

## **A Collaborative Approach to Curriculum Supervision in Limpopo Province Primary Schools**

Livhuwani Robert Manwadu<sup>1</sup>, Nancy H. Mutshaeni<sup>2</sup> and Samuel T. Mashau<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>*University of Venda, Department of Curriculum Studies and Education Management,  
P.O. Box 5050, Thohoyandou 0950 South Africa*

*E-mail: <sup>1</sup><[Livhuwani.manwadu@univen.ac.za](mailto:Livhuwani.manwadu@univen.ac.za), [drlrmanwadu@workmail.co.za](mailto:drlrmanwadu@workmail.co.za)>*

*<sup>2</sup><[nancy.mutshaeni@univen.ac.za](mailto:nancy.mutshaeni@univen.ac.za)>*

**KEYWORDS** Collaborative approach; curriculum supervision; internal curriculum supervision; external curriculum supervision; school based curriculum supervision; curriculum monitoring and evaluation.

**ABSTRACT** The need for collaboration and partnership in supervising by external and internal curriculum supervisors has been felt for decades. The aim of the study is to address the challenges of curriculum supervision and support given to primary school educators in the implementation of curriculum supervision in the Vhembe District, Limpopo Province. Data was collected from 320 primary school teachers, 40 principals and 16 external curriculum supervisors. The study culminated in the introduction of a collaborative approach to curriculum supervisors whereby efforts of external and internal supervisors would be harnessed and incorporated for effective teaching and learning. Findings revealed a unanimous acknowledgement of both external and internal curriculum supervision as being supplementary and complementary to each other. However, an exclusive application of either external or internal curriculum supervision strategy in monitoring and evaluation of teachers is considered to be full of challenges. The study therefore recommends an improvement in curriculum supervision system by introducing a collaborative model which is school-based and in-built in the teaching and learning framework of the school.

## BACKGROUND

The challenges pertaining to curriculum supervision in schools has been persistent over the years in various systems of education. However, the importance of curriculum supervision in schools cannot be overemphasized. It has been acknowledged by several scholars such as Fanning (2002), Nir (2002) and Zuber-Skerrit and Roche (2003). However, challenges pertaining to curriculum supervision in schools have been persistent over the years in various systems of education. In Britain, for example, inspectors or supervisors acted as mere fault-finders for a long time (since the establishment of Her Majesty's Inspectorate in 1938) and in some cases curriculum supervision was done to get rid of incompetent teachers (Ornstein & Levine, 1993).

Issues pertaining to supervision of teachers in schools in South Africa emerged simultaneously with the system of education. When the Dutch East Indian Company established schools immediately after 1652, the public demanded an independent means of monitoring and assessing teachers. The external system of school inspection put in place at the time was manned by the clergymen who were unskilled and ignorant about curricular issues (Ruperti, 2000).

The simmering problems regarding curriculum supervision persisted in the country culminated in the riots of June 1976 when students sought exclusion of Afrikaans as a medium of instruction from the school curriculum. The uneasiness of the situation at schools and its concomitant disobedience of authority by both teachers and learners resulted in general public insurgence as emphasized by Mulaudzi (1995) and Ramparsad (2001). The chaotic situation reached its climax in 1990.

The emergence of the new political dispensation in this country resulted in the development of new visions regarding education and its supervision (Kallaway, 1990). The culture of teaching and learning in schools was restored and the transformation from the old fashioned school inspection to supervision of schools gained more impetus and advocacy (Armstrong, 2000). The traditional school inspection was perceived to be ineffective as a means of helping teachers due to lack of transparency in the process, witch hunt attitudes shown by inspectors, irregular school visits, lack of follow up sessions and others (Dipaola & Hoy, 2008).

The widely preferred and highly advocated curriculum supervision system brought with it the strengthening of the internal curriculum supervision within schools (Saphier & King, 2004). This study therefore sets out to investigate the extent to which external and internal

curriculum supervisors can collaborate for effective teaching and learning to take place in schools.

Despite descriptions, explanation and experiences surrounding curriculum supervision being fraught with theoretical and professional dilemmas in some cases, theorists such as Inskipp (1996), Richmond (2008) and Proctor (2008) suggest that curriculum supervision is the foundation for good practice. In fact, curriculum supervision has always been an integral feature of education programmes in different systems of education. Supervision of activities at the school level is a key factor in ensuring the good functioning of education programmes.

