personal Growth Plan (PGP) that includes targets and timeframes for improvement. The educator must primarily develop the PGP with the refinement done by the DSG (ELRC, 2003:23). Reid *et al.* (2004:166) highlight the fact that towards the end of the interview, the appraiser should identify suitable developmental steps, action

plans and targets, with dates.

#### **2.5.3.4 *Personal Growth Plan (PGP)***

After discussion with the DSG, the educator needs to develop his/her PGP. This will take place after observation of the educator in practice and the evaluation on which consensus was reached. The PGP should take the following on board:

- those areas in need of improvement of which the educator is in full control

(e.g. punctuality);

- those areas in which the DSG has to provide guidance;
- those areas in which the Department should provide INSET, e.g. on

Outcomes-based Assessment;

- those areas where the educator needs reskilling in order to teach new subjects/learning areas, e.g. Technology (ELRC, 2003:23-24).

#### **2.5.3.5 *School Improvement Plan (SIP)***

The Staff Development Team (SDT) must compile the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIP has to take the completed instruments from all the DSGs and the Personal Growth Plans (PGPs) of each educator on board. Educators must submit their PGPs to the SDT by the end of March each year for the compilation of SIP. The School Management Team (SMT) and School Development Team (SDT) have to prioritise the development needs of educators and then develop a development programme. This development programme will cater for INSET (in-service training by the Department) (ELRC, 2003:24). The Whole School Evaluation Team will consider the SIP when conducting Whole School evaluation.

### 2.5.3.6 Computerised performance appraisals

Dessler (1997:359) states that several inexpensive software packages are on the market, most of which function within the Windows operating system. A computerised appraisal system enables managers to log notes on their subordinates during the year, and to rate employees on a series of performance traits. The programme generates written text to support each part of the appraisal. The School Development Team may use the computer system to keep records and programmes of performance management.

## **2.6 CONCLUSION**

The literature review unpacked significant aspects of performance management. It was revealed that for every worker to be utilized to his/her full capacity, a performance management system had to be in place. For performance management to be effective, evaluation of employees had to be undertaken continuously. Thus, in terms of the Integrated Quality Management System, educators had to be evaluated continuously throughout the year.

The other crucial aspects that emerged during the discussion of literature were the early warning signs. It was made clear that early warning signs were needed to determine which events signified an improving or a worsening situation. Changes in the environment and economic conditions coupled with continuous evaluation might necessitate a change in the manner employees could be evaluated. Furthermore, the study of literature helped the researcher to understand the complexities of undertaking performance-related pay in the public sector. Moreover, this literature review served as a basis for further research to establish more facts regarding the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) as an instrument of performance management for educators. It also helped the researcher to restructure his research and ultimately come up with headings for the final report.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

Since research is a way of going about finding answers to questions, methods to conduct such research must be selected. Research methodology is broader than methods and encompasses methods. According to Neuman (2006:2), methodology is all about understanding the social organizational context, philosophical assumptions and ethical principles. Methods are sets of specific techniques for selecting cases, measuring and observing aspects of social life, gathering and refining data, analysing data and reporting on the results.

In this chapter, the qualitative research design was utilized to conduct the whole research. Since the qualitative research design aims at understanding social life and the meaning that people attach to everyday life, educators' account of meaning, experience and perceptions were considered with regard to the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. Educators' written and spoken comments on the Integrated Quality Management System had been analysed and classified. Data collection methods used were interviews, questionnaires and document study.

#### **3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN**

A design is the approach the researcher selects to study a particular phenomenon. Mouton (2005:55) defines a research design as a plan or blueprint of how one intends conducting the research. There are two well-known and recognized approaches to research, *viz.* the qualitative paradigm and the quantitative paradigm (De Vos, 2005: 78). In this project, a qualitative research design was used. It is perhaps imperative to explain why a qualitative approach was chosen rather than a quantitative research approach.

**A qualitative research design** is an approach which is antipositivistic, idiographic and holistic in nature. It aims mainly at understanding social life and the meaning that people attach to everyday life. It elicits participants' accounts of meaning, experience or perceptions. It also produces descriptive data in the participants' own written or spoken words. It thus involves identifying the participants' beliefs and values (De Vos, 2005:79). Brynard and Hanekom (1997:29) state that the indispensable condition for qualitative methodology is a commitment to seeing the world from the point of view of the actors or participants.

In contrast, the **quantitative approach** is based on positivism, which takes scientific explanation to be nomothetic, i.e. based on universal law. Its main aims are to measure the social world objectively, to test hypotheses, to predict and control human behaviour (De Vos, 2005:79). Creswell (1994:1-2) defines a quantitative study as an inquiry into social or human problems, based on testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers and analysed with statistical procedures in order to determine whether the predictive generalisation of the theory holds true.

Taking into account these definitions and explanations that differentiate between the qualitative approach and the quantitative approach, the purpose and aim of the study determined the researcher's final choice of the qualitative approach. The aim of this study was to describe and evaluate the meaning educators attach to the implementation of the IQMS in improving their performance. Hence, the qualitative approach was the appropriate choice because the researcher had to interpret and understand the effectiveness of the IQMS.

Having chosen the qualitative approach, the researcher secondly had to choose a research strategy within the qualitative paradigm. The phenomenological approach appeared to be relevant to the study. The phenomenological design aims at understanding and interpreting the essence of the meaning that subjects attach to their daily lives (De Vos, 2005). In terms of the phenomenological approach, the participants' perspective is the empirical point of departure. It focuses upon the real-life experiences of people (Brynard

& Hanekom, 1997:29). Hence, the real-life experience of educators on the implementation of the IQMS was looked at.

### **3.3 AREA OF STUDY**

The study was located within human resource management. The focus of the study was on personnel utilization that falls within human resource management. Cloete (1977:129) states that personnel utilization embraces training on the job, the allocation of specific functions, supervision and evaluation of personnel for the purpose of training, promotion and self-development. In this research, the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) as an instrument of performance management was subjected to an extensive study. The study of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) was undertaken within the Lebowakgomo Circuit of the Limpopo Department of Education.

### **3.4 POPULATION**

According to Neuman (2006:224), population is the abstract idea of a large group of many cases from which a researcher draws a sample and to which results from a sample are generalised. The specific pool of cases that the researcher wants to study is called a target population. In this study schools within the Lebowakgomo circuit served as the population from which the researcher sampled relevant cases for study. Lebowakgomo Circuit consists of 28 schools. Questionnaires were sent to twenty schools and 17 schools returned them. Only three educators, including the principal, completed the questionnaires at each school. Questionnaires were given to the principal, head of department and a post-level one educator at each school. The respondents were thus 52, including the circuit manager. In addition, twelve individual educators and five focus groups were interviewed.

### **3.5 SAMPLING METHODS**

According to Neuman (2006:219), a sample is a small set of cases a researcher selects from a large pool and generalises to the population. In this study, purposive sampling was applied. De Vos (2005:207) states that purposive sampling uses the judgement of the

researcher in selecting cases. This means that cases are selected with a specific purpose in mind. Purposive sampling was therefore more relevant in consciously selecting schools that had implemented the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) and participants who were well informed about the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS).