In accentuation of the above view, Armstrong (2000) acknowledges that curriculum supervision has changed its roles from fault-finding and terror-striking classroom visits to improving teaching and learning. It can therefore be argued that curriculum supervision is the most important activity towards development of effective teaching and learning in schools. The fact that curriculum supervision enhances teaching and learning is augmented by Zuber-Skerrit and Roche (2003), when elucidating the essence of standards of service delivery in education. Curriculum supervision therefore plays a crucial role regarding the maintenance of standards in teaching and learning in schools.

Effectiveness of curriculum supervision in teaching and learning is determined by the encounter between the supervisor and supervisee. Nir (2003) writes about close relationship between supervisors and teachers. The nature of this relationship depicts a key encounter where the influence of the organizational authority and professional identity of teaching staff collide, collude and connect. The impact of this encounter on teaching and learning can therefore not be emphasized.

On the contrary, Ornstein and Levin (1993), Daresh (2000), and Dipaola & Hoy (2008) argue against curriculum supervision as a means of promoting teacher self-direction since it undercuts professional empowerment through increased surveillance. Curriculum supervision should as a result, be done in such a way that does not stultify initiative qualities of individual teachers. Teachers should always be considered as innovative professionals who can direct their growth and individual development. This view is supported by Pajak (2002), maintaining that supervision programme should grant a space of possibility for teacher monitoring that is generative, liberating and honors the intelligibility and intentionality of the teacher's work. Saphier and King (2004) also state that the pastoral powers of supervisors should not undermine teachers' professionalism. Despite the caution cited above, regular monitoring and evaluation of teachers to ensure satisfactory performance can never be negated.

Collaborative approach to curriculum supervision is vehemently supported by a variety of scholars (Govinda & Tapan 1999, Daresh 2000, Nir 2002, Tam 2008).

Partnership in curriculum supervision is considered essential for effective monitoring and evaluation of teachers as alluded to by Otunga and Nyandusi (2008). They stress the importance of integration among various directorates in Kenyan system of education namely, Monitoring, Evaluation and Improvement: Kenya National Examination Council: Kenya National Union of teachers, and others for effective supervision of teachers.

In emphasizing the essence of integration of external and internal curriculum supervisors in education Govinda and Tapan (1999), maintain that fleeting visits and casual observations of teaching will not help in improving quality of teaching and learning.

Monitoring and support given to teachers should be a continuous and participatory process. Externally determined quality parameters for all schools are inadequate. In her advocacy for school-based curriculum supervision Tam (2003), argues that centrally-driven curriculum supervision initiatives imposed upon schools have limited impact on raising pupil performance and achievement. External curriculum supervision should therefore be augmented and supplemented by internal supervision for improvement of teaching and learning in schools.

In support of collaborative approach to curriculum supervision Uchiyama and Redin (2008), suggest that the values of collegiality and collaboration in curriculum supervision are indispensable as a way of annihilating teacher resistance. Engagement of teachers at the periphery in decision-making and construction of curriculum supervision structure leads to collective ownership of the supervisory system. Conceited efforts would therefore be exerted to make the process a success. Fallen (1991) acknowledges the view mentioned above when accentuating that implementation of curriculum supervision innovations is bound to be unsuccessful if teachers are not involved in the entire process of curriculum supervision. Teacher's role should not be narrowed to curriculum implementation. Collaboration in curriculum supervision can therefore never be overemphasized.

Lack of training is experienced by both supervisors and supervisees alike. Otunga and Nyandusi (2008) argue that the competency of the quality of the assurance and standard in curriculum supervision is compromised by lack of training in curriculum supervision. This view is amplified by Tam (2008) who alludes to lack of knowledge and skills reflected by both supervisors and supervisees. It is therefore of utmost importance that both external and internal supervisors, as well as supervisees be trained intensively before any supervision process is undertaken.