### **3.6 DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

Brynard and Hanekom (1997:30) state that in qualitative research, methods such as case studies, in-depth interviews, participant observation, questionnaires and perusal of documents are used. In this research, the following methods were used:

#### **a. Interviews**

The study utilized qualitative interviews as described by Rubin and Rubin (1995:31), that qualitative interviewing emphasizes the active participation of the interviewer and the importance of giving the interviewee a voice. Individual interviews that focused on the norms, values and understanding of the interviewees were used. Thus, individual topical interviews which were concerned with what happened, when and why were used to gain information regarding the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System.

In addition, toward the end of the data collection stage, focus-group interviews were held. These focus-group interviews were used to obtain opinions or information at the level of groups. The main object was to check whether there was group consensus or disagreement on relevant issues pertaining to the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. Questions were prepared in advance. The researcher was flexible regarding questions asked, i.e. impromptu follow-up questions were asked for further clarity. Respondents were also requested to elaborate where necessary.

### **b. Questionnaires**

A six-page questionnaire for educators was prepared. Another three-page questionnaire was prepared for the circuit manager. The questionnaire for the circuit manager was a three-page document because the circuit manager, who is office-based, was not directly involved in the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System when compared to school-based educators. All in all, sixty questionnaires were prepared but only 52 questionnaires were sent to fifty-two respondents. Forty-three questionnaires were returned. The other nine respondents kept on giving excuses for not completing and returning their questionnaires. Both open-ended and closed questions were set. Both school-based educators and circuit managers' questionnaires are attached as Annexure A and Annexure B respectively.

### **c. Document study**

Documents such as Personal Growth Plans (PGP) and School Improvement Plans (SIP) were looked at. The reports of the School Development Team (SDT) and Development Support Groups were also analysed. Data collected from these documents were compared and integrated with data collected by means of the interviews and questionnaires. The comparison and integration were of value to the researcher as some facts were confirmed. For instance, some schools were unable to produce a School Improvement Plan. Other schools were able to produce it, however, it proved to be of little value as some respondents stated that they had never implemented it. Some respondents indicated that they did not own it as it had been prepared by the principal only.

## **3.7 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES**

Appointments were made with all principals and educators of the schools for interviews and document analysis. Educators were requested to suggest a time convenient to themselves for the interviews and collection of questionnaires. The researcher also sought written permission from the Department of Education, Limpopo Province. It took the researcher two weeks to get a letter of permission from the Head of the Limpopo Department of Education. The research then started upon receipt of the letter of



permission on 6 August 2007. The letter of permission is attached to this report as Annexure C.

### **3.8 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS**

Data analysis was started during the interview process. The researcher analysed what the respondents said. He had to select data that was relevant to the educators' performance management. This helped the researcher to ask follow-up questions. After the collection of data, the researcher began a detailed and deep analysis of his conversation with the respondents. This helped the researcher to discover additional themes and concepts in order to build up to an overall picture. All related materials or ideas were put together under one theme. Information in each category or theme was compared so that themes would follow one another logically. This data was then interpreted in line with Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, i.e. to expose the successes and shortcomings of the implementation of the IQMS. Computer-aided software helped to manage textual data. Findings were critically reviewed and discussed to detect any error of evaluation, bias or mistakes.

### **3.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The respondents provided information on a voluntary basis. The respondents were also assured of their freedom to withdraw the data provided at any time. According to Brynard and Hanekom (1997:4) honesty and confidentiality are the two overarching ethical requirements for researchers. Honesty pertains to the manner of reporting. A reporter should at all times and under all circumstances report the truth and should never present the truth in a biased manner. The truth can usually be verified, for example, by checking whether a particular document exists.

The respondents were assured of the confidentiality of the data collected. Their names were not mentioned in the report. Only their professional positions were mentioned. It was further borne in mind that the interests of the participants should always prevail and that no confidential data should be published against the will of the participants. Thus, the

respondents were assured of the anonymity of all information. The researcher had finally to keep the data for a reasonable period of three years.

### **3.10 CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, it became evident that because of having selected the qualitative research design, the participants' written and spoken words were given much consideration in the compilation of the report. Since the phenomenological approach was chosen, the participants' perspectives were the empirical point of departure. Thus, the real-life experience of educators regarding the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System was analysed in the final report.

As the researcher had used the three data collection methods, namely questionnaires, interviews and document analysis, it took him the two months of August and September to collect data. Out of twenty schools, only three schools, i.e. nine respondents, did not return questionnaires. Interviews and document analysis were conducted smoothly. The following chapter contains an in-depth data analysis of the findings.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA ANALYSIS (RESULTS)**

#### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter, educators' experiences of and reactions to the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) are described. The educators' concern regarding the one percent salary increment, and the role of the IQMS in their development, are also described. It will be established whether indeed the Integrated Quality Management System plays any critical role in developing educators for the ultimate efficiency and effectiveness of schools. It will further be established whether the Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans are used effectively for the benefit of both educators and the school as a whole. The results will then be analysed and presented according to their respective themes. Issues irrelevant to the topic and the problem statement will be eliminated. The analysis of results will ultimately guide their discussion.

#### **4.2 AREAS OF CONCERN REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQMS**

Educators did not feel free to be observed in class. They were not motivated enough. They regarded the IQMS as extra work and therefore viewed it as an increase in their workload. One educator stated that performance measurement was not implemented fairly for salary progression as educators were expected to work hard for only one percent salary progression. The educator indicated that the one percent salary progression demotivated them. It should at least have been five percent. Another educator stated that the IQMS was not reliable because educators would appear to be seriously engaged during their observation in class and relax when the time for evaluation was past. This meant that educator evaluation in terms of the IQMS was a once-off activity. Once the IQMS forms for salary progression had been completed, educators forgot about the IQMS. In addition, one principal mentioned that, contrary to the principles of the IQMS, emphasis was not placed on developing educators for the ultimate acquisition of skills,

but much attention was placed on the completion of assessment forms for the one percent pay progression. A principal concluded that the IQMS was only implemented for money and nothing else, i.e. developmental aspects were not taken seriously.

A principal expressed concern that performance measurement was not implemented fairly because once an educator had reached a certain salary notch he/she had to wait for a number of assessments before progressing to the next level. This discouraged such educators. Some educators indicated that although the IQMS was seen as an instrument to increase their salaries, some educators who were evaluated did not receive the expected salary increase. Those who received it complained that one percent increment was too little and demoralising. The Integrated Quality Management System thus served only to frustrate them.

Some educators expressed their concern that although they had been evaluated for salary progression in the previous years, they had not yet received their one percent salary increase as expected in terms of Resolution 8 that contained facets of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). The head of department (HOD) in one school cited overcrowding in classes as an obstacle to the implementation of the IQMS. Her other concern was that some learners were often left alone while educators performed their duties as members of Development Support Groups. The HOD stated that she did not have free periods to execute her duties as HOD and again as member of a Development Support Group. In addition to overcrowding, some educators highlighted the lack of parental involvement as an impediment to their success.

One school manager also saw impartiality on the part of the appraisers as a challenge. The manager also emphasized the lack of resources as another challenge. This statement was supported by another educator who mentioned the lack of buildings, shortage of educators and insufficient school furniture as stumbling blocks. The majority of educators emphasized things such as overcrowded classes, lack of teaching aids and lack of electricity as serious impediments to effective implementation of the IQMS. Another educator alluded to the lack of a school library and a laboratory as well as learner support materials as hampering progress in schools.

A school manager highlighted the fact that self-evaluation and peer evaluation reduced the Integrated Quality Management system to subjective judgement. As a result, performance measurement was not fairly implemented for salary progression. Another school manager expressed her concern as follows:

*Educators give each other high marks even in areas where they need to be developed because the IQMS is money related. As a result, the final evaluations do not reflect truly what is really happening. On the other hand, school managers cannot secure appointments for evaluation with their seniors, namely circuit managers.*

The head of department from another school pointed out that the aspect of self-evaluation was a problem to him. The educators argued that it was not easy for an educator to evaluate him/herself. In evaluating themselves, they usually did not expose their weaknesses. The head of department summed it up by saying that an evaluation session was a time-consuming exercise. A Lebowakgomo circuit manager expressed the following challenges, which, if not addressed, would continue to obstruct the effective implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System:

- *Inadequate training time for educators*
- Shortage of person power to monitor and implement the process from Head Office, District Office and Circuit Office.

#### **4.3 EDUCATOR TRAINING ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQMS**

The school managers stated that training was in the form of a centralized workshop. All educators stated that only three educators from each school were trained and they were required to cascade their training to other educators. The training was in the form of a workshop which took approximately two hours for the trainees. At some schools the trainees reduced it to thirty minutes or less. Thus at some schools it was merely a ten-minute report. Although they attended such workshops, educators did not understand the performance standards of the IQMS. Schools did not have programmes for individual development. Performance measurement was not implemented fairly for salary progression. One manager of a school recommended that several workshops should be

conducted for the acquisition of knowledge and skills. The manager further emphasized that workshops should be decentralized for more educators to attend.

The Integrated Quality Management System did not help educators to acquire skills, knowledge and competence. Like managers of schools, educators cited lack of teacher training on the IQMS as a serious concern and thus an obstacle towards the success of the IQMS.

Educators confirmed principals' position that only three educators from each school attended the workshop and they were required to cascade their knowledge to other educators. This meant that the workshops were centralized for only a small number of educators to attend. Furthermore, educators, like school managers, did not understand the performance standards and assessment criteria of the IQMS. On this basis educators were unable to determine their areas of strength and weakness. Educators concurred with school managers that they did not have programmes for individual development. This raised the question of how they would be able to develop professionally if they did not have programmes for individual development.

In addition, the facilitators at the workshop did not have enough knowledge about the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). It was like the blind leading the blind. Apart from training on the IQMS, some principals cited lack of training on the National Curriculum Statement as a further obstacle towards their success. If educators did not understand the new curriculum, *viz.* the National Curriculum Statement, their performance assessment through the IQMS might be problematic as they would find it difficult to implement the new curriculum.

It was surprising to learn from some educators that the implementation of the IQMS had not got off the ground in some schools because educators were not adequately trained. However, educators at such schools had received their one percent salary increment although they had not implemented the Integrated Quality Management System. One educator recommended that for the IQMS to be successful, the Department of Education should provide sufficient funding and time for training. This was supported by the

Lebowakgomo circuit manager who indicated that training was inadequate, unfunded and centralized.

#### **4.4 SUPPORT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICIALS**

It was indicated that the departmental officials never came to the schools to conduct Whole School Evaluation as required by Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003. Hence, Whole School Evaluation was never started. The Department of Education did not give the required support in respect of the whole school evaluation and the IQMS implementation as a whole. Principals indicated that the Department of Education did not take the professional development of educators seriously, as no visits were ever conducted or guidelines given. The Department of Education had never developed any programme for in-service training for educators' professional development. It was against this background that one educator concluded that it seemed that the Department of Education did not take the professional development of educators seriously.

Circuit managers were not trained enough to understand and offer the required support to the schools. In terms of the IQMS document, i.e. Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, the circuit managers are supposed to guide and evaluate principals. A principal stated that they found it difficult to get mentorship or guidance from circuit managers. Circuit managers never went to the schools to conduct principal evaluation. One educator put it as follows: "*Area offices do not attend to areas in need of development*". Another educator added to this statement by saying, "*Holistic development is not effected since government does not play its part*". Another educator indicated the following:

*Educators have little knowledge about the implementation of the IQMS on the ground. There is no support from the Department of Education with regard to implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System.*

A Lebowakgomo circuit manager supported this statement by saying that the departmental officials had never gone to schools to conduct the Whole School

Evaluation. In terms of Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, failure to conduct the Whole School Evaluation by the Department of Education seriously compromised the basic tenets of the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. It meant that one crucial aspect of the Integrated Quality Management System had been left out. This throws light on the fact that the Integrated Quality Management System consists of so many instruments that they are not easily manageable.

#### **4.5 THE ROLE PLAYED BY THE DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT GROUPS**

The Development Support Groups (DSGs) were not competent enough to provide the required support and mentoring. This was mainly because educators serving on the DSGs lacked enough training. One educator stated that members of the DSGs knew nothing about the IQMS and they were not able to deliver what was required of them. One principal mentioned that due to the pressure of schoolwork and deadlines to be adhered to, it was very difficult for the Development Support Groups to conduct ongoing observation and evaluation of educators.

With regard to the work of the Development Support Group, an educator said, “*Favouritism takes place in many instances*”. One educator went on to say that implementing the IQMS through the use of Development Support Groups based at schools was not effective as there were usually suspicions among educators regarding issues of witchcraft. A principal remarked as follows:

*The IQMS needs monitoring by the department. Schools alone cannot manage it. An independent body outside the schools should do the evaluation at schools to avoid favouritism.*

One educator emphasized the fact that the Development Support Groups were not effective as all educators were assessed as outstanding educators in terms of performance. A school manager highlighted the fact that educators did not accept being corrected or told about their weaknesses by other educators. Furthermore, not being well informed, members of the Development Support Groups were not in a position to expose the weaknesses of educators. As a result, an educator complained: “*They never explain where*



*I need to rectify*". One educator stated that the Developmental Support Group failed to give her feedback and support. Educators indicated that after implementation there was no follow-up to help them develop.

A school manager illustrated that some appraisers serving on the DSG were influenced by the educational level of the appraisee. If an appraisee was better qualified, e.g. had a higher degree, such an educator would get more points. Hence, the Development Support Group always gave false reports with inflated scores. The Development Support Group's incompetence was confirmed by the Lebowakgomo circuit manager who clearly highlighted that the Development Support Groups were not competent to provide the required support and mentoring.

#### **4.6 DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONAL GROWTH PLANS (PGPs)**

Although educators were able to conduct self-evaluation, they were unable to draw up their Personal Growth Plans. Educators were so confused that some said they did not know how to start developing their own personal growth plans. As a result, educators could not identify performance problems. Insufficient training was cited as the primary reason for this failure. Contextual factors such as lack of school furniture and overcrowding in classrooms were also mentioned as contributory factors. The Integrated Quality Management System thus did not help educators, learners and parents to move towards the realisation of the school's strategic goals.

The principal stated that Personal Growth Plans were supposed to be submitted in September instead of March. Some educators at least knew that their Personal Growth Plans were supposed, in terms of the collective agreement, to be completed and submitted in March, although some said that it had to be submitted in June and September. Some educators did not know what was supposed to be in the Personal Growth Plan. They mentioned things like teaching in an OBE way and other matters related to the curriculum. If educators were in the dark regarding developing their Personal Growth Plans, one wonders whether the IQMS had any meaning for them.