In a nutshell, collaborative approach to curriculum supervision is an indispensable and inalienable component for ensuring quality teaching and learning in schools in various countries. Successful application of collaborative approaches in numerous education systems in UK, USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and others, is espoused in literature (Nir, 2003). As a result of the above scenario the aim of this study is to determine the extent to which external and internal curriculum supervisors can collaborate in supervising teachers for effective teaching and learning. Furthermore, it focuses on curriculum supervision strategies currently employed in primary schools.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This study is governed by the theoretical underpinnings of curriculum supervision concentrating on clinical supervision as a pre-condition for effective teaching and learning. The principles of curriculum supervision involve coordinating, monitoring, stimulating and directing growth of teachers through the provision of continuous guidance and support by supervisors for effective teaching and learning (Daresh, 2000). The relationship between the supervisor and supervisees is accentuated by Pajak (2000). According to Gordon (1992) and Daresh (2002), clinical supervision should be conducted in a cycle of pre-observation conference, observation, analysis and strategy, supervision conference and post conference analysis. Clinical supervision process can provide continuous support and guidance to teachers.

## **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed in this study. The quantitative research approach was used to address structured items in questionnaires distributed to primary school teachers and principals, and in interview conducted with external curriculum supervisors.

The qualitative research approach was used in this study to address the in-depth open-ended items used in questionnaires to teachers and principals and in interviews conducted with external curriculum supervisors. Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2006) stress the importance of qualitative approach in the study of human behaviour and experience.

The population of this study consisted of primary school teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors. Primary school teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors were targeted by this study because of their direct role in the curriculum

implementation processes at classroom level. The schools as well as respondents were randomly selected, using simple random sampling. Permission to conduct the field study was obtained from the Department of Education in Limpopo Province. I personally distributed questionnaires to primary school teachers and principals. Respondents were given two weeks to complete questionnaires and all of them (100%) were returned. Appointments were made with external curriculum supervisors for the purpose of conducting interviews. Each interview lasted for about one hour.

## **ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Questionnaires distributed to primary school teachers and principals were issued with covering letters informing them that information solicited from them would be used for the purpose of the study. Respondents were also assured that their anonymity would be maintained and that they were not under duress to participate in the study and that the outcomes of the study would be made available to them on request.

Data analysis began with the categorization and coding of responses from questionnaires and interview schedules according to variables such as names of institutions, number of respondents and major themes into which responses were grouped.

The analysis was further carried out by counting all responses made on all closed or structured items and converting them into percentages. Open-ended or unstructured items were also used to solicit data pertaining to the respondents' views, ideas and reasons on the matter under investigation. Results were presented first in the form of tables, followed by the researcher's interpretations.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Primary school teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors were requested to furnish information on the availability of curriculum supervision in schools, how often it is done and how adequate it was. The items above sought to establish information with regard to the effectiveness of curriculum supervision in schools. Results on the items mentioned above are discussed below:

Results indicated that an overwhelming majority of primary school teachers (94%), principals (80%), and external curriculum supervisors (60%) concurred that external curriculum supervision was being conducted in primary schools. Regarding the frequency of conducting

curriculum supervision, the majority of all groups of respondents shared similar sentiments that it was done once or twice per year. The picture portrayed by the above results indicates that external curriculum supervisors were not visiting schools regularly.

The situation depicted by the results above suggests that teachers in primary schools stay too long without supervision. But a continuous monitoring and evaluation system is required as it is stipulated by curriculum supervision policy documents.

Regarding the number of external supervisors available, teachers (57.5%), principals (60%) and external supervisors (100%) indicated a ratio 1:50 and more. This situation suggests that each external supervisor is allocated a huge number of teachers to supervise rendering it impossible for effective monitoring and evaluation to take place. More teachers should therefore be recruited to enter the field of curriculum supervision in order to curb the scarcity of human resource.

Results on the quality of external curriculum supervision indicate that primary school teachers (29% disagreed and 68% strongly disagreed), principals (15% disagreed and 60% strongly disagreed) were not satisfied with the quality of external curriculum supervision employed in primary schools. This view was confirmed by external curriculum supervisors (62.5%) who did not approve of the quality of supervision given to primary school teachers. In view of the sentiments expressed above, other avenues of curriculum supervision should therefore be explored as a way of improving curriculum supervision in Limpopo Province.

Primary school teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors respondents were requested to indicate their preferred curriculum supervision strategies. Results on this item are discussed below:

A considerable number of primary school teachers (67.5%) and principals (70%) preferred a curriculum supervision strategy which was internally conducted and in-built in the teaching framework of the school. However, external supervisors (75%) rejected this strategy. This situation could be attributed to the fact that external curriculum supervisors viewed their role to be crucial in curriculum supervision and did not want to be excluded from the process. On the contrary, primary school teachers and principals were of the opinion that locally based curriculum supervision could be ideal and viable in schools.