#### **4.7 DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS (SIPs)**

The majority of schools did not have School Improvement Plans. Educators at schools who had School Improvement Plans (SIPs) stated that they had not been involved in developing the school improvement plans. They further indicated that development programmes derived from the School Improvement Plans were not implemented. Hence, they benefited nothing from the SIPs. The positive aspect that emerged was that the School Development Team had developed the School Improvement Plans, where they were available. However, at some schools the principal alone had developed the School Improvement Plans. At some schools, the IQMS coordinator alone had developed it.

One principal indicated that the SIP had benefited them in that educators were able to design the school action plan together. They were thus able to work together. Document analysis revealed that almost no schools within Lebowakgomo circuit had School Improvement Plans. A small number of schools, which happened to produce them, did not implement them. A school manager mentioned that she did not know how to draw up the School Improvement Plan. The Lebowakgomo circuit manager confirmed that schools did not have programmes for educator development. All these raised the million dollar question: If schools did not have School Improvement Plans, how would they embark on the overall development of educators?

#### **4.8 THE IMPACT OF THE IQMS ON THE PERFORMANCE OF EDUCATORS**

Educators indicated that the IQMS had failed to improve their performance. This was largely attributed to the fact that the Department of Education had never conducted in-service training for educators. The Department of Education did not provide the required support. Hence, the Integrated Quality Management System had failed to contribute towards the delivery of quality public education. The majority of educators argued that since their evaluation, their performance had never improved. As a result, the IQMS had not helped them to add value in the form of knowledge, skills, abilities and innovation to their schools. Furthermore, the IQMS did not assist educators, learners or parents to move

towards the realisation of the schools' strategic goals as educators were unable to unpack the whole system.

A positive aspect with regard to the implementation of the IQMS was that all educators highlighted that their appraisal interviews had been done privately, i.e. not in the presence of other educators. This meant that their rating had been treated as confidential. They further alluded to the fact that no comparison had been made between educators. The majority of educators said that they were given a chance to explain obstacles standing in the way of their success. Some cited lack of parental support with regard to the discipline of learners. Furthermore, the majority of parents did not assist learners to do their homework.

One educator highlighted the fact that evaluation in terms of the IQMS assisted her to ensure that her teaching was learner-centred. On whether educators accepted the IQMS as a vital instrument to measure their performance, many educators responded that on paper, it looked like a good instrument, but in reality, the implementation was a critical problem. It was said that the IQMS had a negative impact on the relationship among educators as they might give each other excessive undeserved points or those who were failed might develop a negative attitude towards educators serving in the Development Support Groups.

Another educator stated that educators did not accept the IQMS as a vital instrument to measure their performance on the basis of the fact that colleagues were jealous of one another and hence they did not give one another a fair evaluation. One educator argued that they were so busy with their own school work that they did not have enough time for the IQMS. Some indicated that they did not accept the IQMS because the one percent awarded to them was not enough. In this regard, one educator said the following: *"We do not accept the IQMS as an instrument to measure our performance because we are not trained and we do not really see its use"*. Another educator stated that he did not accept the Integrated Quality Management System because the evaluation was not done continuously: *"It was executed only when we were supposed to get salary progression"*. Another educator went on to say that he did not accept the IQMS as an instrument to

measure his performance on the grounds that it did not take into account the qualifications of educators. According to him, an educator with a degree should not be treated in the same way as an educator with a diploma.

Many principals stated that the implementation of the IQMS was currently a futile exercise, as the department did not monitor it for proper implementation. This was exacerbated by the fact that the departmental officials never came to the school to conduct Whole School Evaluation. It was against this background that the Whole School Evaluation, contrary to its intent and purposes, did not lead to the overall effectiveness and efficiency of schools. Apart from school-based educators, one principal alluded to the fact that circuit managers were not competent enough to offer the necessary assistance with regard to the implementation of the IQMS.

A principal stated that it was difficult to implement the IQMS because it contained so many instruments, viz. Developmental Appraisal, Performance Measurement and Whole School Evaluation. According to many educators, the IQMS was complicated and time consuming. An educator put it as follows in her own words:

*“The IQMS does not give a true reflection of what is happening at schools.”*

A principal added by uttering the following words:

*“Educators favour each other. No educator is rated as a weak educator.”*

In respect of the impact the IQMS had on educators, one educator expressed her position as follows:

*“I am demoralized as an educator, since no increment in my salary was effected. The IQMS has no value to me”.*

Some educators already had a negative attitude towards the IQMS. This was illustrated by an educator who complained as follows: *“Educators already acquired skill, knowledge and competence when they got qualified as educators and their years of experience also boosted their skills. So the IQMS cannot do anything”.* Some educators added that the

IQMS was so ineffective that some educators only gave a good impression during evaluation and relaxed immediately after evaluation.

The majority of educators indicated that Developmental Appraisal did not help them to be in a position to determine their areas of strengths and weaknesses. Those few who were able to identify their strengths and weaknesses were not able to develop, as their schools did not have programmes for individual development. Another educator argued that they were unable to identify their performance problems because they did not have time to discuss or work as a team on the grounds that there were no subject committees. An educator summed up his observations as follows:

*No clarity on the so-called Integrated Quality Management System.*

*Workshops on the IQMS were not effective. People trying to explain it failed to make their point. At the end, the school management ended up saying that we should just fill up the IQMS forms and submit for only one percent increase.*

In an interview, one principal indicated that the implementation of the IQMS was problematic as they had many children who were from child-headed families. The majority of such learners were from the RDP communities. According to the principal, these learners were difficult to manage. They were sometimes uncontrollable. This affected teaching and learning as they had a negative influence on other learners.

Some educators in their interviews emphasized the problem of coupling performance management with money. According to these educators, the element of money clouded the implementation of the IQMS as educators inflated their scores unfairly for the sake of money. For the sake of one percent increment, educators had the tendency of presenting only their good side, while concealing weak areas. These respondents recommended the separation of the monetary aspect from the developmental aspect. In this way, educators would be free to disclose their weaknesses for developmental purposes.

The head of department (HOD) of a certain school stated in an interview that the purpose of the IQMS was good, but the implementation was chaotic. He further alluded to the fact that even school inspectors just said, *“Fill in forms and submit for the sake of one percent salary progression”*. Since circuit managers did not understand it, they did not take it seriously. An HOD reported that getting one percent salary increment was not a matter of achievement, it was just a matter of *“pass one pass all”*.

At a certain school, educators interviewed in a group mentioned that the IQMS was just a waste of time because they were required to complete so many forms while it did nothing for their development. The respondents stated that the IQMS was boring as members of the Development Support Team were not sure of what they were doing. A principal from another school confirmed that the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System was just a nightmare to them. The principal emphasized his point as follows: *“Scores or points for salary progression were just given out of the head and no one failed”*. The principal finally recommended that the IQMS implementation should be stopped immediately and full-scale training started afresh for all educators.

Another school manager recommended that, since colleagues could not fail one another, the evaluation panel (the Developmental Support Group) should consist of a peer, union representative, HOD or principal and an official from the Department of Education. The principal stated that failure to do so would cause the IQMS to remain a dysfunctional project. An education specialist from another school revealed in an interview that the Department of Education did a good thing by providing every educator with an IQMS file; however, such files were only gathering dust. Their contents were strange to educators as they were far beyond their comprehension.

## **4.9 CONCLUSION**

Educators expressed a number of concerns regarding the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). The key concerns were lack of support by the Department of Education, insufficient training for the implementation of the IQMS and the one percent increment which only served to demotivate them. It also emerged from the data analysis that members of the Development Support Groups were not competent enough to provide the necessary guidance and support. As these Development Support Groups were intended to play a critical role in developing educators, their ability left much to be desired.

Failure by educators to develop their Personal Growth Plans put the whole attempt to implement the Integrated Quality Management System in a dilemma because the Personal Growth Plans had to contain areas where educators needed support for development purposes. Furthermore, failure to develop Personal Growth Plans had a detrimental effect on the development of the School Improvement Plan. This was because the School Improvement Plan was constituted of the personal growth plans of all educators. Without either the Personal Growth Plans or School Improvement Plans, there could be no programmes for the development of educators. This really put the IQMS in a crisis. All these shortcomings and weaknesses will be discussed in chapter five.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter, findings are critically discussed and conclusions are arrived at. In this context, matters to be discussed include the use of performance-related pay in the public sector, critical concerns raised by educators regarding the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System and the impact of lack of departmental support and training on the implementation of the IQMS. In addition to this, the disastrous consequences of the failure to put in place functioning Developmental Support Groups, effective Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans are critically analysed.

It is further checked whether the three Es, namely efficiency, effectiveness and economy were put into effect in the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. In discussing all these, the aim of the study, the problem statement and some aspects of the literature review, particularly the views of various authors on performance management, are critically considered in an integrated way. Far-reaching recommendations, which are worth consideration by the Department of Education, are finally made.

#### **5.2 AREAS OF CONCERN REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQMS**

As indicated in chapter one, the aim of the study was to establish whether performance management through the IQMS could assist educators to improve their skills and competence so that they were able to deliver quality public education. This meant that the effectiveness of the IQMS in improving the performance of educators had to be evaluated and described. Data analysis in chapter four revealed that the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) did nothing to improve the skills, competence and ultimately the performance of educators. This was illustrated by, inter alia, a number of concerns raised by the respondents.



Cloete (1997:134) indicates that performance evaluation should provide for fair treatment of workers by keeping their remuneration and promotion in line with their performance. This would improve the morale and determination of educators. Cheminais *et al.* (1998:163) add that the increased use of performance-related pay in the public sector is essentially aimed at motivating staff by rewarding performance in the hope that they will be able to deal with the recruitment and retention problems. The Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) was also planned to realise this vision. However, respondents clearly illustrated that the one percent awarded every year following evaluation was too little and demoralising. This made educators focus their attention on completing assessment forms for one percent pay progression. It implied that educator evaluation was just a once-off activity in a particular month in order to be able to complete forms for a one percent increment. It vividly illustrated that monetary aspects were over-emphasized at the expense of developmental aspects. Hence, the crucial element of educator appraisal in terms of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) was sacrificed. This was also contrary to Cloete's assertion (1998:242) that continuous evaluation or appraisal of the conduct and effectiveness of personnel is essential.

The research thus vindicated the statement by the president of the South African Democratic Teachers' Union, Willie Madisha, that the professional development of educators was ignored by the Department of Education in implementing the IQMS. To make matters worse, some respondents complained that although they went through the pain of evaluation, they did not receive their expected one percent increment. This might be due to the inefficiency of the Department of Education in processing the IQMS forms. This also served as a demoralising factor.

Moreover, some respondents exposed that the educator evaluation was not fair in the sense that during peer assessment educators gave each other undeservedly high marks, even in areas where they needed to be developed because the IQMS was money related. This indeed diluted the whole intention of educator appraisal in terms of the IQMS. Furthermore, self-evaluation did not produce the desired results; usually educators did not expose their areas of weakness, as they feared forfeiting the one percent increment.

Minnaar and Bekker (2005:127) highlight the fact that the concepts of efficiency, effectiveness and economy lie at the heart of organizational performance in the government sector. Combined in an integrated perspective, they deliver value for money. In respect of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), the concepts of efficiency, effectiveness and economy were to be put into effect. However, educators responded that they found it difficult to put these concepts into effect due to lack of basic resources such as school furniture, enough accommodation, teaching aids, electricity, libraries, laboratories and a shortage of human resources such as educators and clerks. It was indeed true that a shortage of such basic resources might detrimentally affect the smooth implementation of the IQMS. For instance, teaching in an overcrowded class has never been effective. Observing an educator in practice in such a situation may immediately provide an excuse for any failure or weakness.

In addition, some respondents emphasized lack of parental involvement in the education of their children as an obstacle in the way of smooth implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). With the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement, parental involvement in the education of their learners is of paramount importance. The ultimate performance of educators is implicit in the final success of learners academically, morally and socially. If parents are not involved, educators may find it difficult to achieve success with learners; hence it will have an adverse effect on the educators' performance.

### **5.3 EDUCATOR TRAINING ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IQMS**

According to Cloete (1977:152-160), training is a means to utilize personnel optimally. Training opportunities need to correspond with the actual individual needs of the personnel. The Integrated Quality Management System document also puts emphasis on training as of crucial importance for the proper utilization of personnel. According to Reid, *et al.* (2004:166), performance evaluation may also help to define training needs and future potential for the personnel. It emerged from the data analysis that training for the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System was completely inadequate. School managers, heads of department, post-level one educators and the

circuit manager of Lebowakgomo concurred that training was in the form of a centralized workshop which was attended by only three educators from each school. The three educators were expected to cascade the training to other educators at their respective schools. However, it emerged from the data analysis that the three trainees were workshopped for approximately two hours. At some schools the training was reduced to thirty minutes or less, while at other schools, it was a mere report of ten minutes. This was a clear demonstration that the cascade method had failed a large number of educators at many schools.

All respondents indicated that they had failed to implement the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) effectively owing to insufficient training. As a result, educators did not understand the performance standard of the IQMS. Furthermore, schools did not know how to develop programmes for individual development. Matters became worse when it emerged that facilitators at the original workshop did not have enough knowledge about the IQMS. Training was therefore a disaster from the beginning as the facilitator for the trainees looked incompetent. This implied that the Department of Education did not have a proper plan for the training of educators for the IQMS. This clearly confirmed the statement by the president of the National Professional Teachers' Organization of South Africa (NAPTOSA), Dave Balt, that the provincial departments did not provide the kind of training that was required in terms of the IQMS. Because of lack of training, the implementation of the IQMS did not even get off the ground at some schools. This raised the crucial question as to why some educators at schools where there was no IQMS implementation received a one percent increment. This confirmed the statement that educators just completed the IQMS forms for the sake of the one percent salary increment. This amounted to fraud.

#### **5.4 SUPPORT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICIALS**

The implementation of any new policy needs both the political and professional support of, for instance, Circuit Managers, the Head of Department and the Member of the Executive Council. Pauw, Wood, Van der Linde, Fourie and Visser (2002:139) highlight this fact in their argument that given the inherent difficulties in measuring and reporting

on efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness, strong political support is needed in the implementation of performance measurement and management.