Teachers preferred self-appraisal and self-directed approach by but other respondents did not support the strategies. Teachers and principals (77.5% and 81% respectively) also preferred the introduction of some form of clinical supervision in schools whereby school principals and senior teachers take sole control of the process but acknowledged some challenges in this approach of curriculum supervision. As a result of the above situation a form of collaborative

approach was suggested by all respondents aiming at harnessing the efforts of all stakeholders concerned in curriculum supervision.

Primary school teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors were requested to give information pertaining to concepts related to curriculum supervision. The majority showed understanding of the concepts; external curriculum supervision, internal curriculum supervision, curriculum inspection, facilitation and evaluation. The understanding of the concepts could be contributed to the current trend in education where these concepts are accentuated in relation with curriculum implementation processes in schools.

Primary school teachers, principals and external supervisors were asked to give information pertaining to the necessity for external curriculum supervision in schools. Results on the above item are reflected in Table 5.

Despite the rejection of the external curriculum supervision strategy by primary school teachers (61%), principals showed a divided opinion on the issue. However, the majority of external curriculum supervisors (75%) welcomed the external approach.

The following reasons were given in support of external curriculum supervision: It is necessary to inform the Department of Education and other stakeholders about what is transpiring in schools; teachers need external supervisors to be effective and serious about their work; external supervisors are perceived to be unbiased towards supervisees; lack of knowledge and skills to conduct curriculum supervision by school-based supervisors and others.

Respondents also indicated that external curriculum supervisors mainly applied the following as ways of conducting curriculum supervision: Staff appraisal; general inspection; follow-up inspection; routine inspection and Whole School Evaluation (WSE). However, all proposed strategies were considered ineffective as a means of promoting teaching and learning in the classroom as they possessed several inherent pitfalls within them.

Teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors were requested to give information on strategies to improve external curriculum supervision. The strategies proposed are discussed below:

Results on the strategies for improving external curriculum supervision in schools indicated that the majority of teachers, principals (75% and 70% respectively) and external supervisors (87.5%) supported the integration of external and internal curriculum supervision. The school-based curriculum supervision was also welcomed by teachers and principals (67.5% and 65% respectively) but rejected by external supervisors (37.5%). Engagement of

educators as curriculum supervisors was also supported by teachers (67.5 %), principals (65%) and external curriculum supervisors (81%).

Recruitment of more external supervisors to beef-up the supervising section was also viewed as essential by teachers (65.5%), principals (70%) and external curriculum supervisor respondents (75%). This situation could be attributed to the acute shortage of human resource in the curriculum supervision wing of the Department of Education. The engagement of more curriculum supervisors was therefore a priority for curriculum supervision to become more effective in schools.

The above results show that all categories of respondents were not comfortable with the type of curriculum supervision employed in primary schools then. Several suggestions were as a result made to improve the current curriculum supervision system.

Primary school teachers, principal and external curriculum supervisor respondents were requested to give information regarding constraints experienced in external curriculum supervision. The following issues were most commonly raised by teachers and principals:

External curriculum supervisors did not inform teachers and principals about their pending visits to schools. Ideally, surprise visits to schools should not be the norm in the district under study.

Teachers as well as principals were not informed about the criteria involved in curriculum supervision.

External curriculum supervisors were considered unfamiliar with certain factors occurring within schools. They were therefore not in a good position to help teachers to improve teaching and learning in the classroom.

Teachers did not have ample opportunities to discuss issues with external curriculum supervisors after evaluation processes. Follow-up sessions should be improved by creating contact time between the supervisor and supervisees.

External curriculum supervisors unanimously stated that inadequate external curriculum supervisors were a major concern in implementing effective curriculum supervision in schools.

Constraints mentioned above accentuate the fact that external curriculum supervision in schools was fraught with pitfalls that needed to be addressed for curriculum supervision system in schools to become vibrant.

Primary school teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors were requested to furnish the researcher with information pertaining to the nature of internal curriculum supervision in schools. Results on the above aspect are discussed below:

Results indicated that internal curriculum supervision was done. However, it was of a poor quality as indicated by teachers (33.75% = disagree and 62.5% = strongly disagree) and principals (80% = disagree and 7% = strongly disagree) with internal curriculum supervisors having divided opinions on the matter. The situation reflected by the results above suggested that school-based curriculum supervision was not effectively conducted in schools. However, external curriculum supervisors were watching the development in curriculum supervision from a distance. Hence they had divided opinions on the issue.

In essence, the sentiments shown on the items mentioned above suggested that the sole application of internal curriculum supervision in schools as a way of bringing about effective teaching and learning is not ideal.

Primary school teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors were requested to furnish the researcher information on the necessity of internal curriculum supervision. Results on this item are discussed below:

There was unanimous consensus with regard to the necessity of internal curriculum supervision in schools as the majority of primary school teachers (72.5%) principals (86%) and external curriculum supervisors (87%) shared the same sentiments.

The following are given in support of internal curriculum: it can be in-built into the school system and activities; criteria for evaluation are conveyed to teachers in time; anxiety and fear associated with supervision are greatly reduced; it can ensure continuous evaluation; follow-up sessions are easily conducted, and others.

On the contrary, the following challenges were given by respondents pertaining to the application of internal curriculum supervision: Lack of knowledge and skills for conducting curriculum supervision by internal curriculum supervisors; exclusion of external curriculum supervisors could lead to lack of support by department leading to a laissez faire attitude; disloyal and resistant teachers could derail the process; favouritism towards certain teachers; lack of commitment and seriousness, lack of uniformity in curriculum supervision; internal curriculum supervisors committed to teaching and learning activities in classrooms.

In a nutshell, despite its anomalies, internal curriculum supervision approach cannot be totally obliterated as a means of enhancing effective monitoring and evaluation of teachers in schools.

All three categories of respondents were requested to make recommendations on how to improve curriculum supervision in primary schools. Results on the above item are interpreted below:

The primary school teachers; principals and external supervisors (56%, 65% and 81.5% respectively) suggested that external and internal curriculum supervision should complement each other. Some other strategies of improving internal curriculum supervision given were: workshops, seminars and conferences to be held regularly for empowering educators with knowledge and skills on curriculum supervision, principals and teachers to be allowed to do classroom observations, self-evaluations be encouraged, objective of curriculum supervision be clearly spelt out to teachers and others.

The majority of respondents expressed a need for integrating several positive aspects of external curriculum supervision into internal curriculum supervision approach as a way of improving curriculum supervision in schools. The incorporation of external and internal curriculum supervision approach would tap on positive elements from both strategies discarding all aspects considered negative.

Teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors were requested to rank constraints experienced in internal curriculum supervision in schools (from 7 to 1) according to their seriousness, with the most serious one assigned seven (7) and the least serious given one (1). Results on the above aspect are discussed below:

Results on constraints indicated by respondents show that teachers consider bias and nepotism by external curriculum supervisors (ranked 7) as a major constraint in effective application of internal curriculum supervision in schools. This view could emanate from lack of professionalism portrayed by the current crop of teachers. Teachers also viewed lack of experience, skills and knowledge by internal curriculum supervisors (ranked 6) as another serious constraint. This situation could be attributed to lack of training on curriculum supervisory matters experienced by teachers.

Principals regarded lack of workshops, seminars and conferences (ranked 7) to be a major hindrance in internal curriculum supervision. This was coupled with shortage of time (ranked 6) as internal supervisors were educators who were expected to be committed to teaching and learning activities in their classrooms. Principals also had managerial and administrative commitments that debarred them from conducting curriculum supervision. Principals also considered curriculum supervision to be time consuming for teachers (ranked 5). The view expressed by principals could be due to the fact that teachers were expected to be engaged with learners in classrooms. However, this situation could be curtailed if curriculum

supervision was in-built within the framework of schools. An ideal curriculum supervision system should be infused in the teaching learning programs of the school.

External curriculum supervisors shared similar sentiments with principals regarding lack of workshops, seminars and conferences (ranked 7) conducted on curriculum supervision for schools. External curriculum supervisors also considered lack of support from internal curriculum supervisors (ranked 6) as a serious constraint. The view expressed by external curriculum supervisors could be influenced by the fact that both teachers and principals considered visits by external curriculum supervisors to their schools as time consuming.

The above constraints in internal curriculum supervision, as put forward by primary school teachers, principals and external curriculum supervisors prompted the researcher to conclude that there were problems in the internal curriculum supervision approach. Therefore, the Department of Education in the Limpopo Province could not rely solely on internal curriculum supervision to bring about effective quality education in schools.

While several findings were made during the course of the study regarding curriculum supervision, this section deals only with conclusions that are deemed significant in the study.

## **RESULTS PERTAINING TO EXTERNAL CURRICULUM SUPERVISORS**

External curriculum supervisors dominated the field of curriculum supervision. Despite some challenges inherent in the strategy, external curriculum supervision could not be utterly discarded as a means of monitoring and assessing teachers.

External curriculum supervisors were not aware of the day to day curriculum implementation problems experienced by teachers in schools.

Externally based curriculum supervisors concentrated mainly on routine inspections, devoting little time in addressing classroom challenges faced by teachers.

Irregular school visits by external curriculum supervisors failed to address challenges experienced by teachers on a regular and continuous basis.

### **Results Pertaining to Principals**

Principals felt excluded from decision-making processes on curriculum supervision. They considered decisions taken by the top echelons as parachuted on them as there was no consultation that took place.

Principals were also not comfortable with external curriculum supervision. They cited some challenges inherent in the system such as; time consuming, lack of transparency and irregular school visits.

Principals strongly argued that teaching and learning did not improve due to efforts of external curriculum supervisors alone. They stated subject meetings with peers, cluster meetings, hard work and dedication as contributory factors.

### **Results Pertaining to Teachers**

Teachers considered themselves excluded from decision-making processes about curriculum supervision. There was no consultation prior to the formulation of curriculum supervision policies.

Teachers rejected an exclusive application of external curriculum supervision in primary schools as this approach was perceived to be having some challenges such as lack of transparency, irregular school visitations, lack of follow-up mechanisms, results of evaluation not well communicated to teachers timeously, and others.

Teachers viewed external curriculum supervision as being conducted by prescriptive outsiders who did not exactly know what was transpiring in the classrooms.

## **THE COLLABORATIVE CURRICULUM SUPERVISION MODEL**

Findings from literature review and the field indicated that both external and internal curriculum supervision approaches applied in the region under study had some challenges. On the basis of these findings, the study proposes a model of curriculum supervision which is school-based and in-built within the operational framework of the school.

The collaborate curriculum supervision approach, if professionally guided and supported, would be effective in promoting collaboration of external and internal curriculum supervisors. The infusion of external and internal curriculum supervision strategies would embrace tapping on positive aspects from both approaches for effective supervision structures to be established in schools.

Each school should establish a school-based curriculum supervision team with an experienced curriculum advisor at the helm. The purpose of the curriculum supervision team should be to organize and monitor all curriculum supervisory activities. Inputs from teachers would be accommodated. Such system of curriculum supervision would ensure continuous assessment of teachers and would be open to monitoring by outsiders. External curriculum

supervisors would still play a crucial role as they would provide expert advice and conduct seminars, conferences and workshops to school-based curriculum advisors and curriculum supervision teams.

The Collaborative Curriculum Supervision Model (CCSM) should be a school-based and in-build into a school programme. The principal and the school-based curriculum advisor are responsible for coordinating all activities regarding curriculum supervision in schools. Internal curriculum advisors are assisted by the Internal Curriculum Supervision Team as in schools.

The Collaborative Curriculum Supervision Model (CCSM) should be an integrative model. As a result, there is an integration of efforts by various individuals mentioned above. The idea is to make the model more effective and more inclusive in its implementation, coordination and monitoring process. Therefore, the approach to curriculum supervision advocated for by the researcher is collaborative in nature.

Regarding promotion, the ideal approach is to introduce it to the educators first. Shared understanding of the model by educators is essential. Educators are expected to advocate for the model on a day to day basis in the classrooms. A bottom-up approach is, therefore, necessary for the collective ownership of the model by educators. These would include external curriculum advisors, curriculum developers, parents, politicians and other people concerned with education.