Data analysis exposed that the departmental officials never came to the schools to conduct the Whole School Evaluation as required by Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003. Other respondents emphasized that the Department of Education did not take the professional development of educators seriously because no visits were paid to the school to assist in implementing the Integrated Quality Management System. Circuit managers did not even dare to go to school to give the required assistance to the principals. In terms of Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, circuit managers had to evaluate the principal, but research revealed that they never carried out this task. This was attributed to the fact that circuit managers were not trained enough to understand and provide due assistance and guidance.

All the above facts clearly support the statement that the Department of Education did not provide the required support for the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. This fact was also confirmed by the deputy president of the South African Democratic Teachers' Union, Thobile Ntola, who stated at the World Teachers' Day on 5 October 2006 that the success of the Integrated Quality Management System was threatened by the lack of support and commitment on the part of the provincial Departments of Education. This had, as a result, put the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS) into crisis. That was why Thobile Ntola called on the Department of Education to dedicate resources and support to the implementation of the IQMS

[www.iol.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_South+Africa&set\\_id=1&click\\_id=&art\\_id...](http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?from=rss_South+Africa&set_id=1&click_id=&art_id...)

Furthermore, lack of support from the Department of Education was vividly demonstrated by the fact that no programmes for in-service training were ever developed and made available to the schools. This point was emphasized by respondents, including the circuit manager. It became clear that lack of training on the Integrated Quality Management System had put the whole implementation into crisis.

## **5.5 DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT GROUPS (DSGs)**

The research revealed that the Development Support Groups (DSGs) were not competent to provide the required support and mentoring due to poor training. In terms of Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, the main purpose of the DSGs was to evaluate educators and thereafter provide mentoring and support. This meant that members of DSGs had to have thorough knowledge of Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, which contained the Integrated Quality Management System. The research indicated that owing to lack of training, members of the DSGs were in the dark regarding the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. Hence, the Development Support Groups were not effective in carrying out their duties.

Another factor that was contributing to the poor work of the Development Support Groups was alleged favouritism. Hughes (2003:161) points out that performance pay is a good idea in the abstract, but it can be used to reward the favourites and may cause resentment in those who consider themselves worthy of extra pay. The favourites may be advantaged at the expense of those who are really deserving of recognition. On the grounds of this favouritism, some respondents called for the amendment of Collective Agreement Number 8 so that there could be a clause allowing an independent body outside the schools to go to schools and conduct evaluation in the place of school-based DSGs. Some respondents supported this fact by mentioning that the Development Support Groups based at schools were not effective as there were usually suspicions among educators on issues of witchcraft.

The other critical factor working against the school-based Development Support Groups (DSGs) was the exposure by respondents that the DSGs had failed in their duties as they assessed every educator as outstanding in terms of performance. It meant that members of the DSGs did not expose weaknesses of educators for further development. This raised the crucial question of how Development Support Groups would be able to evaluate and help to develop educators if they had failed to identify the areas where support was needed. This confirmed the idea that the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System was indeed in a crisis.

For any evaluation programme to be effective there had to be regular feedback to the people who had been evaluated. Van der Waldt and Du Toit (2005:204) state categorically that those being evaluated should receive regular feedback on the results of their efforts to enable them to determine progress. However, the respondents reported that the Development Support Group had failed to give them feedback and support. Respondents indicated that after evaluation there had been no follow-up to help them develop. This further confirmed the notion that the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System was in crisis.

### **5.6 PERSONAL GROWTH PLANS (PGPs)**

The evaluated educators in consultation with members of the Development Support Group developed their Personal Growth Plans (PGP). In terms of Collective Agreement Number 8, the PGP formed an important record of the needs and progress of individual educators. The research exposed that educators were unable to draw up their Personal Growth Plans. Respondents attributed their failure to draw up their PGPs to insufficient training. Personal Growth Plans were supposed to contain performance problems, weaknesses and areas of strength. This meant that the PGP was a crucial document for the development of educators, without which any attempt to develop educators in terms of the Integrated Quality Management System would be an exercise in futility.

The Personal Growth Plans could also help educators to carry out the schools' strategic plans. According to Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003, completed Personal Growth Plans had to be submitted in March for proper planning. This would enable the development of School Improvement Plans (SIP). The research exposed the fact that the majority of educators did not know when Personal Growth Plans should be submitted. Some educators did not know what was actually supposed to be contained in the Personal Growth Plans. This implied that educators did not know one of the key aspects of their development, hence the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System for educators and the whole school development was a total fiasco.

## **5.7 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS (SIPs)**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a document that contains the proposed overall improvement of the whole school. The School Management Team and School Development Teams develop the SIP. The SIP must be linked to the strategic plans of the school and the Department of Education. The SIP must take on board educators' Personal Growth Plans as well as the seven focus areas included in the Whole School Evaluation policy. Among other things, the SIP helps the school to measure its own progress through a process of ongoing self-evaluation and development.

Nel *et al.* (2001:519) state that managers and subordinates jointly decide on an action plan to achieve the individual's goals. At school level, this action plan is known as the SIP. Managers and subordinates have to agree on specific times for formal checks to be made on the progress towards the goals. In terms of the Integrated Quality Management System, the SIP must contain development plans and their timeframes.

It emerged from the research that the majority of schools did not have School Improvement Plans. Educators at the very few schools where there were SIPs said that they were not involved in developing the school improvement plans. Only the principal or School IQMS coordinator had developed such plans. However, respondents further indicated that such arbitrary plans were never implemented. As a result, these SIPs had never benefited either the educators or the schools. This made one infer that schools had failed to implement one of the central aspects of the Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS), *viz.* the School Improvement Plans. This put the implementation of the IQMS into a further crisis.

## **5.8 CONCLUSIONS**

It is now beyond doubt that the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System has had no visible or experienced positive impact on educators within the Lebowakgomo Circuit. The only impact was negative in that it demoralised educators because of poor implementation. The Integrated Quality Management System therefore failed to realise its golden goals, *viz.* to improve the performance of educators and the

overall effectiveness of schools. This signifies that the IQMS failed to add value to schools. Respondents attributed this fiasco to a number of factors, for instance, lack of training, no support from the Department of Education and the complexity of the IQMS documents such as the appraisal document, performance measurement and whole school evaluation. This vividly confirms the statement by the Minister of Education, Naledi Pandor, that the IQMS contains too many tools that do not work together in a co-ordinated manner.

It is against this background that one would agree with the deputy president of the South African Democratic Teachers' Union that the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System is indeed in a crisis. This was clearly proved by the failure of all schools within the Lebowakgomo circuit to put in place and implement the crucial aspects of the IQMS such as Personal Growth Plans and School Improvement Plans. This statement also supports the notion of the former president of Democratic Alliance, Tony Leon, that it seemed that the national minister, Naledi Pandor, lacked the capacity to implement the IQMS.

In addition, the research also disclosed areas that needed to be researched further. This included the possibility of delinking the money-related incentive from the development of educators. Salary increment as an incentive could indeed motivate educators to perform better, but to some extent, it may corrupt the whole performance management tool. The research demonstrated that the corruption was mainly in the form of favouritism, inflated scores for the sake of the one percent salary increment and grade progression, and only pretending to be working hard during the evaluation period. It is a fact that in most cases money-related activities result in corrupt tendencies for personal gain.

The other area that requires further research is the issue of self-evaluation. It emerged from the research that educators were unfair in their self-evaluation. They did not expose their areas of weakness. They painted a picture of everything going on smoothly in their teaching activities. This was done for the sake of the salary increase, thus hiding crucial areas for further development. Finally, the recommendations given below, may, if



considered, help to unpack and streamline the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System.

## **5.9 RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is against the above background that the following recommendations are made:

- The one percent salary progression should be reviewed and increased to three percent because one percent serves only to demotivate educators.
- The administration of the Department of Education at regional level should be improved so that those who have been evaluated receive promptly what is due to them.
- The Department of Education should immediately ensure that resources such as school buildings to alleviate overcrowding, school furniture, libraries and laboratories are provided to the schools.
- The Department of Education should immediately appoint education specialists to facilitate the implementation of the Integrated Quality Management System. Such education specialists should be appointed at all levels of the departmental structures, namely, circuit, regional and provincial level. The appointed education specialists should pay regular visits to the schools to facilitate the implementation of the IQMS.
- The cascade method of training educators should be stopped as it has completely failed to deliver the expected results. The Department of

Education should budget for the training of all educators. Such training should be in phases, grade by grade, until Grade 12. Enough time should be set aside for training.

- The trainers of the trainees must first be thoroughly prepared to facilitate the overall training of all educators.
- Circuit managers should also be thoroughly trained to be in a position to evaluate principals.
- Collective Agreement Number 8 should be reviewed and restructured in such a way that the Development Support Group is made up of a peer, head of department or a principal, a departmental education specialist from the circuit and a union representative. Thus each Development Support Group will consist of four members who are well positioned to deal with any form of favouritism. This group must also provide regular feedback to educators.
- Collective Agreement Number 8 should further be reviewed in order to reduce the number of instruments making up the Integrated Quality Management System. Only Development Appraisal and Performance Measurement should be retained. The Whole School Evaluation instrument should be discarded. This will help to streamline the performance evaluation process.

- All educators should be involved in the development of School Improvement Plans (SIPs). Their Personal Growth Plans must thus be taken on board. The SIPs should contain timeframes.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, M. (1994). *Performance management*. London: Kogan Page.

Armstrong, M. & Murlis, H. (1988). *Reward management: A handbook of salary administration*. London: Kogan Page.

Bittel, L.R. & Newstrom, J.W. (1990). *What every supervisor should know, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Brynard, P.A & Hanekom, S.X. (1997). *Introduction to research in public administration and related academic disciplines*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Cascio, W.P. (1995). *Managing human resources*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cheminais, J, Bayat, S., Van der Waldt, G. & Fox, W. (1998). *The fundamentals of public personnel management*. Kenwyn: Juta & Co Ltd.

Cherrington, D.J. (1995). *The management of human resources*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cloete, J.J.N. (1998). *South African public administration and management*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Cloete, J.J.N. (ed). (1977). *South African public administration*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Cloete, J.J.N. (1997). *Personnel administration and management*. Pretoria: JL van Schaik.

Coetzee, W.A.J. (1988). *Public administration: A South African introductory perspective*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Crossly, P. J & Taylor M.J (1995). *Effective performance management system*. London: Routledge.

Dessler, G. (1997). *Human resource management*, 7<sup>th</sup> edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

De Vos, A.S. (ed). (2005). *Research at grass roots*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Education Labour Relations Council. (2003). *Collective Agreement Number 8 of 2003: Integrated Quality Management System*. Johannesburg: Government Printers.

Education Labour Relations Council. (1998). *Employment of Educators Act, Number 6*. Johannesburg: Government Printers.

Education Labour Relations Council. (1998). *Resolution No. 4 of 1998*. Johannesburg: Government Printers.

Esman, M.J. (1991). *Management dimensions of development: Perspectives and strategies*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Fisher, J., Miller, K., Katz, L.A. & Thatcher, A. (2003). *South Africa at work: Applying psychology to organizations*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Flynn, N. (1997). *Public sector management*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. London: Prentice-Hall Harvester.

Gibson, J.L, Ivancevich, J.M & Donnelly, J.H. (1991). *Organizations: Behaviour, structure, processes*. Homewood, III: Irwin.

Hanekom, S.X. & Thornhill, C. (1983). *Public administration in contemporary society: A South African perspective*. Johannesburg: Macmillan Southern Africa.

Hanekom, S.X. & Thornhill, C. (1986). *The functions of public administrator*. Durban: Butterworth.

Hogwood, B.W & Gunn, L.A. (1984). *Policy analysis for the real world*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, T & Shand, P. (1995). *Performance Management*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers

Hughes, O.E. (2003). *Public management and administration: An introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Katz, M. (1995). *Performance management*. Jaw: People Dynamics.

Kgosana, C. (2006). *Teachers to fight over bonuses*. City Press: Johannesburg.

Lundy, O. & Cowling, A. (1996). *Strategic human resource management*. London: Routledge.

McLagan, P.A. (1993). *Performance management: Can it work?* Minnesota: McLagan International, Inc.

Minnaar, F. & Bekker, K. (2005). *Public management in the information age*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Mohlala, T. (2006). *Is Pandor panicking?* Mail & Guardian: Johannesburg.

Mouton, J. (2005). *How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Nel, P.S., Gerber, P.D., Van Dyk, P.S., Haasbroek, G.D., Schultz, H.B., Sono, T.J. & Werner, A. (2001). *Human resources management, 5<sup>th</sup> edition*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Neuman, W.L. (2006). *Social research methods, 6<sup>th</sup> ed*. Boston. Pearson.

Nigro, F.A. & Nigro, L.G. (1984). *Modern public administration, 6<sup>th</sup> edition*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Ntola, T. (2006). *Quality teachers for quality education*. The Educators' Voice: Johannesburg.

Pandor, N. (2006). *Address by the Minister of Education at the SADTU conference, Johannesburg, Friday 1 September*. The Educators' Voice: Johannesburg.

Pauw, J.C., Woods, G., Van der Linde, G.J.A., Fourie, D. & Visser, C.B. (2002). *Managing public money: A system from the south*. Sandown: Heinemann.

Reid, M.A., Barrington, H. & Brown, M. (2004). *Human resource development*. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. London: CIPD House.

Rosenbloom, D.H. (1989). *Public administration, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Rubin, H.J. & Rubin, I.S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. London: Sage.

South African Democratic Teachers' Union (SADTU). (1999). Manual for developmental appraisal system workshop for SADTU members (unpublished).

Spangenberg, H. (1994). *Understanding and implementing performance management*. Kenwyn. Juta & Co, Ltd.

Starling, G. (2002). *Managing the public sector, 6th edition*. New York: Harcourt College Publishers.

Van der Walddt, G. & Du Toit, D.F.P. (2005). *Managing for excellence in the public sector, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Lansdowne: Juta & Co, Ltd.

<http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:TzHQJFrFUScJ;www.topkinisis.com/conferen>).

<http://www.cosatou.org.za/news/weekly/20051007.htm>)

[www.fin24.co.za/articles/business/display\\_article.aspx?Nav=ns&lv12=buss&Ar...](http://www.fin24.co.za/articles/business/display_article.aspx?Nav=ns&lv12=buss&Ar...)