In order to defray costs the promotion of the Collaborative Curriculum Supervision Model (CCSM) could be done in workshops, seminars and other gatherings so as to avoid holding special meetings for such promotions. School-based Curriculum Advisors and their teams should promote and popularize the Collaborative Curriculum Supervision Model in meetings and workshops with colleagues, and parents. It is essential for parents to understand the new approach. Parental support is therefore necessary for the survival of the Collaborative Curriculum Supervision Model.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The study recommended that the Department of Education in Limpopo Province revisits the policy on curriculum supervision in order to establish a collaborative curriculum supervision approach whereby efforts of external and internal curriculum supervisors are integrated for effective continuous monitoring process. Continuous monitoring and evaluation is unanimously supported by scholars such as Daresh (2000), Dipaola & Hoy (2008) and others.

In planning curriculum supervision, teachers themselves should draw up the agenda, identify issues, establish the methodology of promoting effective teaching and learning, determine follow-up procedures, and ways of incorporating their plans to national policy. Annual plans in curriculum supervision should be drawn by teachers themselves.

Advanced courses on curriculum supervision should be provided to school-based curriculum teams and advisors by external curriculum supervision experts.

External curriculum supervisors should provide the link between schools and circuits, districts, province, national and international curriculum supervision experts and resources.

Principals should liaise with the circuits to initiate and monitor the process of curriculum supervision in their schools when initiating the establishment of the collaborative system of curriculum supervision whereby efforts of external and internal curriculum supervisors would be harnessed for effective teaching and learning in the classrooms.

## CONCLUSION

The collaborative approach to curriculum supervision whereby the efforts of external supervisors, principals and teachers are integrated was hitherto unexplored in the province and the country at large; therefore, the study envisaged to fill this void.

The model presented here revolutionizes the process of curriculum supervision in schools for better results. It also affirms the Outcomes-based Education expectations whereby teaching, learning and supervision thereof are locally based rather than centralized and employing a top-down approach. It also provides mechanisms for continuous monitoring and assessment of teachers in schools.

## REFERENCES

- Armstrong, M. (2000). *A Handbook of Personnel Management Practice*. London: Kegan Page.
- Cawood, J. & Gibbons, J. (1981). *Educational Leadership: Staff Development*. Cape Town: Nasou.
- Daresh, C.J (2000). *Supervision as Proactive Leadership*. Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Department of Education (2002). *School Management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Dipaola, M.F & Hoy, W.K (2008). *Principals Improving Instruction: Supervision, Evaluation and Professional Development*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

- Fanning, G.R (2002). *Curriculum Development and Program Management*. Interview with a High School Teacher, July, 14, 2002.
- Gordon, B.G (1992). *Making Clinical Supervision a Reality: Steps Towards Implementation*. NASSP Bulletin, 74. March, 14-19.
- Henning, E. (2004). *Teaching Qualitative Methodology for Educational Research: Educational Change* 6(1): 52-68.
- Kallaway, P. (1990). *Apartheid and Education: The Question of Education for Liberation*. Johannesburg: Raven Press.
- Mbatha, M.V (1994). *The Principals Instructional Leadership Role as a Factor Influencing Academic Performance*. A Thesis Presented to UNISA for M.Ed Degree.
- Mulaudzi, R.I (1995). *A Conception of Education in Democratic South Africa*. A PhD Thesis submitted to the University of Illinois: Chicago.
- Nir, A.E (2002). The Impact of School-Based Management on Supervision Instructors' Professional Consideration. *International Journal of Educational Management*. Vol. 17, No. 2, 2003:49-58.
- Ornstein, A.C & Levine, D.U (1993). *Foundations of Education*. Boston: Houghton.
- Pajak, E. (2002). *The Control Office Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction*. Georgia: Allyn and Beacon Inc.
- Ramparsad, S. (2001). *The Leadership Role of the Principal in Management and Supporting Curriculum Change in South African Schools*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Ruperti, R.M (2000). *The Education systems in Southern Africa* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Saphier, J. & King, M. (2004). *Good Seeds Grow in Strong Cultures. Document for Supervision and Curriculum Development*. Vol. 7, 1-4.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (2000). *Basics of Qualitative Research*. Newbury: Sage.
- Welman, J.C, Kruger, L. & Mitchell, D.E (2006). *Research Methodology*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press of Southern Africa.
- Zuber-Skerrit, O. & Roche, V. (2003). *A Constructivist Model for Evaluating Postgraduate Supervision*. Quality Assurance in Education. Vol. 12, No. 2 : 82-93.