[www.mg.co.za/articlePage.aspx?articleid=281661&area=/the\\_teacher/teacher...](http://www.mg.co.za/articlePage.aspx?articleid=281661&area=/the_teacher/teacher...)

[www.pmg.org.za/docs/2006/060620iqms.htm](http://www.pmg.org.za/docs/2006/060620iqms.htm).)

[www.sadtu.org.za/idex.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=284&Itemid...](http://www.sadtu.org.za/idex.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=284&Itemid...)

[www.sadtu.org.za/idex.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=290&Itemid...](http://www.sadtu.org.za/idex.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=290&Itemid...)

[www.iol.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_South+Africa&set\\_id=1&click\\_id=&art\\_id](http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?from=rss_South+Africa&set_id=1&click_id=&art_id)



ANNEXURE A

*QUESTIONNAIRE TO EDUCATORS*

To the respondents:

*This questionnaire is meant for gathering information on the implementation of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). It is only meant to fulfill the requirement for the study of MPA. You are assured of the confidentiality of the data collected. Your names will not be mentioned in the report. No confidential data will be published without the consent of the participants. Thus, the respondents are assured of anonymity of information.*

**NB: This questionnaire consists of both closed and open questions. For closed questions, answer by making a tick in a selected box. For open questions, elaborate as possible as you can. If the space is not enough, you may attach a loose sheet.**

1. Is IQMS managed in such a way that educators are able to acquire skills, knowledge and competence?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

1.2 Please state areas of concern regarding the implementation of IQMS

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

2. Were you all trained as educators to implement IQMS?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

2.1 What type of training? Was it a centralized workshop attended by two or three educators from each school that were to cascade it down to other educators. Please explain.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

3. Do you understand IQMS's Performance Standards and Assessment Criteria?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

4. With the help of Development Appraisal (DA), are you able to determine your area of strength and weakness?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

5. Does your school have programmes for individual development?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

6. Is the Performance Measurement (PM) implemented fairly for salary progression?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

6.1 State areas where you feel PM is not implemented fairly.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

7. Do you, as an educator, accept IQMS as a vital instrument to measure your performance?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

7.1 State reasons for your answer.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

8. Did the Departmental officials ever come to conduct the Whole School Evaluation?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

8.1 If yes, does the Whole School Evaluation lead to the overall effectiveness and efficiency of a school?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

8.2 Explain how effective the Whole School Evaluation at your school is

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

9. Are the Development Support Groups (DSGs) competent enough to provide the required support and mentoring?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

9.1 Describe areas where the DSG has failed you or satisfactorily supported you

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

10. Is there adequate support from the Department of Education in respect of the Whole School Evaluation and IQMS implementation as a whole?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

10.1 Is the professional development of educators taken seriously by the Department of Education?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

10.2 Is there any programme such as In-service Training by the Department of Education for your professional development?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

11. Can IQMS really help you to deliver quality public education?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

12. Since your evaluation, has your performance improved?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

12.1 If your performance has not improved since the implementation of IQMS, discuss possible reasons.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

13. Are you able to conduct self-evaluation and identify your strength and weaknesses?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

14. Are you able to draw up your Personal Growth Plan?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

14.1 If yes, what are key issues in your Personal Growth Plan?

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

15. Does your School have School Improvement Plan (SIP)?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

15.1 Were you involved in drawing up the School Improvement Plan (SIP)?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

15.3 Are the Development programmes derived from the SIP implemented effectively and efficiently?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

15.4 Discuss how you benefited from your SIP's development programmes

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

16. Does IQMS enable you to add value in the form of knowledge, skills, abilities and innovation to your school? Explain.

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |

17. Can IQMS help educators, learners and parents to move towards the realization of school's strategic goals?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

17.1 If NO, explain why.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

18. Were you able to identify performance problems at an early stage of evaluation and provide possible solutions?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

18.1 If no, discuss reasons and if yes, give example of such problems and solutions.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

19. Has Development Support Group considered contextual factors when evaluating educators?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

19.1 If yes, give examples of such contextual factors

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

20. Halo effect is a tendency to let one favourable or unfavorable incident/trait to colour appraiser's judgement of an individual's performance, e.g. prejudice, favouritism, unforgiveness, stereotyping or discrimination. Explain any halo effect you have experienced.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

21. Was appraisal interview done privately?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

22. As an educator, were you given chance to explain obstacles standing in your way of success?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

22.1 If yes, cite examples of those obstacles and if no, explain the reason.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

23. Were your ratings treated as confidential?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

24. Was a comparison between you and other educators made?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

25. Who has developed the School Improvement Plan?

|                  |               |                         |
|------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| IQMS coordinator | The principal | School Development Team |
|------------------|---------------|-------------------------|

26. When must Personal Growth Plan be submitted?

|       |      |           |
|-------|------|-----------|
| March | June | September |
|-------|------|-----------|

I would like to express my sincere thanks for your patience, tolerance and understanding.

**ANNEXURE B**

***QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE CIRCUIT MANAGER***

**To the respondent:**

*This questionnaire is meant for gathering information on the implementation of Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS). It is only meant to fulfil the requirement for the study of MPA. You are assured of the confidentiality of the data collected. Your names will not be mentioned in the report. No confidential data will be published without the consent of the participants. Thus, the respondents are assured of anonymity of information. Thanking you in anticipation.*

**NB: This questionnaire consists of both closed and open questions. For closed questions, answer by making a tick in a selected box. For open questions, elaborate as possible as you can. If the space is not enough, you may attach a loose sheet.**

1. Is IQMS managed in such a way that educators are able to acquire skills, knowledge and competence?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

1.2 Please state areas of concern regarding the implementation of IQMS

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

2. Were all educators trained to implement IQMS?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|



2.1 What type of training? Was it a centralized workshop attended by two or three educators from each school that were to cascade it down to other educators. Please explain.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

3. With the help of Development Appraisal (DA), are educators able to determine their area of strength and weakness?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

4. Do schools in your circuit have programmes for individual development?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

5. Do educators accept IQMS as a vital instrument to measure their performance?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

5.1 State reasons for your answer.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

6. Have the Departmental officials ever gone to schools to conduct the Whole School Evaluation?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

7.1 If yes, does the Whole School Evaluation lead to the overall effectiveness and efficiency of a school?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

8. Are the Development Support Groups (DSGs) competent enough to provide the required support and mentoring?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

9.1 Describe areas where the DSG has failed educators or satisfactorily supported them

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

10. Is there adequate support from the Department of Education in respect of the Whole School Evaluation and IQMS implementation as a whole?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

10.1 Is the professional development of educators taken seriously by the Department of Education?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

10.2 Is there any programme such as In-service Training by the Department of Education for educators professional development?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

11. Can IQMS really help educators to deliver quality public education?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

12. Are educators able to draw up their Personal Growth Plans?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

13. Do Schools within your circuit have School Improvement Plans (SIPs)?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

14. Are the Development programmes derived from the SIP implemented effectively and efficiently?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

15. Does IQMS enable educators to add value in the form of knowledge, skills, abilities and innovation to your schools?

|     |    |
|-----|----|
| YES | NO |
|-----|----|

16. Can IQMS help educators, learners and parents to move towards the realization of school's strategic goals?

17.1 If NO, explain why.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |

